Co-ordinating Editor
J. LAMBERT, University of South Africa

Editors
L.W.F. GRUNDLINGH, Rand Afrikaans University
J.P.C. LABAND, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

Review Editor (Africa)
C. KROS, University of the Witwatersrand

Assistance Review Editor (General)
T.M. DEDERING, University of South Africa

Editorial Board
H. BRADFORD, University of Cape Town
T.R.H. DAVENPORT, Cape Town
P. DE KLERK, Potchefstroom University for CHE
D.R. EDGECOMBE, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg
W.M. FREUND, University of Natal, Durban
C.A. HAMILTON, University of the Witwatersrand
B. MBENGWA, University of North-West
P.R. MAYLAM, Rhodes University
C. RASSOOL, University of the Western Cape
C.C. SAUNDERS, University of Cape Town
A.J. TEMU, University of the Western Cape

Production Manager
N.D. SOUTHEY, University of South Africa

Business Manager
A. DELPORT, Unisa Press

The South African Historical Journal is published bi-annually by the South African Historical Society. It is devoted to articles based on original research, general historical articles, historiographical overviews, critical reviews, and review articles. All material submitted is evaluated by the editorial board and other referees. Articles appearing in the Journal are annotated, indexed, and/or abstracted in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index, Current Contents: Arts and Humanities, Historical Abstracts, and America: History and Life.

Contributions should be submitted to the Co-ordinating Editor, South African Historical Journal, c/o Department of History, P.O. Box 392, UNISA 0003, Republic of South Africa. Manuscripts and disks are not returned to authors.

Members of the South African Historical Society receive the Journal free of charge; otherwise subscriptions are R60.00 both for individuals and for institutions and R150.00 (US$ 40.00 or GB£ 25.00) for overseas subscribers. All subscriptions should be sent to the Business Manager, South African Historical Journal, c/o Unisa Press, P.O. Box 392, UNISA 0003, Republic of South Africa.

Produced by the University of South Africa

Financial assistance by the Bureau for Scientific Publications towards the publication of this issue is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this journal, or conclusions arrived at, are those of the authors and should under no circumstances be considered to be the opinions of the Bureau for Scientific Publications.

ISSN 0258-2473

SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORICAL JOURNAL
SUID-AFRIKAANSE HISTORIESE JOERNAAL
40 (1999)

ARTICLES / ARTIKELS

V.C. Malherbe
Testing the ‘Burgher Right’ to the Land: Khoesan, Colonist and Government in the Eastern Cape after Ordinance 50 of 1828

Karla Poewe and Ulrich van der Heyden
The Berlin Mission Society and its Theology: The Bapedi Mission Church and the Independent Bapedi Lutheran Church

Louise Vincent
The Power Behind the Scenes: The Afrikaner Nationalist Women’s Parties, 1915-1931

Sue Krige

Robert Edgar and Hilary Sapire
Dry Bones: The Return of Nontetha, an Eastern Cape Prophet

Edna Bradlow
J.H. Hofmeyr, Liberalism and Jewish Immigration

Goolam H. Vahed
A ‘Public Health Nuisance’: The Victoria Street Early Morning Squatters Market, 1910-1934

Vishnu Padayachee and Shahid Vawda
Indian Workers and Worker Action in Durban, 1935-1945

Karen L. Harris
‘Accepting the Group, but Not the Area’: The South African Chinese and the Group Areas Act
encouraged them to undertake appeals. But not only did the Khoesan lack effective clout; as Robert Ross observes, the mission influence which they looked to for support was 'never great' and the central government 'repeatedly blocked' their applications for land. Moreover, as noted, Khoesan initiatives alerted colonists to head off any claims which threatened their privileged access to a scarce resource.

Ordinance 50 was a labour law which happened to be shaped by a conjuncture of humanitarianism and progressive economic thought. As such it took account of civil disabilities besides the labour practices by which the Khoesan were oppressed. The disappointing sequel to Article 3's seeming promise illustrates a possible (or likely) outcome where a right lacks concrete measures of support. Demonstrably, an influential element in this was the negative stereotyping of 'Bushmen' and 'Hottentots': The language of Stockenstrom and others cited above exemplifies this. On all fronts — in towns where the established townsmen could monopolise resources and keep 'the coloured classes' on the fringe, and in the rural areas with respect to tenantry, new settlements, and private ownership of farms — the prospects for satisfying Khoesan land hunger within the colony remained bleak.

