Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

4

Abantu Abamnyama
A Prelude to a Book

BY TANTALISING HIS *Ilanga lase Natal* readers with the title *Abantu Abamnyama* even before the book was published, Magema Fuze was already making an argument without saying a word. As argued in the previous chapter, the title of the published book arrests the reader's attention by being both direct and suggestive. It demands to be read and considered even if one does not read the book because it states it as a fact that black people had an origin; and that they came from somewhere. It tantalises because it does not hint at these whereabouts, but only suggests that they exist. One consequence of this provocative title is that it creates expectations in the reader that Fuze more or less failed to meet. But this failure is not, as one would expect, a reason for ignoring the book. On the contrary, although it is obvious that the book is not a history of the black people and whence they came, it contains enough adequate and readable accounts of the reigns of Zulu kings, the genealogies of different clans, and descriptions of cultural practices for it to be considered a coherent narrative. The difficulty is in deciding what to call this narrative: is it history, ethnography or autoethnography? The difficulty is compounded by the judgements passed on the text by the translator H.C. Lugg, the editor A.T. Cope and other readers and commentators who have highlighted the weaknesses and incompleteness of the work. In re-reading *Abantu Abamnyama* one faces the basic quandary of whether it is possible to transcend these limitations and to re-interpret the book as more than a failed attempt to write a history of *abantu abamnyama*.

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena
30 March 2011

The first step in this re-interpretation consists of re-situating the book as one part of a writer's body of work rather than just an isolated product – 'the first book ever written by an African of this Province [Natal]' (Lugg, 1979: xvii). When considered from this viewpoint, *Abantu Abamnyama Lapa Bavela Ngakona* becomes more than just a novelty; its existence represents the author's attempt to write himself into history.[1] It therefore follows that in reconsidering *Abantu Abamnyama* one has to reflect on and recognise that in writing his histories – both those published in newspapers and in *Abantu Abamnyama* – Fuze was concurrently carving out a role for himself as an educated *ikholwa*. It is this self-reflective consciousness as a writer that defines his obsession with the written word and the project of writing a book for and about the black people. This chapter is an attempt to elucidate how Fuze conceived this project of writing history. It is important to state clearly that the objective is not to assess Fuze's narratives as true or false, accurate or inaccurate. Rather the objective of this and subsequent chapters on Fuze's writing is to interpret his work as literary production; that is, as writing produced and conceived as contributing to an imagined or extant literature.[2] The literariness of Fuze's writing does not just consist of his facility and familiarity with literacy and Western literature, but it is also about his sourcing of African oral traditions which he then turns into literary devices. In other words, my concern is with Fuze as a storyteller of a particular kind – he told stories about history and histories, including his own history as a convert and a writer. One important reason for ignoring the temptation to audit Fuze's writing is that many of the statements he made about historical events are contestable and continue to be contested in contemporary South African historiography.

As a first attempt at interpreting the body of work Fuze produced, this book has explicitly chosen to eschew the traditional or hagiographic biography – the biography of great men – in favour of an intellectual history of Fuze as a writer. Fuze was not a great man and this book does not propose to make claims that he was. Instead, it aims to explore how in the course of his life as a writer, Fuze articulated a number of ideas and themes whose provenance can in the first instance be traced to particular historical moments of his life, but which then continued to concern him in his later writings as well. This means that though his life as an author

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

developed through distinct stages and contexts, his writings cannot be neatly located in, or confined, for example, to early, mature or late periods. The fragmentary nature of his writing also means that it is impossible to make categorical assertions about its nature and location. A great deal of the interest and significance of Fuze's work has to do with the ways in which it was located in the transition between different cultural and intellectual worlds. Whether one reads the book *Abantu Abamnyama* or the serialised articles in *Ilanga*, one finds Fuze addressing an audience, real or imagined, which no longer belongs to a traditional oral culture nor quite yet to the modern world of literate culture. This active bricolage and dialogue emanate from a collage of ideas and arguments that are difficult to categorise under a single name or term as either traditionalist or modernist, tribalist or nationalist. As in the previous chapter, Fuze's development as an historian is explained by distinguishing between moments of articulation and moments of consolidation. This distinction rests on the assumption that each of his ideas germinated or emerged at a particular historical moment, sometimes without being clearly and explicitly articulated by Fuze, only to be revived later in more explicit and direct terms. The difference between the moments of articulation and those of thematic consolidation consists not only of changed political and historical contexts, but also of distinct writing styles, genre, vocabulary and audience.

Whereas in 1859 the Natal-Zululand divide was still largely about the Zulu royal refugees who had fled to Natal and were residing with the Bishop, by 1877, when Fuze visited Zululand again, converts had become a more prominent population group and their status within the independent Zulu kingdom was a growing bone of contention. As a consequence, Zulu authority and sovereignty were challenged as being intolerant to converts and conversion. There were rumours that the Zulu king Cetshwayo was killing converts and missionaries were also known to be abandoning their missions (Etherington, 1978: 84–6). Fuze travelled to Zululand in July 1877 to investigate the allegations that the Zulu king was ordering the execution of converts. His account, 'A Visit to King Ketshwayo', was published in the prestigious *Macmillan's Magazine* (1878). This published account was remarkable in that, apart from the records of Fuze's conversations with the king, it also included ethnographic

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

details about the practices of the Zulu people as well as historical information about the graves of deceased clan chiefs. Of principal interest, for our purposes, was Fuze's admiration for what he termed the government of Zululand and his proposals concerning how educated Africans could be of use to this government. The text was, according to Colenso, written in Zulu and translated and edited for publication by him.

It was Colenso who framed Fuze's article as a defence of the Zulu king Cetshwayo. It is obvious that the article was intended for an English audience and therefore Colenso began by describing reports of atrocities as exaggerated. The bishop wrote:

> Such exaggerated accounts have been sent to England of the state of things in Zululand, and particularly of the 'atrocities' which are said to have been committed by orders of the king, in respect of numerous native converts, and to have caused a sudden flight of many of the missionaries from the district, that your readers may be interested in a narrative of a visit which has just been made to the Zulu king, by a Natal native, written down by himself in Zulu, and literally translated into English.[3]

Colenso then went on to describe how Fuze worked as a manager of the Bishopstowe printing office and vouched for the reliability of his account. Colenso's English readers would probably not have thought that it was significant that Fuze was described as a Natal native, but the fact that he and his fellow converts were from Natal affected their attitudes and assessments of the political situation in Zululand. This cultural and social difference, embodied in the position of the Natal native, was evident in Fuze's approach to the Zulu king. Although, as expected of a Zulu subject, he saluted, praised and was obsequious in his conversations with the Zulu king, Fuze also took great liberties in advising him how he should be governing the Zulus. Thus, after hearing all the reports concerning the converts who were allegedly killed and the king's denial of his involvement in these killings, Fuze and Cetshwayo entered into a conversation about the missionary, Robert Robertson. The king alleged that Robertson had been saying that all his Zulu people and soldiers

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

should be converted. Cetshwayo told Fuze, 'I answered him that we don't know anything about that; he had better go and make converts of the soldiers of his own people first, and after that these people of ours may be converted'.[4] That Cetshwayo well understood the double standards of British imperialism and its agents was thus clearly enunciated. Fuze, true to the controversial teachings of his mentor Colenso, responded to the king's obvious unease at the implications for his authority of more conversions to Christianity, by stating:

> King of kings! That is good. Gumede![5] And I too say, sir, that the soldiers of the king and the whole Zulu people should be converted. For what means that being converted? Is it not a good thing to be converted? To be converted, sir, it is to practise what is right and good before men and in one's own heart, to carry a white heart through reverencing Him who made all men. That is not being converted, Gumede, when people cast off the power which is appointed to rule over them, and despise their king, and go and live with the missionaries.[6]

Fuze's apparent acceptance of Zulu authority – that is, his translation of the meaning of conversion to include obedience to the temporal powers of the Zulu sovereigns – might seem surprising. After all, he had been to see Mpande in 1859 and had heard the laments of Mkhungo's sisters and their fear that they would be killed when Cetshwayo came to power. By claiming that there is no contradiction between the secular power of the Zulu king and the sacred act of conversion, Fuze performed the kind of explanation-by-analogy that Colenso had used to explain baptism to his father.[7] Moreover, it is obvious that Fuze's understanding of the legitimacy of the Zulu king was not just concerned with his customary authority, but was instead envisaging a basis for the future autonomy of the kingdom. Thus, in Fuze's ensuing comments on Zululand, it became apparent that his notions of proper governance were by no means traditional. For example, in his assessment of Cetshwayo he stated:

> It is right that all people should know that Ketshwayo loves his people; he does not at all wish that they should kill one another,

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena
30 March 2011

> or that he himself should kill them. He has altogether abandoned the policy of Tshaka and Dingane, and carries on that of the English in earnest.[8]

At another point, Fuze chastised the Zulu councillors of the king for allowing diviners (*izanusi*) to continue their practices of smelling out supposed witchcraft. In these comments, Fuze's Victorian ideal of Zulu sovereignty was explicitly stated:

> I wish to tell you that all the Zulus across the Tugela (refugees in Natal) wish to return here to-day, being oppressed with trouble coming from the white men, through having to pay much money to the government and to the white landowners. But I assure you that there is not one who will come back to be killed, for truly you are people ruled by *izanusi* [diviners], who tell you that this or that person is an evil-doer . . . Why, don't you know that you have now joined yourselves entirely with the laws of the Queen? . . . Further I wish to tell you that it would be good that all the children of Zululand should be instructed . . . and get power to be wise like white men. Your sons ought to speak with the white chiefs, and to go across the sea, and speak with the great Queen of the English, who is kind and gracious in all she does; you ought to know that.[9]

Fuze's complex articulation of the views of the Natal refugees; his desire for a modernised, albeit Victorian Zulu mode of governance and justice; and his exhortation that the Zulu aristocracy should be educated to converse with the colonial and imperial order, encapsulated the dilemma of the Natal native within the geopolitical Natal-Zululand divide. Fuze's comments, rather than suggesting a complete capitulation to English ways, seemed to be about the pragmatic management of power as a response to the presence of European power and expansion. Thus, although the reference point is Queen Victoria, and to a certain extent Christian notions of just government, this should not suggest that Fuze was a Zulu imperialist. Rather, what Fuze articulated was the novel idea that the political divide between the independent Zulu polity and colonial Natal

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

was temporary and would be bridged if and when Zulu government was reformed along Victorian lines.

Fuze's 1878 article thus gave a generally sympathetic view of the reign of the Zulu king, Cetshwayo. His admiring comments on the peacefulness of Zululand and the kindness and virtues of Cetshwayo were evidently written to counter the unflattering reports of those who were fleeing the kingdom. Cetshwayo himself expressed a suspicion that there was a hidden strategy behind the accusations that he was killing converts. After Fuze had told him about the appeals that had been made on behalf of Langalibalele by Colenso, Cetshwayo replied:

> You see Sobantu there is a father to me, he is not like other white men; his words are different from theirs, they are pleasant . . . I hope that Sobantu will always have a care for me, for those white men are talking – talking – talking, and they want to come down with might upon me. But for my part, as I have done no wrong, I will not run away. And yet through that I know the ruin of the land will come.[10]

The king's appreciation of his predicament is extended by Fuze, who compared the position of Cetshwayo to that of Langalibalele and Matshana. In his own assessment, Fuze emphasised the potential ruin of the Zulu king. He stated:

> One who knows the story of the ruin of Matshana will see plainly how matters stand with black people, and how the black chiefs are attacked with accusations . . . Why, Matshana was completely ruined through it; it was said that it was he who sent his people to kill that Sigatiya; and that talk, in fact, drove Matshana away from Natal, and he fled away to Zululand. After many years the truth was brought to light through the trial of Langalibalele, that Matshana never sent men to kill Sigatiya; and so Matshana was ruined for nothing at all, and his people were killed for nothing at all. Will it be the same, I wonder, in the case of Ketshwayo? It ought to be thoroughly known that Ketshwayo is wholly blameless in respect of the death of the convert.[11]

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

This portentous judgement of how indigenous leaders were ruined by rumours and accusations that they were killing converts, explained not only Fuze's sympathy for Cetshwayo, but underscored his personal interpretation of the Langalibalele trial. Like Cetshwayo, Fuze could from experience appreciate the hidden colonial strategy in the accusations and this informed his conclusions that Cetshwayo's rule was benevolent. When he wrote *Abantu Abamnyama*, Fuze repeated his laudatory assessment of Cetshwayo's government and although the book's account of his conversations with the king differed from the 1878 article, he reiterated the argument that at the time Cetshwayo had sensed an imminent invasion. His later views on Zulu government and Zulu kings would be consistent with those expressed at this time.

'*Ukuqala kokuhlupeka*': the beginning of the troubles

If Fuze's 1877 trip was about reading the omens that foretold war, it was not long before the invasion occurred and indeed Cetshwayo, the last Zulu king, was destroyed. As history would have it, the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879 was a watershed moment for innumerable reasons, not least because the defeat of the British forces at Isandlwana shocked the imperial world and was instrumental in the creation of the image of the Zulu people as the martial race of South Africa.[12] There is certainly no shortage of accounts of the war – from soldiers' accounts to glossy coffee-table pictographic books to movies – the war has been thoroughly researched, revisited and re-enacted.[13] Thus when reading Fuze's 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu kwaZulu' (The Attack of Zululand by the White People) series published in *Ilanga* in 1919 it is natural to compare and weigh his account against this extant archive. Certainly his own account contains historical information about the battles and skirmishes of the war, the actors who were involved and in many instances dramatic re-enactments of the battles. Considering these characteristics 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu' belongs with this archive. The problem is that his account has never really been captured and incorporated into this archive.

Second, if one judges the series by comparing it to others then one is faced with the problem of choice: whose account should be used as a standard by which to assess Fuze's account? Even he was not consistent because the account given in *Abantu Abamnyama* is not the same as the

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

Ilanga series. There have also been as many oral traditions and stories about the war as there have been historians' accounts and analyses. The problem of interpretation also emerges again: if Fuze's writing on the war is regarded as unique, then one is hard-pressed to explain why it shares similarities with the other standard oral accounts. On the other hand, if one reads his work as being part of the colonial archive, then one is left with the impression that Fuze was merely mimicking and regurgitating contemporary colonial notions about the war. Neither of the positions is an accurate reflection of the content of the series. In choosing how to interpret the series, it is obvious that any attempt to compare Fuze to other writers and informants would merely produce a tabulated he-said-she-said account of very little value. Alternatively, if our interpretation were to focus on extolling the originality and authenticity of Fuze's war reporting then we would lose sight of the fact that his account is only one amongst innumerable native accounts and therefore has no special claim to authenticity. With these limitations in mind, our examination of the series will interpret the work as what it is, namely a retrospective account by a writer who was a witness, an accomplice and an aspirant historian. The three elements of witnessing, participation and writing are so commingled that the final product is indefinable. It is neither an eyewitness account, because Fuze was not physically present when some of the events took place; nor is it about his own actions during the war, because these are often hidden from view by Fuze's impersonal and detached narrative. And, even when recounting and writing, Fuze often dramatised and quoted conversations to which he certainly was not privy. In short, 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu' is as much a work of the imagination as it is an historical account of a war in which Fuze was an observant witness. The fact that it was published in 1919 only adds to the sense of historical distance that separated the original events and Fuze's account.

The character and personality of Cetshwayo is a central feature of Fuze's account of the war and this is not just because he was the last Zulu king. Since Fuze had already written about the magnanimity and judiciousness of the king for his 1878 article 'A Visit to King Ketshwayo' it is not surprising that he accentuates this portrait of the king and uses it as an explanation and prelude to his account of the war. The differences

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

between the 1878 and 1919 accounts are important to note: the 1878 account was written in Zulu and translated into English for an English-speaking audience; whereas the *Ilanga lase Natal* series was written in isiZulu for a Zulu-speaking audience. The latter fact seems to have caused Fuze to be more liberal in his recollections because instead of paraphrasing the conversations of the king, he now quoted verbatim. It is of course unlikely that these were word-for-word quotations, but their quality and rendition suggest that Fuze was also dramatising and memorialising his encounters with the king.[14] For example, he cited at length the king's supposed premonition about the invasion and wrote:

> Kwaba njalo-ke ukufa kwezwe lakwaZulu, kwaya ngezwi lenkosi eyalikuluma kimi yati, 'Abelungu bayeza lapa, kepa tina asiyikubabalekela ngoba lesi siqingana sikaSenzangakona angikonzile ngaso kubelungu, kukonze mina ngedwa. Ngiyazi ukuti sekuyakuba nga'mhla lidubukalayo-ke mzuku loko'.[15]
> So went the destruction [death] of the land of the Zulu, it went according to the king's words which he spoke to me, 'The English [whites] are coming here, but we will not flee from them because this islet of Sezangakhona's is not my tribute to the English, I am the only one who is a tributary. I know that on that day it [the land] will splinter'.

This pitiable picture of a king who is isolated, hemmed-in and a tributary of the English is the image around which Fuze hooked his narrative of the war. The above citation of the king's words also serves a further function because it presents Cetshwayo's understanding of his own kingship. Although obscure, Cetshwayo's argument that even though he was paying tribute to the English, he was not using the Zulu kingdom – Senzangakona's islet – as the prize is a reference to both his coronation by Theophilus Shepstone in 1873 and his own sense of his diminishing powers as an independent monarch. Again, the cautionary proviso should be repeated that these could be Fuze's words, put into the king's mouth. But even so, as a statement about the king's notion of his relationship to the English they depict an ambiguous political situation in which the king was both a sovereign and a subject coupled with his own naïve view

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

that he, and not the Zulu kingdom, was a client of the British empire. Interestingly, this summation of the king's premonition is in the first instalment of the series in which Fuze described 1879 as a kind of *annus mirabilis* for the Zulu people and kingdom. He recounted the rumours that Cetshwayo had killed a regiment of girls, the iNgcungce, for refusing to marry the veteran regiment to which they were betrothed. Fuze defended the king by stating that he merely threatened to kill the girls in order to frighten them, but never did. The second misfortune of that year was the fight between two of the king's regiments, the amaMboza and iNgobamakhosi. This led to him conclude that 'lowonyaka wabe umubi, unesisila esikulu' (that year was bad, with many misfortunes).[16] As a prelude to the account of the 1879 invasion, this characterisation of the king and the year has the effect of portraying the war as fated and the king as a tragic figure who was powerless to change the course of Zulu politics. The fact that the belligerent regiment, the amaMboza, was led by Hamu, one of the king's brothers who later defected to the English, strengthened Fuze's argument that the events of that year were ominous. He goes so far as to argue that it was already evident in 1879 that certain Zulu dignitaries and nobles had had conversations with the English who promised to make them kings if they participated in the destruction of the Zulu king.[17]

The actual invasion of Zululand began with an ultimatum delivered to Cetshwayo on 11 December 1878 that demanded amongst other things the extradition of certain Zulu men to Natal, the payment of fines and the abolition of the Zulu regimental system. When the ultimatum lapsed on 11 January 1879, the British forces invaded (Guy, 1994a: 49; Laband and Thompson, 1989: 193–5). In his own account Fuze dedicated a whole instalment to narrating the colonial events and machinations that preceded the invasion. He described the events in Zululand that led to the issuing of the ultimatum and also the attempts by Colenso to intervene and prevent the invasion.[18] It is in his descriptions of Colenso's lobbying that Fuze inserts himself into the narrative by describing how the Ekukhanyeni press worked night and day to print Colenso's letters to the imperial and colonial authorities. This portion of the narrative, written as it is from an Ekukhanyeni perspective, provides yet more evidence of how Colenso's growing involvement in colonial and Zulu

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena
30 March 2011

politics implicated his converts. In retelling the story, Fuze cited the advice that Colenso sent to Cetshwayo once he realised that his intercessions had come to naught. He is said to have advised the king thus:

> Niyabona, loku abelungu sebelwa noCetshwayo, nize nimtshele umntanami, ati noma eselwa nabelungu, angalingi abadhlulisele eminceleni yezwe lakwaZulu uma ebahlehlisile, ukuze nami ngiphendulane kahle nabelungu; ngoba impela bayakugcina ngokunahlula.[19]
> You see, now that the English [whites] are fighting Cetshwayo, tell my child that when he fights the English he should not follow them across the borders of the Zulu country if they retreat, this is so I can respond to the English because truly they will defeat you.

The gravity of these words of advice – or treachery, if you were British – are that they reached, in Fuze's account, Cetshwayo who advised his warriors accordingly. It is important to note the terms which he is reported to have used:

> Eseyibutile eyake uMahlamvu wakuluma nayo, eyiyala, eyiqondisa ngako konke; wayitshela nokuti baze bangaweqi umncele bangene kwelase Silungwini noma bebaxotshile abelungu kuleyo nkati; wabayala nangokuti mabalwe baqinise, bakumbule ukuti balwa impi yokugcina ngomuso abasayikupinde bayilwe, baqonde futi ukuti sebeyakudonsa izinqola zabelungu batwale amasaka ombhila njengamahashi.[20]
> Once Mahlamvu[21] had gathered them [his army] he spoke to them, and gave advice while making them understand all, he told them not to cross the border and enter the land of the English even if they had forced them to retreat; he warned them that they must fight with might, and remember that they are fighting the last war because on the morrow they would not fight another, they must also understand that they were going to pull the wagons of the English and carry sacks of maize like horses.