The opportunities which opened up to 'Hottentots and other free Persons of colour' as a result of the Cape's Ordinance 50 of 1828 resemble, in important ways, certain policies and freedoms introduced in post-apartheid South Africa. Attempts by individuals and groups who were formerly discriminated against, to realise benefits which are held out, also resonate with Khoesan strivings in that ordinance's wake. Even with the energetic help of a pro-active government, the present process to bring about redistribution of a scarce resource is slow and difficult to carry out — and vulnerable to the old complaint of partiality (renamed 'reverse discrimination'). But another feature of the changed environment, from then to now, is the momentum of a movement with respect to claims to nationhood by indigenes around the world. To mention just one occasion when persons of Khoesan descent united to press claims in this spirit: on Human Rights Day (21 March) in 1997, some 600 met in Cape Town and requested recognition of 'First Nation' status, which entails identity and land.

91. R. Ross, Beyond the Pale: Essays on the History of Colonial South Africa (Hanover, NH, 1993), 97.
92. This is discussed in Malherbe, 'The Cape Khoisan', passim.
93. For my own comments, and references to those of others concerning this, see Malherbe, 'The Cape Khoisan', 31-5 and passim.

The Berlin Mission Society and its Theology: The Bapedi Mission Church and the Independent Bapedi Lutheran Church

KARLA POEWE and ULRICH VAN DER HEYDEN
University of Calgary and Humboldt Universität

Abstract

The Berlin Mission's theology was a distinct world view that informed simultaneously the research, pedagogy, and behaviour of pupils, missionaires, and African converts, especially leaders known as 'national helpers'. The theologically based methods of understanding, on the one hand, and the behavioural manifestations or attitudinal indices looked for in those who were becoming Christian, on the other, resulted in tensions and conflicts between missionaries and national helpers. One could say that Berlin missionaires were empathetic to things African in their methods of understanding, but prussocentric to things Christian in their delegation of responsibilities. This article reviews the variable emphases of the mission director Wangemann's and his son-in-law Winter's theology and shows how their theological predilections played into the church independence process in the larger context of competition from numerous little charismatic movements started by, especially, Black Wesleyans.

Review of Some Scholarly Literature: The Christianity-Avoidance Syndrome

Christianity is a world tradition that should be subject to anthropological and historical research like any other tradition. And yet, as Burridge points out, people are ignorant about Christianity or have misconceptions, and this despite the fact that we have had four hundred years of missionary ethnographies and missionary aid to anthropology. The aim of this section is to make us aware of the futility of scholarly evasion of an important tradition.

1. Poewe is grateful to the Pew Foundation for funding her book research entitled, Byways to Anthropology: An Ethnography of Berlin Missionaries (manuscript in preparation), of which this article is a part.
What scholars should research and how they should use mission archives has been defined largely by English language scholars working in English-language mission archives. It is their advice we must review first, keeping in mind the question whether it is equally applicable to the archive of the Berliner Missionswerk.

One of the most careful evaluators of English language mission archives and research is J.D.Y. Peel. He makes three suggestions. First, he argues that scholars should use primary unpublished sources like journals and letters because these documents bring one close to the originating experiences. We agree. Journals and letters take the reader to where the action is. Höckner’s book about myth and reality of the rain queen Modjadji is a good example. The book is based primarily on Berlin missionary Friedrich Reuter’s unpublished journals. Nevertheless, many of her interpretations of Reuter’s words lack conviction because Höckner ignores the very thing that informs his assessments of situations and motivates or brakes his actions – his Christianity. Consequently, if Reuter makes an unfavourable remark about Queen Modjadji’s councillors, Höckner contradicts it by offering another perspective, often that of a social scientist. But the social scientist or the anthropologist speaks from the distanced perspective of a generalizing description and theory, while Reuter speaks from hard specific experiences with distinct individuals. As Höckner points out herself, the social science publications of anthropologists such as the Kriges do not easily lend themselves to synthesisization with Reuter’s Tagebücher (journals) and mission reports.