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

Whether these were Cetshwayo's literal words we shall never know, but the fact that they are stated as such by Fuze reveals that he saw Cetshwayo as an anti-colonial hero who, when the time came, understood the basic fact that one of the objectives of the war was to subjugate the Zulus and turn them into beasts of burden. This notion of the economic and political exploitation that accompanied colonisation is repeated in other parts of the narrative and is important because it suggests that the Zulu rationale for fighting the war was not just about preserving the traditional authority of the king; but it was also about preventing the enslavement the Zulus associated with colonial modernity.

Whatever the king may have thought of the imperial ambitions of the English, he also had enemies, traitors and antagonists who were closer to home. In his account Fuze wrote extensively about the different actors who participated in the war either for or against the king. His account also reveals much about the causes of the war, especially when he writes about the internal strife within the Zulu polity. The fission and fragmentation of the Zulu elite that preceded and typified the conduct of the civil war of the 1880s are all elements mixed into Fuze's narrative. As noted above, one of the events that defined the year 1879 for Fuze was the fight between the two regiments amaMboza and iNgobamakhosi. Fuze stated that it was Hamu who told the older regiment that since they were being routed by the younger one, they should stab them with spears instead of beating them with sticks.[22] For Fuze this event signalled the beginning of Hamu's sedition:

> Wo! kwaba njani ke lapo! amaMboza ebagwaza ngemikonto abafana kwaba insumansumane. Loko kwaseku ukuqala kwokuhlubuka kukaHamu embusweni wakubo . . . Hau! kwaba buhlungu nasenkosini loko'kwenza kwomfo wabo, yazibonela nje nayo ukuti uHamu uyalwa nayo ngokwenza lomkuba.[23]
>
> Alas! it was a sight to behold! The amaMboza stabbed with spears the boys and it was an extraordinary thing. That was the beginning of Hamu's desertion of his family's reign . . . Oh! it hurt the king that his brother acted this way, he saw for himself that Hamu was fighting him when he carried out this evil deed.

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

The accusation that Hamu was already undermining the king's rule is developed into Fuze's argument that other Zulu nobles began to entertain illusions of grandeur because the English promised them sovereignty. He thus concludes: 'Elakwa Zulu lafela emoneni wokuhaukela izwe, akuko okunye' (The land of the Zulus was destroyed because of jealousies and the desire for the land, nothing more).[24]

Zibhebhu of the Mandlakazi – the other antagonist in this internal strife – acquired an even more notorious reputation.[25] His role in the civil war is particularly important since he was one of the chiefs whom the British appointed when the kingdom was divided into thirteen chiefdoms in 1879. Fuze's account of Zibhebhu's actions begins in the aftermath of the king's restoration in 1883. In terms of the development of his narrative Fuze had modified the title of his series to 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu kwaZulu ngo1879 – Ukuqala Kokuhlupeka' (The Attack of Zululand by the White People in 1879 – The Beginning of the Troubles). This seems to indicate that for Fuze the Zulu kingdom ended with the arrest and exile of Cetshwayo and that everything after that falls into the category of the troubles, which defined not only the restoration and attenuated reign of Cetshwayo, but that of his son and successor Dinuzulu. Zibhebhu was central to the waging of the civil war and Fuze sketched his role accordingly. In drawing his portrait, Fuze used many methods and one of these was comical caricature. At one point he described Zibhebhu as:

> umfo koMapita onkonovana ombana, ongeze watsho nokusho
> ukuti ngumuntu omkulu, ungabona ikhehlana nje
> eliyindojeyana embana kakulu esicocwana sibheke nhlanye.[26]
> that fellow of Mapitha's who is slovenly and ugly, you wouldn't
> say that he was an important person; you would just see a
> small head-ringed and insignificant man who is very ugly with
> his lop-sided head-ring.

This caricature provides comic relief to an otherwise detailed and damning portrayal of Zibhebhu's opportunism. According to Fuze, when Colenso died in the winter of 1883 messengers reached Zululand and told Zibhebhu:

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> 'Utshonile uSobantu ob'ekade ebusela inkosi; hamba Zibhebhu uyomqeda manje kakulungele, kona seuzakutata umuzi wakwaZulu ube ngowako.' Wanela ukuzwa ukuti uSobantu kaseko wayihloma umfo koMapita [*sic*].[27]
> 'The Sobantu who ruled on behalf of the king is dead; go now Zibhebhu and finish him off he is not prepared, you will then take the house of Zulu and it will be yours.' As soon as he heard that Sobantu was dead the fellow of Mapita's armed.

By insinuating that an unnamed person or persons sent a message to Zibhebhu telling him about the death of Colenso and its auspiciousness for an attack on Cetshwayo, Fuze was pointing fingers at Natal's officials and accusing them of causing the civil war. The fact that he quoted directly from the supposed message and its derisive reference to Colenso as the person 'who ruled on behalf of the king' verifies his other arguments about the mendacity of the colonial officials who promised Zulu upstarts power if they dethroned Cetshwayo. There is no doubt that Natal's officials, especially the British Resident in Zululand, Melmoth Osborn, favoured and aided Zibhebhu's claims to power (Laband and Thompson, 1989: 208–9; Guy, 1994a: 102–3). Fuze accused them also of being agents provocateurs who assisted Zibhebhu to strategise and thereby force the uSuthu into reacting, which would then strengthen their allegations against Cetshwayo. The details of the civil war are well documented (Guy, 1994a: 183–209; Laband and Thompson, 1989: 211–15). The relevance of Fuze's account is that he provides both an Ekukhanyeni version of events while at the same time exposing and attempting to explain the animosity and intrigue that fuelled the civil war.

Hamu and Zibhebhu were the most prominent of the king's enemies, but they were not the only ones. In his account Fuze intermittently mentions other traitors, deserters and mercenaries whom he, with varying degrees of focus, incorporates into the narrative. One example of an ambitious upstart who benefited from the exile of Cetshwayo is Mfanawendlela whom Fuze uses as an example of the chiefs who, once they were appointed by the English, imagined that they had truly become kings.[28] He wrote:

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> kute selifile nje elakwaZulu, uMfanawendhlela umnumzana
> wesizwe sakwaZungu, wati uba abekwe ngabelungu wawuveza
> obala lowo mkuba ababulala ngawo izwe. Kwakuti uma kufika
> umuntu kuye engangeni emnyango engakulekanga ati
> 'Bayete'.[29]
> once the land of the Zulu was destroyed, ~~u~~Mfanawendlela the
> headman of the Zungu people, exposed, as soon as he was
> appointed, the evil practices by which they destroyed the land.
> Whenever a person came to see him he would not enter the
> door without saluting him by saying 'Bayete'.

The usurpation of the traditional salute for the Zulu king is an apt example of the illusions of grandeur to which many of the appointed chiefs succumbed. Fuze's argument is that these illusions were created and incubated by the British and colonial officials who promised these minor chiefs power and influence. The more telling case of a beneficiary of Cetshwayo's demise is John Dunn, who not only resided in Zululand at the time of the 1879 invasion but had also fought as a mercenary for Mbulazi in the 1856 battle of Ndondakusuka (Guy, 1994a: 16, 34). In Fuze's account, Dunn leaves Zululand after a conversation with the king about whose side he would be on when the English attacked. The impression created by Fuze's account is that Cetshwayo in his wisdom and foresight asked Dunn, before the invasion occurred, who he was going to fight for and gave him the opportunity to leave Zululand. In his dramatic recounting Fuze again verbalises the conversation as if he were there when the two spoke.[30]

An analysis of Fuze's 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu' would not be complete without a comment about how he re-enacted the events around the 1879 invasion and the subsequent civil war. It is again necessary to be cautious that his stories are not read as eyewitness accounts. Rather, they should be regarded as an historical narrative that Fuze weaves from different components in an attempt to create a coherent story and develop an argument. The creative re-enactment and vivid depiction of some of the battle scenes is just one example of how Fuze interweaved historical facts with fictional or fantastic elements. And rather than detracting from his story, this narrative style adds flair, colour and veracity to a set of events

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena
30 March 2011

that had, by the time Fuze wrote, possibly passed into obscurity or else been recounted innumerable times.

As the most famous battle of the Anglo-Zulu War, Isandlwana receives thorough treatment from Fuze. In recreating the events of the battle, he described not only the tactical and strategic moves of the Zulu army but also commented on the strategies of the English. The account is therefore not simply a eulogy to the Zulu warriors. His inclusion of details of the British war effort suggests that he was not merely writing to praise or extol the Zulus, but also to demonstrate his vast knowledge of what went on during the war from both sides of the conflict. By treating the two sides as equal competitors he could also have been trying to create an aura of objectivity or suggest that on the battlefield the two parties fought as equals. As in his other histories, Fuze does not confine himself to the facts. His narrative contains historical data juxtaposed with elaborate blow-by-blow re-enactments of the battles. A classic example of this is his description of the battle of Isandlwana. After describing how the English cavalry was forced to retreat to their camp to join the other soldiers stationed there, Fuze told of what happened once the encamped soldiers realised they were under attack:

> Bat'uba babone abelungu ukuti nansi is'iza nayo, bapuma kwotente manje; izinduna zawakuza amasotsha kona emabaleni lapo ehleze ekuzelwa kona. Wo! waya nabo uZulu. Bat'uba babone abelungu iza nayo, wezwakala kaloku umbaimbai, Ati owayo ngenhlamvu yabelungu lapo, zimemeze ziti, 'Uyadela wena ungasayi kuwumba umgwaqo!' Bagalela kwaze kwaba kane.[31]
> When the English saw that they [the Zulu army] were bringing the fight to them, they left their tents; their captains gave them orders right there on the open where they normally drill. Alas! the Zulu followed them. When the English saw that the Zulus were bringing the fight, there was an explosion of cannon fire. And when one warrior was caught by an English bullet, the others would shout, 'O, how fortunate you are since you will no longer dig roads!' They [the English] fired four times.

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

As an example of Fuze's account of the actions of the British and the Zulus the above is notable because it is typical of a style of retelling he employed throughout the series. While the account contains the factual information about how the battle was conducted, he embellished it with emotive and animated language which, when combined with the narrative, creates the impression that he had first-hand information about what happened on the battlefield. What is more striking is that Fuze gave voice to the warriors by quoting their salute to their fallen comrades. The significance of this salute is that not only does it echo Cetshwayo's warning that his soldiers would soon pull the wagons of the English, but it also offers an alternative explanation of the warriors' reasons for participating in the war. By verbalising the fighters' loathing of road digging, Fuze is simultaneously implying that the war was not just a defence of the Zulu monarch and culture, but that it was also a rejection of the economic and physical subjugation symbolised by road digging.[32] It is also possible that the soldiers were making an ironic reference to the forced labour practice of *isibhalo* that was already part of the Shepstonian system of indirect rule in Natal. Under this system, chiefs were expected to supply squads of young men to work on the colony's roads and public works (Carton, 2000: 31; Marks, 1970: 43). In Fuze's story, the warriors' exclamation is a climactic moment because it suggests a resistance to forced labour while at the same ascribing to the soldiers a naïve but single-minded purpose. Tactically, Fuze described the encounter between the English forces and the Zulu armies in poetic terms:

> Bagalela kwaze kwaba kane. Wabe uZulu engasakunakile loko, ebange pambili; kuti ngenye inkanti zilale pansi izinsizwa ziti watalala njengezinyoni, zibuya zivuke zibange kona lapaya. Kulapo kwamemeza kona uVumandaba kaNteli (induna), ehlezi kona lapa oqaqeni[33] olupezu kwamadulana abukana nentatshana Isandhlwana, wati 'Katshongo njalo!' Lapoke amabuto avukisa okwesikonyane.[34]
> They [the English] fired four times. The Zulus took no notice, they were aiming forward; and at times the young men would lie low like birds, and then rise up again and move towards that place [the camp]. It was then that a shout was heard from

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> Vumandaba of Nteli (the chief), who was sitting on the rocks on top of the hillock facing that mountain of Isandlwana, and he said 'That is not what he [the king] said!'[35] Whereupon the armies rose like a swarm of locusts.

Even while describing the battle in the tactical and strategic language of combat, Fuze allowed for divine intervention:

> Umbaimbai waduma kane wacima. Kulapo kwenzeka kona umhlola lapo, bati bonke beqabuka kwasekumi umuntu pezu kwentaba Isandhlwana, owamemeza ngezwi elikulu, wati, 'Bapakati, mabandhla kaMjokwane!'[36] kepa kaziwa lowo muntu ukuti upume ngapi, nokuti ngowapi. Po, usabuza ubani lapo? Angena amabuto kwotente, kwakala nkabi, kwakala mbongolo, kwakala muntu kwatula kwati kwitshilili![37]
> The cannon fired four times and stopped. And then a mystery occurred, all of a sudden they caught sight of a person standing on top of the Isandlwana mountain, the person [he] shouted in a loud voice and said, 'They are within, you people [assembly] of Mjokwane!' and no one knows where that person came from, or where he is from. But, who would ask questions. The armies entered the tents – the ox bellowed, the donkey brayed, people screamed in a continuous din [violent commotion]!

The marvellous occurrence described functions as a rationalisation of the actions of the Zulu forces. Its apt allusion to the praises of Shaka ('umjokwane kaNdaba') links the battle to the grander narrative of the growth of the Zulu nation. Fuze's penchant for dramatisation is again apparent in his description of the slaughter and commotion that accompanied the Zulu attack on the British camp.[38]

Although military tactics and strategies dominate Fuze's reconstruction of the battle, he also appreciated the loss of human lives. Again, he did not just focus on the Zulu losses. He stated: 'Ningezwa kutiwa bapela nya abelungu lapo eSandhlwana, kwapela naye uZulu uqobo, ngoba kwalwiwa impi eyesabekayo' (Don't just believe that it was the English who were decimated at Isandlwana, it was the same for the Zulus, because a terrible battle was fought).[39]

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

In addition, Fuze comprehended the meaning of the battle in terms that went beyond just the casualty lists. He interpreted the victory of the Zulus as a Pyrrhic one because he observed that even the warriors knew that their victory was as costly as a defeat. He noted:

> Kutiwa kwati ngokubulawa okukulu kukaZulu lapo, kwaba yilowo watwala impahla ayipangileyo kwotente waqonda emzini wakubo kaze waya kwomkulu enkosini, – isici esabonakalisa ukuti amabuto apelile noma ebaqedile abelungu. Kutiwa nenkosi uqobo yamangala nje ibona lowo mkuba owenziwa ngabantu, yasola nayo, yabona ukuti impi yayo yahlulekile noma ibaqedile abelungu.[40]
> It is said that because of the high fatality among the Zulus, each and every warrior carried his booty, looted from the tents, and went to his home without going to the capital, to the king – it was this fault that revealed that the regiments were destroyed even if they had destroyed the English. It is said that even the king was surprised when he observed this disgraceful act of the people, he began to be suspicious, and realised that his army had failed even though it had devastated the English.

As evident in his description of the slaughter of soldiers and livestock at the camp, Fuze did not seem to regard these incidents as mere details. The above demonstrates that he was aware, even if in retrospect, that the victory at Isandlwana would cost the Zulus. The fact that he ascribed the same apperception to the king suggests that he was also aware of the implications of his soldiers' actions for the war effort in general.[41]

There was also more to war than just bloodshed. In another moment of comic relief Fuze wrote about the hymns that the Zulu fighters composed:

> Amabuto ashaya amahubo okuti: 'Umlungu wahlab'inkosi Uzondelel'inkonyana yenkosi! Siyamtanda zintshwayintshwayi;[42] ningepinde nihlabe,' namanye nje amaningi amahubo.[43]
> The regiments sang many hymns, and said: 'The Englishman

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

stabs the king. He covets the calf of the king! We love him, you marchers; you will never again stab [win]' and many other hymns.

The humour in this hymn serves different functions in Fuze's narrative. It provides his serious and grave depiction of war with a moment of comedy; but it also again verbalises the feelings and thoughts of the Zulu soldiers as if Fuze had access to them. It gives credibility to his story, while also preserving an artefact from the war.

Women are the unlikeliest heroines of Fuze's historical narrative. Throughout the series he makes passing reference to the names and clans of those wounded or dead. Thus, for example, in his report on the battle of Isandlwana he noted the death of Mkosana of Mvundlana the captain of the iKandampemvu regiment.[44] Heroism and sacrifice were not, however, limited to men in his narration. In his description of the battle of Hlobane, which took place on 28 March 1879 (Laband and Thompson, 1989: 199; David, 2004: 250), he described the bravery of two young women in the following terms:

> Kungamdhla kuhlabana izintombi ezimbili zasebaQulusini, ezazicashe ngapezulu kwentaba entubeni okwati uba abelungu badundubale eHlobane, bati lapa bekuluma bebuka intaba 'Umuhle Hlobane ufana nesicoco sendoda!' kanti bakuluma loko nje kabazi, abaQulusi sebelele ngalapa nangalapa kwentaba, betuka sekuvuka impi enkulu ibagwaza. Bati ukwetuka kwabo abelungu sebebaleka bazitela pezu kwezintombi ezimbili zabaQulusi zihlomile nazo. Yavuka enye yamgwaza umlungu wawa yapinda futi yagwaza omunye yase ivukile nayo futi lena enye, yadundubala owayo nayo; kwasala abelungu abatatu lapo eHlobane abagwazwa izintombi bafa.[45]
> On that day two maidens from the Qulusi clan fought with valour, they were hiding at the top of the hill in a pass and when the whites ascended the Hlobane, and they were saying to themselves when they looked at the mountain 'You are handsome Hlobane like the headring of a man!' meanwhile they are talking not knowing that the Qulusi people are lying

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> on both sides of the hill, they were startled when there suddenly arose a large army which stabbed them. When they were startled the English ran straight into those two maidens of the Qulusi who were armed. One arose and stabbed an Englishman who fell and she stabbed another and then the other maiden arose, and overpowered another for herself; three whites were left on the battleground of Hlobane, stabbed by these maidens.

The event is itself notable because it confirms that the war fought between the Zulus and the British was not a male-only affair. The manner in which Fuze treated and wrote about the women indicates that he did not regard their role as minor: he gave as much space and thought to the heroism of the two women as he had done to other illustrious acts of courage. This does not necessarily mean that Fuze was a feminist. However, it does confirm his ability to write an alternative and unconventional history in which credit is given to both classic heroes and the marginal figures.

The events of 1879 are only a small portion of the six-month long series. Although the gory details of the battles are prominent and fascinating, there was more to Fuze's 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu' than just the sensationalism of war stories. As an extended history of the demise of the Zulu kingdom, Fuze's articles are a commentary on the events that preceded the 1879 invasion, the civil war that followed and the nature of Zulu history in general. This is clearly evident in the fact that while inclined to exaggerate the actual events with his vivid imagery and language, Fuze interspersed these depictions with astute observations about the meaning of the events and their significance for the Zulu king and people. At this point it is therefore important to return to the broader meaning of the series and examine how Fuze wrote about the complex and abstract consequences of the war and the demise of the kingdom.

In writing about the war as inevitable and ominously anticipated by the king, Fuze was no doubt augmenting his other portraits of the character and personality of Cetshwayo. However, the personality traits of the king were for him part of a larger development of Zulu kingship as an ideal system of government. In the instalment in which he wrote about the battles of Khambula and Hlobane and the heroism of the abaQulusi

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

maidens, Fuze also argued that the battle at Khambula (Kambule) was lost because uMnyamana kaNgqengelele, the prime minister, failed to heed the king's advice that they should not attack the whites when they were inside the Khambula fort. Even when a message was received from the Qulusi people that the most opportune moment for attacking would be in the morning when the English were still at Hlobane, he chose to ignore it.[46] The failure to act on the message was because 'basebe nolimi ngakubelungu' (they had already spoken to the English).[47] One of the consequences of this prevarication was that once the regiment iNgobamakhosi heard about the concealed message they plotted to attack the fort, a decision that led to their defeat. Fuze concluded:

> Nibokumbula ukuti nenkosi uqobo lwayo yabe ikwazi kahle ukuti ayiyikumelana nabelungu, bayakugcina ngokuyepuca umbuso wayo, ngenxa yomona ungaxutshwe naluto. Yase izibonela futi izikulu, ukuti ngokungazi kwazo nokukohliswa kwazo ngabelungu, seziqonde ukuyinikela ezizweni. Yiloko eyaqamba ngako indodana yayo eyabe se izele [*sic*] iyodwa yayiqamba ibizo yati ngu 'Dinuzulu' izitsho yona ukuti: 'Sebediniwe iyo abakwaZulu'.[48]
> You must remember that the king himself knew very well that he would not withstand the English, they would eventually snatch his kingdom, because of pure envy. He also saw that the nobles, in their ignorance and deception by the English, aimed to betray him to the foreigners. It is because of that that when he named his son, whom he left behind, he called him 'Dinuzulu' because he was referring to himself saying: 'The Zulu people are tired of me'.

The above statement confirms yet again the recurring theme of Fuze's admiration of Cetshwayo and his feeling that the king was a blameless victim of the intrigues of the Zulu nobles. However, he goes further, deftly connecting the legacy of Cetshwayo with that of his son by elaborating on the meaning and significance of the choice of name of Dinuzulu. Although this notion of reading and extrapolating a person's character or destiny from a name is common and appears repeatedly in

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

Fuze's work, he also seems to be linking the onomastic history of Zulu kings to the history of the Zulu monarchy in general.[49] For example, he concluded his account of the death of Cetshwayo in February 1884 by stating:

> Zinjaloke izindaba zokufa kukaCetshwayo, ibizo lake aliqanjwa nguyise owati ngu 'Cetshwayo' lalikomba ukuti uyakucetshwa ngamanga kudhlalwe ngaye abulawele ize. Ngoba nembala enkatini yokuzalwa kwake uyise naye babekona ababemceba kuDingane osongati angabulawa.[50]
> Such are the stories of the destruction [death] of Cetshwayo, whose name was given to him by his father who called him 'Cetshwayo' to indicate that he was going to be slandered with lies, toyed with and destroyed [killed] for nothing. Indeed at the time of his birth his father was also being slandered by some to Dingane who wished that he would be killed.