Second, Peel argues that anthropologists need to do a much fuller reading of missionary sources in order to gain a deeper understanding as to their potentials and limitations. To make his point, he contrasts anthropological fieldwork which he sees as being guided by prior theories and hypotheses, with the more open ‘historian’s craft’ which he sees as having ‘much less control over his data’. Contrary to Peel, however, the common experience of anthropologists is to be so profoundly affected by fieldwork as to make them discard any preconceived theories and hypotheses. To Poewe, however, the impact of the field and the archive are equally strong. Both led her in unanticipated directions. She also does not agree with Peel’s suggestion that historians have less control over their data. The historian Peter Delius’s theoretical perspective based on conflict theory and French Marxism predetermined his attitude toward, and treatment of, Berlin missionary sources. His use of the Berlin archive was limited to confirming what he wanted to demonstrate.

Third, Peel suggests that scholars should study especially the letters and journals of black evangelists and converts. There is no question that unpublished sources of black evangelists and converts, when they exist, are vital aspects of African history and anthropology. They are, for example, largely missing in Delius’s portrayal of the Pedi polity. But they must be seen in context. Where Berlin missionaries are concerned, scholars need to understand how missionary theology and methods of fieldwork guided their work, perceptions and, importantly, their published and unpublished documents.

It is in their published documents, based on a specific set of objective data, interpreted from a specific framework of historical writing, that we glimpse the fascinating fact that black pioneers started an awakening of small Christian groups even before Berlin missionaries turned them into ‘national helpers’ in charge of religious communities. Early Berlin missionaries could recognize the African awakening for what it was because they had experienced an analogous

4. For example, even Kirsten Rüther works with German mission material, especially that of Hermannsburg, from an English perspective: K. Rüther, ‘No Longer Adams in a Simple Eden: Culture and Clothing in Hermannsburg Missions in the Western Transvaal, 1864-1910’ (Seminar Paper, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 1997). She has contempt for Hermannsburg missionaries because the mission recruited poor German farmers, forgetting that, by contrast with Britain and France, Germany’s secular intellectual leaders also came from humble origins: Winckelmann was the ‘son of an artisan, Kant of a saddler, Herder of a parish clerk’, and so on: C. Dawson, The Crisis of Western Education (Garden City, 1963), 55.
7. Ibid., 71.
(pietistic) awakening as students in Berlin. Their interpretive framework was specific because it was, as will be shown later, that of Neander and Tholuck.

The ease with which problems of missionary methods and Christianity are sidestepped can also be seen in the work of Landau. He concludes that, because of the many problems with what religion is, one should ‘focus on what people themselves show through their behaviour and expressions’. The shortcoming of this approach is that it does not take into account that the Christian tradition is not necessarily the same as Christian behaviour. More importantly, it fails to recognize that Christianity itself may be, indeed, often is, the main weapon in contests of power. To make non-western converts’ use of language the main focus of one’s research, when the focus should be African converts’ use of a world tradition, is like advising Africans to use sticks against bomb-throwing enemies.

Related to Peel’s and Landau’s call for researchers to study the letters and journals of black evangelists and converts is the question of voice or of who speaks for whom. The postmodern emphasis on achieving multivocality in one’s writing by including transcribed interviews or by telling it ‘through their eyes’, is playing havoc with serious research. While witness accounts, books of transcribed interviews, or books deriving from ‘their voice’ have their place, we have to understand that ‘their voices’ are as subject to bias, vested interest, deception, or exaggeration as ‘our voices’. In fact, anthropologists and historians usually do not ‘speak for’ anyone, nor should they. Rather, their task is to offer analyses and interpretations based on defined sets of data in terms of theoretical concepts or interpretive frameworks. And if these data were collected, analysed, and written by missionaries, then we have to know, as mentioned above, what they consider their data to be and what conceptual or interpretive framework informed their reports and analyses.

Unfortunately, the pioneering work of Delius on the Bapedi among whom Berlin missionaries worked makes no attempt to understand Merensky’s and Wangemann’s epistemological quest nor their methods of learning and writing about Pedi culture. Instead, he talks about ‘the mythology of the Lutheran Church … and the Berlin missionary society’, as if mission endeavours were divorced from rational pedagogy, practical action, objective reporting, and several forms of Lutheran Christianity. Consequently, Delius often misrepresents what a missionary actually wrote. For example, he writes that Berlin missionaries concluded that ‘Christian advance depended on the destruction of chiefly power’. To prove this he cites Merensky’s Erinnerungen.