Although this may give the impression that Zulu kingship consists of a succession of ill-starred and ill-named kings, Fuze also uses these names and their meanings to comment generally on the fact that Zulu kingship had been won and lost by slander and conflict. Although this may suggest that he is borrowing from the colonial stereotype of Zulu despotism, his arguments rely on the subtle but effective insinuation that it was the ignorance and avarice of the Zulu nobility that destroyed the kingdom and not an inherent inclination towards tyranny as suggested by the stereotype. This ideal of a Zulu regime whose legitimacy derives from its ancient lineage and successive bestowal is clearly captured in his recitation of the king's last words in direct speech:

> Yati uba izwe ukuti ukufa sekuyahlulile yabiza uMr. Grant namadoda enawo lapo yati 'Loku-ke sengizwa ukuti ukufa sekungahlulile nango umntanami uDinuzulu nize niye kumbika kuKwini petsheya. Akuqali ngami ukufa loku. Nami umuzi lona bengiwupatele uMpande; noMpande wabe ewupatele uTshaka; noTshaka wabe ewupatele uSenzangakona; noSenzangakona ewupatele uJama uJama ewupatele uNdaba;

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> uNdaba ewupatele uMageba. Kodwa noma ngifa namhla wena Dinuzulu uze uyekulwa noZibhebhu, ulwe umahlule nami uqobo ngiyakuba ngikona lapo pakati kwempi yami elwayo, niyakumahlula impela'.[51]
> When the king felt that death had finally overwhelmed him he called Mr Grant[52] and other men who were there and said 'Now that I feel that death has finally overwhelmed me there is my child Dinuzulu whom you should introduce [report] to the Queen overseas. I am not the first to die. I was also only presiding over this house for Mpande; and Mpande presided for Shaka; Shaka presided for Senzangakhona; and Senzangakhona presided for Jama and Jama presided for Ndaba; and Ndaba presided for Mageba. Even if I die today Dinuzulu you must go and fight Zibhebhu, fight and defeat him and I will be there in the midst of my fighting army, and you will surely defeat him'.

Dingane is glaringly absent from this genealogy of Zulu kingship.[53] This was possibly due to the fact that Fuze was again using poetic licence and ascribing to the king statements that he would not have heard uttered. Compared to the account of these dying words provided by Guy (2001: 6) there is a discrepancy between Fuze's and the official version of Cetshwayo's will and choice of successor. The discrepancy, however, works in Fuze's favour because the official version does not contain the militant directive that Dinuzulu should attack Zibhebhu. Again these supposed utterances of the king should not be read literally. They represent Fuze's creative embellishments and in this case his version of the will may be closer to the truth than the official version.[54]

These statements about the final days of the Zulu kingdom and king conclude another lengthy and detailed account of the capture and exile of Cetshwayo, his re-installation and the civil war that followed. They should not, therefore, be regarded as mere summaries – they are in fact culminations of Fuze's consideration of the historical facts and events. Interestingly, the fact that Cetshwayo was transported to Cape Town to be imprisoned precipitated a digression in Fuze's narrative. Thus, for the three weeks of 18 and 25 April and 2 May, Fuze wrote about the exile of

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena
30 March 2011

Cetshwayo, especially the fact that he ended up living next to Langalibalele, the exiled chief of the amaHlubi. This also caused another digression in which Fuze then narrated the history of Langalibalele's supposed rebellion, trial and punishment. Without explicitly stating it as his objective, Fuze linked the stories of Cetshwayo and Langalibalele by highlighting their shared history of colonial demotion and exile. His conclusion about the link between the two stories is unambiguous and he told his readers: 'E! nizizwile-ke kaloku izisusa zezigigaba zokubulawa kwomuntu omnyama' (Yes! Now you've heard about the origins and affairs of the destruction [killing] of a black person).[55]

By condensing the destruction of the Zulu and Hlubi rulers into a statement about the destruction of a black person, Fuze revealed that he was not narrating these stories just for the sake of it. He was making explicit what is perhaps an implicit argument in his histories; namely that the history of the Zulu people is synonymous with the history of black people in general. Cetshwayo and Langalibalele are therefore merely emblems of the continual destruction of the black person. Such symbolic representation is constantly present in Fuze's histories and is therefore evidence that, although he was not writing a manifesto for black nationalism, Fuze conceived of a black identity in political rather than natural or tribal terms.

Besides this digression into the history of Langalibalele and his exile, Fuze's account of the civil war, like his account of the 1879 invasion, is an admixture of the historical facts and his own inventive reconstruction of events. Here again, Fuze demonstrated his ability to write about the parties involved in the conflict without necessarily eulogising one side. The narrative is of particular importance not just because it is an account of the conflict between Cetshwayo's uSuthu and Zibhebhu's Mandlakazi, but because it functions as a link between the kingship of Cetshwayo and that of his heir Dinuzulu. The transition from one king to the next is not only bloody, but Fuze's Cetshwayo was aware that he was bequeathing a fragile legacy to his son. Like the eponymous Hamlet, the ghost of Cetshwayo haunts his son's reign over the Zulu people, not least because he had promised to be there when he confronted Zibhebhu. Since Fuze's 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu' traverses these two periods in the history of the Zulu kingdom, – the reign and demise of Cetshwayo and his succession

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

by his son – it is important to interpret it in conjunction with a series in *Ilanga* that he penned two years later titled 'UDinuzulu: Ukuzalwa Nokuba-ko Kwake'. This also permits a much broader examination of Fuze's understanding of the reign of Zulu kings and the meaning of the genealogy of kingship he so frequently cited.

uDinuzulu

When Cetshwayo died, he left his son facing two inescapable dilemmas. The animosity between the uSuthu and Mandlakazi was already an irreversible fact and part of the status quo in Zululand. The partition of the kingdom also meant that the ascendancy of appointed chiefs and their ambitions were a political fact to contend with. The British and colonial officials were either indifferent to the crisis in Zululand or patently anti-uSuthu and would remain so (Guy, 2001: 87–8). In Fuze's narrative these dilemmas are encapsulated in the actions of three competing forces: the English, Zibhebhu and the Boers. Underlying this trio's behaviour is the legacy of Zulu kingship. Repeatedly, Fuze pointed to these forces and contests to explain the behaviour of Dinuzulu and also to develop his argument about the nature of Zulu kingship. Part of the interest in his portrait of Dinuzulu lies in the fact that as if to confirm the biblical curse that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children, Fuze wrote about the consequences of the 1888 retreat to kwaCeza,[56] led by Dinuzulu, in oracular language:

> Kwabanjalo-ke ukuhlupeka kwomntwana kaCetshwayo pansi kwombuso wabelungu. Ukuhlupeka loko kwakuseyiko loko okwesuka kuyise. Konke loko kulandela isiqalekiso sika yisemkulu owati: O! kabazazi iziGqoza eziziputa![57] Ubehlisele isikumba seZulu sibasibekele kanyekanye sibati-mbo bonkana. Nembala iziputa ezingabelungu zalimboza kanyekanye izwe njengokufisa kukaGxoboshe. Ake nibone-ke madoda umkuba omubi wokuyenga ingane yenkosi okwenziwa ngamaBhunu eti ayomelekelela![58]
>
> That is how the child of Cetshwayo suffered under the rule of the English. This was the same suffering that began with his father. And all of this was in line with the curse of his

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena

30 March 2011

> grandfather who said: Oh! You don't understand the pig-headed iziGqoza! Send down a hide of the heavens [sky] that will cover them instantly and entirely. Indeed the pig-headed English covered the land all at once as wished by Gxoboshe [Mpande]. Witness for yourselves the evil deed of deceiving the child of the king that was done by the Boers while saying that they were assisting him.

The three antagonistic forces of English colonial ambition, Boer duplicity and the cursed inheritance of Zulu kingship are clearly articulated in the above statement. What is less obvious is the meaning of Mpande's supposed curse and why Fuze cited it here. The curse carries meaning because in pronouncing it Mpande was equating the English with the followers of Mbulazi by using the name iziGqoza. Although it is not clear whether this curse was uttered before or after the 1856 battle of Ndondakusuka in which Cetshwayo eliminated his rival Mbulazi, the comparison's poignancy is elucidated by Fuze who interpreted Mpande to mean that the land would be eclipsed by the English. The force of this assertion is enhanced by his observation that it was the Boers who tricked Dinuzulu while pretending to assist him. In Fuze's argument the history of Zulu kingship and the manoeuvrings of the Boers are inseparable. While elaborating on the consequences of the death of Cetshwayo and the onerous suffering that Dinuzulu inherited he argued:

> AmaBhunu abe engayekile njalo ukuzaugqugquza ingane yenkosi ukuba ivume ize kuwo azoyibeka wona ebukosini bukayise, njengaloku abeka uyisemkulu ekadeni. Wabe lapo uZibhebhu kaMapita eselibusa lonke ngendhlovula, ehamba etelisa abantu edhla izinkomo zabo, imizi yonke yaba ngamagobongo yahlonga inkomo esibayeni ukupela labo asebevuma uZibhebhu ukuti sekunguyena nkosi yabo.[59]
> The Boers did not give up their constant nudging at the child of the king to agree to go to them so they would install him in his father's kingship, as they had done for his grandfather in times past. At the same time Zibhebhu of Mapita was ruling the land aggressively, he went about taxing people and confiscating their

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> cattle, all the homesteads became vacant and in want of a cow in the kraal excepting those who assented that Zibhebhu is now their king.

In this regard the observation about the Boers' constancy in seeking an alliance with Dinuzulu is followed by a comment on Zibhebhu's denudation of the people, suggesting once more that the two are related. The important point being made is that although Mpande cursed his grandson by wishing that the land be swallowed by the English iziGqoza, it was his political action in allying with the Boers that set a political precedent his grandson would later follow. Even the Boers did not fail to see the opportunity of making history repeat itself. His characterisation of Zibhebhu's rapacity is confirmation of the earlier statement that the core ambition of the nobles who opposed Cetshwayo was the desire to be made kings. For Fuze, Zibhebhu was merely acting out his long-standing ambitions when he taxed people and only rewarded those who would hail him as king.

After positioning Cetshwayo and Dinuzulu's antagonists in the above terms, Fuze spent the rest of the 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu' series describing the clash between Zibhebhu and Dinuzulu and the perfunctory assistance of the Boers. He described the 5 June 1884 eTshaneni fight between the two parties and how, once Zibhebhu's Mandlakazi were defeated by Dinuzulu's uSuthu, the former were forced to flee to the Reserve created by the 1882 restoration agreement (Guy, 1994a: 222–7; Laband and Thompson, 1989: 213).[60] In Fuze's narration of these events, the common element is the partisanship of colonial officials that continually favoured Zibhebhu and his followers while ignoring the sufferings and complaints of the uSuthu. Although Fuze does not enumerate all its consequences, the uSuthu-Boer alliance was politically costly. As part of the pact, Dinuzulu had agreed to cede land to the Boers, but soon after the defeat of Zibhebhu at eTshaneni numerous whites started entering Zulu territory demanding the cession of land. Later Dinuzulu's allies drafted a proclamation that granted the Boers land to establish a New Republic on the borders of Zululand. The proclamation was signed on 16 August 1884 (Guy, 2001: 100–1, 104–5). In recounting the events between the installation of Dinuzulu by the Boers and the 1888 rebellion, Fuze abbreviated the

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

sequence of events although he continued to give detailed accounts of some of the battles. In his narrative, the key actor and antagonist was Zibhebhu whose contumacious behaviour was the cause of much of the depredation in Zululand. On the decision by Osborn to support Zibhebhu's request to be allowed to return to his former lands in northern Zululand, Fuze noted that this was done despite the fact that Osborn knew the following: 'upambene nomteto ngokuvumela umuntu oxabene nomunye ukuba ayobahlanganisa (he was contradicting [violating] the law when he allowed one person who is in disagreement with another to be placed together).[61]

These and other occurrences that culminated in the violence of 1888 are described in the rest of the series. What is notable is that two years later Fuze published another series dedicated entirely to Dinuzulu and it is in this set of articles that he developed his interpretation of the Mandlakazi-uSuthu conflict even further while at the same time continuing his history of Zulu kingship.

Although a shorter series compared to 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu', Fuze's 1921 'UDinuzulu: Ukuzalwa Nokuba-ko Kwake' (Dinuzulu: His Birth and Existence) is a significant contribution to his general history of Zulu kings. It is also the only series from which substantial portions are duplicated in a chapter in *Abantu Abamnyama*. The chapter in the book ~~(Fuze, 1922)~~ has the same title, but is longer than the series. This suggests that the chapter was incorporated into the book after the articles had featured in *Ilanga*. As a prologue to the series, Fuze gave his readers at least one important reason for reading the articles. He told them that they should preserve his words for later generations so that they could appreciate and know about the sufferings of Dinuzulu. He stated:

> Ngojabula inxa beyakuti abakiti bawalondoloze amazwi ami bangawalahli, ukuze kuti noma sengihambile mina basizakale yiwo lapa, abantwana babo bezwa ukuhlupeka kwomntwana wenkosi yakubo, bese bekumbula ubunje bake.[62]
> I would be pleased if our people would preserve my words and not throw them away so that even when I'm gone they would have them to aid them, when their children hear about the suffering of their king, and remember his character.

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

The request that readers should conserve his words for posterity is another example of Fuze's recognition of the longevity of the written word. His statement is based on the assumption that the printed word, and therefore the newspaper in general, was a store of knowledge that each generation could bequeath to the next. Although this desire for immortality seems to dominate Fuze's prologue, it is also possible that the fact that he knew Dinuzulu personally was an additional reason for writing. Thus whereas his ideas about Cetshwayo and other Zulu kings were based on detached observation and interpretation of historical facts, his portrait of Dinuzulu exhibited some intimate knowledge of the king and his character.

Genealogy is again used as a central pillar in this examination of the reign of Dinuzulu. Instead of listing a succession of ancestors, as he had done previously, Fuze at one point singles out an ancestor and designates him as the originator of Zulu kingship. He summarised the role of Ndaba in the emergence of Zulu power in the following terms:

> Amakosi akona angaoyisemkulu naokoko bake, ngitata ibizo lika Ndaba indodana kaPunga, oyena waqalisa ukuzwakalisa izwi lokuti ubukosi obukulu buyakuhlaluka enzalweni yake, owati alusile esengumfana osokileyo, esendhle, waqamba ihubo elikulu lesizwe sakwaZulu elimiyo njalo nanamhlanje. Ngeuye [*sic*] owahaya lelihubo elikulu kunawo onke lokuti:–
> A! Ha! Oye!
> uNdaba uyinkosi.
> Oye! Ha! Oye!
> Ji-ji-ji!
> A! Oye! Ji-ji-ji!
> A! Oye! Ji-ji-ji![63]
> Of the known kings who are his grandfathers and ancestors [great grandfathers], I will pick the name of Ndaba the son of Punga, he is the one who began to assert that a mighty kingship will appear from his progeny, when he was herding as a circumcision initiate, in the veldt, he composed a great hymn of the Zulu nation which still stands today. It is he who chanted this great hymn that surpasses all the others that said:

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> A! Ha! Oye!
> Ndaba is king.
> Oye! Ha! Oye!
> Ji-ji-ji!
> A! Oye! Ji-ji-ji!
> A! Oye! Ji-ji-ji!

Again, Fuze introduces an element of predestination; only this time it is Ndaba who anoints himself, and by implication his progeny, as king. The conclusion to be drawn is that Zulu rule is legitimate because it was conceived by Ndaba and immortalised in the hymn. The connection between Dinuzulu and his kingly ancestors is thus presented as an embodiment of the promise of Ndaba's hymn. The legacy of Ndaba is further elaborated in yet another example of Fuze's onomastic history of Zulu kings. He again demonstrated how the naming of children, especially royalty, should not be done thoughtlessly. He wrote:

> Yena-ke uNdaba wazala uJama, eti ngaloko ujama ngeklwa lomkonto eziteni zake. Wati-ke uJama wazala uSenzangakona; etsho ukuti 'Loku sikwenza ngakona' epete ukuzalwa kwendodana yake. Ngako-ke uSenzangakona ezala uTshaka ozaku'tshakazisa'[64] izizwe zonke, noDingane oyaku'dinga' aze ayofela oBonjeni[65] . . . Nonke-ke niyazibonela kuloku engikubalayo ukuti ibizo lilandela umninilo njengesitunzi somuntu nesento yonke ezwayo nengezwayo.[66]
> Ndaba beget Jama, and saying by that he stares threateningly with a large-bladed spear at his enemies. In turn Jama beget Senzangakona; by that he meant 'We are doing this the right way' referring to the birth of his son. Therefore, Senzangakona beget Shaka who would 'subdue' all the nations, and Dingane who will 'want' [wander] and end up dying at Lubombo Mountains . . . So you see for yourselves in these things that I have spelt out that a name follows its owner like the shadow of a person and all things sensible [sentient] and insensible.

The implied fatalism of these arguments and Fuze's constant use of genealogy and ancestry could be interpreted as simple word play precisely

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena
30 March 2011

because its veracity depends on hindsight – we know that Shaka shook up and vanquished nations because that is what the historical record states he did. However, it seems that for Fuze these histories are more than just clever punning. Rather, the seriousness with which he treated these names and their meanings suggests that he may have been using them to imbue his interpretations of Zulu history and its proverbial wisdom with incontestable authenticity. Whether or not he succeeded in convincing the readers of the value of his interpretation is impossible to know. What is important is that Fuze was convinced enough by his method to repeat it and to reinforce its efficacy by continuously elaborating on the symbolism of names and naming. Moreover, this resort to onomastics is not about describing an immutable fatalism. Rather, Fuze used the names of kings to comment on the agency and political choices of the Zulu people and nobles. Thus, in the case of Dinuzulu he observed that the prince was only ten years old when the British invaded in 1879 and that it was soon afterwards that the Zulu people began to tire of their king. He argued:

> Kukuyo leyonkati ebuhlungu lapa uZulu wabe eseqalile ukudinwa yinkosi yabo. Ngoba pela uCeshwayo wati eyiqamba nje indodana ngalelobizo wabe ezitsho yena uqobo lwake. Nembala abakwaZulu bakuqubile bakufeza konke loko okwabe kwaziselelwa yinkosi uCetshwayo ngoDinuzulu, baza bagcina ngokutengisa ngaye ezizweni ngako ukudinwa nguye (1922: 214).[67]
> It was at that painful time that the Zulu people began to tire of their king. This is because when Cetshwayo was naming his son with that name he was talking about himself. Indeed the Zulu people furthered and accomplished all that was proclaimed by the king Cetshwayo about Dinuzulu, they ended up selling [betraying] him to the foreigners because they were so tired of him.

In his theory of the succession and meaning of the Zulu royal lineage, Fuze is therefore arguing that the name given to a king is both fate and latent agency – it is the Zulu people who ultimately act and fulfil the

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

prophetic meaning of a king's name. In fact, one could argue that Fuze's histories of Zulu kings are about this tension between fate and free will; or put differently, the pull between ancestry and innovation.

As a history of the reign, trial and exile of Dinuzulu the series 'UDinuzulu' contains the basic historical information as well as accounts of events and conversations that Fuze knew about because he worked at Ekukhanyeni. Although it also contains accounts already narrated in 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu', the series is not a mere repetition of these other stories. Thus, for example, on the issue of Dinuzulu's ancestry Fuze began the series with the story about how Cetshwayo's offspring often died soon after birth and that on observing this the Zulu people consulted diviners who expressed the following message from the Zulu kings:

> Izanusi zafika zabatshela indaba abebengayibhekile (loku pela bona bebebheke ukuti kwenziwa abatakati), zati: 'Loku kwenziwa ng'amakosi akwa'Zulu ati, ayazi ukuti kwaZulu aitandwa inzalo; ngoba uSenzangakona wabe ezele abantwana abaningi, kepa uDingane wababulala bonke. Emva kwaloko nangu uMpande ezala abantwana abaningi naye, nampo-ke bebulawa beqedwa bonke enDondakusuka. Ati amakosi akwa'Zulu sekuyakuzalwa umntwana abe munye; kona kungayikuba-ko ukuxabana nokubulalana'.[68]
> The diviners told them a matter which they were not watching (since they were expecting that this was done by witches), they said: 'This is being done by the kings of the Zulu nation saying that they know that in the Zulu nation progeny is disliked; because Senzangakona beget many children, but Dingane killed them all. After that there was Mpande who also beget many children, but they were also all killed and eliminated at Ndondakusuka. The kings of the Zulu nation say that only one child will be born; so that there will no longer be quarrels and assassinations'.[69]

So begins the story of another auspicious birth of a Zulu king. Unlike his other approach to writing history by names, Fuze deployed a new strategy by referring to yet another ancestral legacy, this time through the mediation of the diviners. The ancestral voices cited here provide both a

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

commentary on the bloody history of Zulu kingship, but also serve a legitimising function in that they insinuate that there will be only one child born, and therefore only one potential heir. This therefore legitimates the eventual succession of Cetshwayo by Dinuzulu by presenting the matter as preordained by their kingly ancestors. Politics would, however, interfere with this predestination. Despite Cetshwayo's last words, which were conveyed to the colonial officials by his brothers, the ascension of Dinuzulu to the throne was not automatic. Rather than recognise him as the heir, Sir Henry Bulwer, the Special Commissioner for Zululand and Governor of Natal, equivocated and countered the uSuthu claim that Dinuzulu was the legitimate heir. At issue was the legacy of Shaka and the colonial, especially Shepstone's, version of Zulu history (Guy, 2001: 5–11). The alliance with the Boers was therefore a political necessity occasioned by the refusal of the British and colonial officials to recognise Cetshwayo's heir. It is these political manoeuvrings that underpin Fuze's version of events. In his account, Cetshwayo's death was followed almost immediately by Dinuzulu's adoption by the Boers. His coronation by the Boers is animated in terms that demonstrate both their eagerness to be associated with a Zulu sovereign and their impersonation of Zulu rituals of kingship. On the alliance forged between uSuthu and the Boers, Fuze observed:

> Po! amaBhunu atokoza ngaloko ngoba abe ekade encenga nasenkosini ukuba ayelekele ngokuyitata, alwe noZibhebhu. AmaBhunu kwati uba afike kuwo uDinuzulu amtata ahlangana, amkwelisa ehashini elimhlophe, ambeka abe inkosi esikundlesikayise [*sic*]; wakulekelwa kwatiwa kuye 'Bayete'. AmaBhunu akuluma ati 'Niyazi nani ukuti noyisemkulu uMpande wabekwa yiti'.[70]
> Well! the Boers were gladdened by that because they had been long pleading with the king to support him by taking him, and fight Zibhebhu. As soon as Dinuzulu reached the Boers they took him and assembled, they seated him on a white horse,[71] they crowned him as king in his father's place; they saluted him and said 'Bayete'. The Boers spoke and said 'You all know that even his grandfather Mpande was crowned by us'.

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

The political and ideological failure to recognise Dinuzulu's claim to the Zulu throne led him into an alliance that would ultimately lead to the complete destruction of the Zulu kingdom. In the meantime, the prospect of victory over Zibhebhu was both enticing and necessary since Dinuzulu was instructed in his father's dying words to attack his archrival. Although there were material gains to be made in an attack on Zibhebhu, as described below by Fuze, the plunder and looting that accompanied the conflict was also a reflection of the extent of the despoliation and destitution experienced by the Zulu people since the 1879 settlement that had elevated Zibhebhu to a chiefly status. Fuze wrote:

> Kwati napezu kwamandhla kaMandhlakazi, lwayibhedula uSutu olumpondonde.[72] Kwati loku izinkomo zonke zezwe lakwaZulu sasezipelele kwaMandhlakazi lwazidhla lwazigogoda zonke uSutu. Lwababulala abantu laba kwaba ubucobololo. Po! Loku inkomo lena yabe ingasaziwa muntu noyedwa kwaZulu sezapelela kwoZibhebhu zonke, bazidhla baze bazidhla nobuka lwazo.[73]
> Even with all the strength of the Mandlakazi, they were chased by uSuthu, the-long-horned ones. Since all the cattle of the Zulu nation had ended up with the Mandlakazi, the uSuthu plundered [ate] and made a clean sweep. They killed [destroyed] all the people, it was devastation. Well! Since a cow had become a rare thing in Zululand because they had all ended up with Zibhebhu's people, they plundered and took even the emaciated ones.

The Mandlakazi and uSuthu conflict is therefore a central event in Fuze's history of the demise of the Zulu kingdom. The rest of the 'UDinuzulu' series recounts the bloody events of 1888 that led to the arrest, trial and exile of the young prince. As with the other accounts of battles and conflicts, he used both historical information and dramatisation to evoke the actions of the warring parties. For example, Fuze spent some time describing how Dinuzulu used his position on the Ceza mountain to repel the advance of the oNongqayi, the Zululand Police, and the auxiliary army in their attempt to arrest him.[74] Perhaps as a summary of Fuze's

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

interpretation of the effects of war on the Zulu people, it is apt to cite his description of how even the words used to define enemies and allies changed over time. He wrote:

> Hau, kwati nikilili nje, izwe lonke lakwaZulu lwonakala impela. Basebebizana ngokuti 'amambhuka' laba asebehlubuke umbuso wakwaZulu 'Abatshokobezi' laba abasabambelele enkosini. Kwaba kubi nje kwaqamuka amacala amabi okubulalana; kwafa muntu kwafa mlungu kwatula kwati kwitshilili.[75]
> Alas, there was scattering, the entire land of the Zulu was truly despoiled. They started calling each other 'the traitors' if they had deserted Zulu rule, 'the rebels' if they were still attached to the king. It was all very bad since there appeared many wicked crimes of murder; blacks died, whites died in a continuous din [violent commotion].

In counting the human costs of the civil war, Fuze did not distinguish between the destruction and murder of blacks or whites; he wrote about a general state of violent commotion in which people were killing each other. The fact that the terms *amambuka* (traitors) and *abashokobezi* (rebels) were used is also a sign of the extent of the polarisation of the Zulu people. Both terms have a history that predated the civil war of the 1880s: the term *amambuka* had once been used to designate the followers of John Dunn;[76] and *abashokobezi* had once designated those warriors who wore the badge of honour made of the white brush from the tail of an ox (Doke et al., 1958: 494, 744). The civil war changed the meaning of loyalty and desertion; and Fuze's account implies that the line drawn between the two was rather arbitrary and had devastating consequences.

Writing history: a writer's aspirations

The purpose of a lengthy summary and exposition of Fuze's writing on the history of the Zulu kings and kingdom was not just to demonstrate the extent of his prolific literary output; it was also to presage the more abstract and general account of the meaning of writing history, especially when it is done by an aspirant *kholwa* intellectual. There are numerous

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

possible methods of assessing Fuze's histories and there is no self-evident one. This is partly because the project of writing history was self-initiated. Fuze continuously wrote to his *Ilanga* readers requesting assistance for his prospective book on the black people. Second, even while he was writing these serials he also published letters and responses to readers who either challenged him on questions of fact or offered their support and encouragement. These readers' responses are a crucial indicator of the manner in which his *kholwa* contemporaries understood, or disputed, his putative aim of writing history. The fact that the book *Abantu Abamnyama* was eventually published means that there has to be a reconciliation, and an account of the relationship, between the book as a history of the black people and the serials, which were published under diverse titles that often had no obvious relation to the book.

Although it is impossible to construct a whole picture of how Fuze's articles were read and interpreted by his contemporaries, there are a few examples of astute and pointed commentaries and suggestions. If we accept that *Ilanga lase Natal* was a forum for the expression of a general *kholwa* literate culture, then some of these letters to the editor also provide telling insights into how these literates read texts in general and how they understood their own social and political position. While Fuze was publishing the instalments of 'Ukuhlasela kwabelungu', Jekonias Shandu wrote to thank him for his account of the destruction of the Zulu kingdom and the perfidious role played by Zibhebhu. He wrote:

> Yebo axoxe ubaba ati, Wo, he lafa bantabetu elihle kakulu. Uti, ababulala izwe izo izikulu . . . Kulukuni ukwazi kwetu tina bamnyama ngoba sikuluma esingaku qondi. Uzwa abanye beti sekukuhle ngoba kubusa abelungu. Kwake kwati ngafumana amazwi epepeni elalinyatelwa eDundee 'Izwe lakiti' Uti omunye emhlanganweni wati omunye kwakuhamba amabuto lapaya namhla sekuhamba iVangeli, lapa ekomba kona enxiweni las'Ondini[77] kepa aqondi noma wayeqondeni ngokusho njalo. Ngati lapa ngizoloba lendaba lafa ipepa . . . Ngabe kuhle Fuze wenze ibhuku.[78]
> Ah yes the old man tells us, Alas my children that is how our splendid land was ruined. He says, the land was destroyed by the nobles . . . Our knowledge as black people is limited

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

> because we speak about matters we don't understand. You hear some saying that it is now better because the whites rule. Once I came across words in a newspaper, that was printed in Dundee, 'Our Land [country]'.[79] One person reported that at a meeting another said [that] regiments [warriors] used to travel over there now it is the Gospel that travels, and pointed at the Ulundi ruins and he didn't understand what he meant by that. Just as I was about to write on that matter the newspaper collapsed . . . It would be good Fuze if you wrote [made] a book.

Without being obviously in agreement with Fuze, Shandu clearly understood the import of Fuze's criticisms of the Zulu nobles as implying that they were to blame for the demise of the king and kingdom. For Shandu, the political meaning of the destruction of the kingdom is also explicitly stated: it ushered in white rule. His concern is that some black people believed that this loss of political sovereignty was a good thing. He demonstrated his point by citing the comments that appeared in the Dundee newspaper about how the demise of Zulu power meant that whereas once regiments travelled the land, it was now the gospel that was being spread. The latter comment is particularly important if one is to generalise the political and social condition of the literati that read *Ilanga*. Shandu's citing of this pun indicates the extent to which he, and perhaps other readers, felt both nostalgic and ambivalent about the replacement of regimental marches by the march of the Christian gospel. There is, however, in his observation a separation between a concern about the spread of Christianity and the spread of literature: Shandu, like Fuze's other readers, wanted a book written and his comments about the Dundee newspaper show that he was already a seasoned reader and commentator on Zulu affairs. This desire for literature in isiZulu is a recurrent theme in readers' responses to Fuze's work and is an ubiquitous reminder that although they may not have agreed on the meaning of Zulu history and their contemporary political predicament they, as Zulu-speaking literates, shared a common history of literacy and writing.

Another reader, W. Mkasibe, linked Fuze's writing to yet another phenomenon that was associated with the intellectual, social and political

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

condition of the *amakholwa* – separatist churches and movements. In a rather confrontational letter, Mkasibe challenged the Reverend Gardiner Mvuyana, president of the African Congregational Church (ACC), to support Fuze's efforts to publish a book. He addressed Mvuyana in the following terms:

> Ngicela indawo Mhleli kwelako lodumo lwase South Africa. Ngifuna ukubhekisa kulo mzalwane ohloniphekileyo uRev. G. B. Mvuyana waseGoli eAfrican Congregational Church eDoornfontein. Ngibuza ukuti Mfundisi utuleleni ute du! Uti kanti lendaba ibhekiswe kobani na? . . . Akuko sonto elifanele ukwenzela umdhlandhla lencwadi enhle ngapandhle kwelako. Sibize tina Zulu uzobona into yamehlo . . . Futi ngetemba kungaba yinto enhle kakulu lencwadi yenziwe yiSonto loHlanga, ukuze abantwana betu bazi okuyilona Sonto libafanele ukuba balisekele. Hloma iConcert, imali yiti esiyofika nayo.[80]
>
> Could I, dear Editor, ask for space on your famous South African newspaper. I want to address myself to our respected brother Rev. G. B. Mvuyana from Johannesburg at the African Congregational Church[81] in Doornfontein. I am asking the Reverend, why are you so silent! Who do you think this matter is addressed to? There is no fitting church to work actively for this wonderful book other than yours. Summon us the Zulu nation and we will amaze you . . . And I am sure that it would be wonderful if this book was made [produced] by a Church for the Nation [indigenous church], so that our children can know which Church they should support. Organise a Concert, we will bring the money.

This letter was partly a reaction to Fuze's constant request for funding for the publication of his book, but it was also an observation on the role that Mkasibe thought the secessionist or Ethiopian churches should be playing in the creation of an indigenous literature. Connecting the two movements – separatism and book publishing – seems odd at first, but for Mkasibe the two things were linked by their common concern for

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

uHlanga (the nation or ancestry). Implicitly he was arguing that Fuze's writings were, like the separatist churches, a move towards independence. It is, however, not clear whether the national independence he was imagining was Zulu or Africanist. Also, it is not possible to know whether Fuze would have agreed to be linked to a separatist church, but the tension between Zulu ethnic nationalism and African nationalism was central to his ideas about the future of black people in South Africa.

The very act of writing had a particular meaning for Fuze and his contemporaries. While the series on Dinuzulu was being printed in *Ilanga*, Fuze also wrote a lengthy letter updating the readers about the funding he had received but also asking for more support. As a record of Fuze's attitudes to his vocation as a printer and writer, this letter is an elaborate and extensive expression of not only his work ethic but also the nature of a writer's aspirations. After listing some of his main sponsors who included Nicholas Masuku, N.J.N. Masuku, R.M. Siboto and his own son Solomon, Fuze chastised his other readers by telling them:

> Inningi leli litule liqintile, libheke ukuba inncwadi lena izicindezele yona ngokwayo, ukuze liti libona ibe sei yisideku esipeleleyo, esizenzileyo. Kanti, bakiti, awuko nowodwa umsebenzi ozenzayo. Konke kwenziwa ng'abantu ngezandhla nangekanda. Seloku kwakunjalo nasendulo njengoba kuse njalo nanamuhla, abantu bayasebenza ngezandhla nangamatupana abo, basebenza imisebenzi eyakugcina ngokubukwa ng'abanye; bati bonke labo abayibukayo balinganise osongati ayenziwanga ngezandhla (1922: 211).[82]
> The majority of you are silent and idly standing by, expecting that the book will print itself, so that you will suddenly find that it is a substantial and complete thing that has made itself. On the contrary, folks, there is no work that completes itself. Everything is done by people with hands and mind. It's been like that since time immemorial and it's still like that today, people work with their hands and fingers, they do work that others will marvel at; and those who see the work will pass judgement [compare] as if it wasn't done by hands.

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

As a trained printer, Fuze's irritation that his readers did not appreciate the amount of work that goes into printing a book is understandable. He was, however, also revealing much more than irritation. He was elaborating a particular work ethic, which for him had existed since time immemorial. He was arguing that both manual and mental labour are the foundation of work and that therefore his readers should exert themselves if they wanted to be productive. That he conceived work in these terms is obviously proof that he had inculcated the Protestant work ethic his mentor Colenso no doubt imparted to his converts. These statements about a productive work ethic should, however, not be separated from his other thoughts about the work of the writer. He noted:

> Mina kambe, madoda, okwami ukuzindhla bengilinganisa ukuti masizame kuso lesi sikati ukwenzela abakiti abazovela izindaba ezibakombisa ekaya ngalapo bavela ngakona . . . Kwobakuhle nangomuso uma abantwana betu bezuza ukwazi izindaba zakubo ezindala kunokuba bahlale bengazi'luto beyizintumantuma ezifana nezipungumangati (1922: 211–12).[83]
> As for me, men, my lot is to cogitate and I supposed that we should try now to create for those of our people who are still to come the stories that will point them to their home whence they came . . . It would be wonderful if in the future our children would benefit [gain] from knowing their stories from olden times instead of living in ignorance and being stupid like cocooned pupae.

In conceiving of his purpose as writer, Fuze not only defined himself as a thinker, but he also justified his particular focus on the origins of the black people. His argument therefore linked his self-conception as a writer, defined as a custodian of stories from the past, with his conception of the kind of heritage his generation should bequeath to posterity. The mental picture he conjured of what a generation without heritage would look like is in itself notable. His use of the word *isiphungumangathi* (chrysalis) (Doke et al., 1958: 678) suggests that he conceived of cultural and mental development as metamorphic. In warning that unless the

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

older generation imparted to the younger one knowledge of their origins and culture the latter would remain stupid, he was also implying that they would become like a chrysalis that doesn't transform into an imago. He was warning against cultural immaturity. In a statement that was edited out of *Abantu Abamnyama*, Fuze wrote about the link between the selfless work of the writer and the growth of national solidarity:

> Kambe madoda niti mina ngihlupekelani ngokunilobela izindaba kangaka! Niyaye niti nina ngenziwa yini, loku nina anitandi ukungisiza nangendibilishi yodwa lena ebomvu! Ngicita imali kambe ngitenge amapepa ne ink. Konje mina ngibuyelwa yini kuloko, kwokobucopo nomsebenzi wami ongakanana! Qa, bakiti angisebenzeli nzuzo ebonakalayo, ngisebenzela ukululeka abantu bakiti ukuba bacabange baze bakubone nabo loku engikubonayo. Izwe lakiti lisaqala ukufumfusa njengekaba, alikakubonisisi ukwaka ubuzwe bakubo; kwoti mdhla likubonayo litandane lonke angabiko ozonda omunye, ati oti wenza loko bamnengwe bonke.[84]
> Why do you suppose, men, I worry myself by writing these many stories! What do you think my reasons are, since you are not keen to assist me even with a single copper [red] penny! I spend money buying paper and ink. What is my recompense from that, my mental labour and immense work. No, folks I don't work for material reward, I work to guide our people to think until they see what I see. Our nation is beginning to blossom like a youth, it has not yet comprehended the work of building its nationhood; on the day that we comprehend this we will love each and no one will hate the other, and anyone who does this will disgust the others.

Although still chastising his readers for not appreciating his energy and dedication, Fuze was also reiterating his self-conception as a thinker and writer. By emphasising that he was not expecting a reward, but only working for the satisfaction of persuading people to think, he was defining a specific role for himself as a guide who was leading people towards enlightenment. This notion of seeing the light is then linked to

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena
30 March 2011

another equally important development, namely that of nationhood. In the conception presented, Fuze thought of the nation as being in its youth and that it would reach maturity when people learnt to love each other and detest hatred. This notion of a nascent or dormant nationality is not unique to Fuze and is commonplace in nationalist thought. What is of interest is that in Fuze's understanding the work of building a nation was linked not just to the growth of knowledge, but also to the work of the writer. Like his image of the chrysalis, a nation matured if it was prompted to think by its writers. Otherwise it remained in a cocooned state.

In *Abantu Abamnyama* this notion of the relationship between writing, history and the growth of national solidarity was taken even further. He presented himself as a solitary writer who was striving to preserve history for posterity. He stated:

> Nonxa ngingedwa kambe namuhla, ngiyacabanga ukuti siyakuba baningi tina esifisa ukuba inncwadi epete ABANTU ABAMNYAMA ibekona ezikoleni zabantu, kona abazovela beyakuqonda bazi ngalapa bavela ngakona, ngoba namuhla zonke izingane zakiti aziqondi ukuti zavela ngapi na (1922: ix–x).
> Even though I may now be alone in this project, I think that there will be many of us desirous of having the book *Abantu Abamnyama* in our schools, in order that our children may get to know where they originally came from, because at present they do not know (1979: v).

These comments about writing form part of lengthy introductions and prologues to the book. It is in statements like these that one can discern his awareness that the book he was writing and had been trying to publish had wider significance and import for the writing of history by, for and about *abantu abamnyama*. This kind of awareness signals the nationalist undertones present in some of his other work and reinforces the idea that he conceived the book not just as an end product, but the beginnings of an as yet undefined *kholwa* literary tradition. Although not as voluble as his statements in *Ilanga*, there is a definite continuity

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

between his notion of the role of the writer presented in the newspaper and the arguments advanced in the book.

Whereas the histories of Zulu kings and their ancestors create the impression that Fuze was only interested in the heroic historical figure, this impression is not borne out by evidence that he was also able to grasp the sense and existence of anti-heroic personalities who populated the history of the Zulu people. If the anti-hero is understood as a tragic figure who lacks the qualities of majesty, stateliness and power associated with the classic hero (Abrams, 1993: 214), then the one notable example of an anti-heroic figure is Bhambatha, the Zondi chief who in 1906 led a rebellion against the poll tax imposed on Natal's African men. When writing about the Bhambatha rebellion, Fuze gave a dispassionate account of the events that led up to the rebellion and the manner in which the colonial government reacted to the unrest. Contrary to what one might expect of a nationalist, Fuze did not depict Bhambatha and the rebellion as an act of anti-colonial resistance. He described the rebellion and those who rebelled thus:

> Kwaba njalo-ke: izindaba zalowo'nyaka zaba'mbi kakulu; kwaciteka igazi eliningi kakulu, ngoba abantu labo babeti bayalwa njalo benziwa izinhliziyo nje bengenazo izikali, beyisa izidumbu zemizimba yabo kupela (1922: 248).
> And so it was: the events of that year were very serious indeed, and a great deal of blood was shed because the people were driven to fighting by their hearts, without weapons, and without thought for their bodies (1979: 143).

From this statement alone it is evident that Fuze would not have been one of the *amakholwa* who joined the rebellion (Marks, 1986: 60; La Hausse de Lalouviére, 2000: 12–13). His concern to absolve Dinuzulu from the accusation, for which he was tried and convicted by the colonial government, that he had instigated the rebellion dominated his account. Despite this detached account of events, one should not underestimate the effect that the rebellion had on the collective psyche of the *kholwa* elite. As La Hausse de Lalouviére argues, 'the rebellion also served to deepen *kholwa* awareness of the fragility of their status in colonial

Circulated with permission from UKZN Press.
© Hlonipha Mokoena 30 March 2011

society. Out of the trauma of the rebellion emerged the basis for novel forms of élite political identification with Zulu chiefs and commoners, and with the Zulu royal house itself' (2000: 13).

In the case of Fuze, his identification with the Zulu royal family would seem to have taken precedence over any identification with Zulu chiefs and commoners. This has to be read in the light not only of Fuze's personal contact with the Zulu royal family, but also his express admiration for the Shakan legacy the Zulu monarch represented. In this regard Bhambatha was anti-heroic because he was not part of this legacy and his ineffectual anti-colonial rebellion was in Fuze's thinking tragic because it sacrificed human bodies and Dinuzulu, the living heir of the Shakan legacy, simultaneously. Also, the rebellion could have confirmed for Fuze and his *kholwa* contemporaries the inefficacy of primary resistance against colonial oppression. As with other *amakholwa*, anti-colonialism was synonymous in Fuze's writing with cultural and political nationalism, and not armed resistance.