Yet, far from arguing the need for the ‘destruction of chiefly power’, Merensky muses that it usually takes two to three generations for chiefs, in particular, to begin to show an interest in Christianity. Furthermore, Merensky explains that it is understandably difficult for sacred chiefs to convert because of the religious nature of their office. Delius, however, dismisses the religious underpinning of chiefly power, although he gives a superficial functionalist account of chiefly rainmaking rituals. The numerous anthropological studies of sacred chieftoms, and the understanding of them offered by Berlin missionaries, are ignored by Delius. In the process, he eliminates a vital explanatory factor of the grim conflict between sacred chiefs and black Christian evangelists, on the one hand, and between sacred chiefs and missionaries on the other. It is not only Merensky or Reuter who were pressured to adapt their ways to those of an African chief. Posselt reports from Natal: ‘the Zulu cling to their chiefs like bees to their queen. A Black can barely live without a chief, and converts downright pressure their teacher to be a ruler whose decision they are then willing to follow.’

Like Delius, other researchers too may take theoretical perspectives which ignore, are incompatible with, or are hostile to mission endeavours and motives. Stanley recognizes, quite rightly, a tension between the work of academic historians and missionaries who lived the experience that the historian wants to

17. L. Witte, Das Leben Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1884); H.T. Wangemann (oldest son), D. Dr. Wangemann, Missionsdirektor: Ein Lebensbild (Berlin, 1899).
20. Landau, Realm of the Word, xxv.
25. Delius, The Land Belongs to Us, 108.
28. Ibid. Berlin missionaries alternately felt pressured to behave like chiefs: E. Pfitzner and T.H. Wangemann, eds, Wilhelm Posselt, der Kaffernmissionar: Ein Lebensbild aus der südafrikanischen Mission von dem Missionar selbst beschrieben und nach seinen Tagebuch ergänzt, fortgeführt (Berlin, 1888). They were accused by Bapedi chiefs of trying to be chiefs: BMB (1890), 230, in Historische Angaben über Missionar Johannes Winter: Entnommen den Missionsberichten der Gesellschaft zur Beförderung der evangelischen Missionen unter den Heiden (typewritten accurate excerpts) Berlin, n.d., 29, or felt so positive about chiefs as to say things like ‘were he not a chief, he would have been a Christian long ago’ in ibid., 13, taken from Winter’s journal of 1886, published in BMB (1888), 358ff.
29. Delius, The Land Belongs to Us, 53.
31. Hessel, Die Lobedu Südafrikas.
discuss as themes, conflicts, and problems. According to Stanley, missionaries worry that too little is said about their personal contributions, while historians worry that missionary concerns may compromise the task of writing a properly critical narrative. In our view, however, Stanley misses the point. What is more commonly ignored and compromised is not the historian’s rendition of things in terms of themes, conflicts, and problems, but the missionary’s.

Knowing The Berlin Mission: Its Roots in Pietism and Romanticism

The Berlin mission was rooted in the eastern provinces of Prussia, including Pomerania, Silesia, and East Prussia. Silesia, especially, was the general area to which the Bohemian Brethren (also known as Moravians) moved and where Christian David (1690-1751) built Herrnhut in 1727 on the Berthelsdorf estate of Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760). The general area between Prague to the south, Wroclaw (Breslau) to the east, Berlin to the north, and Halle to the west practised a religion of the heart, as Zinzendorf called his trope of Moravian and Lutheran Pietism.

From this region, came various groups of Christians who founded and supported the Berlin Mission Society. Berlin had witnessed decades of stormy revolutions, material impoverishment during the Napoleonic era, and spiritual deprivation during the enlightenment. By the 1820s, Romanticism and Brethren Pietism gave rise to a two-tracked Prussian awakening. Romantic scholars like Schleiermacher (1768-1834) took the awakening in a scientific (wissenschaftlich) and speculative direction. Practising Pietists like Baron von Kottwitz (1757-1843) took it in a practical and ascetic direction, one that harnessed men’s organizational skills for religiously inspired self-help schemes.

Of significance for this article is the fact that the Berlin mission’s director from 1865 to 1894, Hermann Theodor Wangemann (1818-1894), was determined to hold these streams together. In this, he and Alexander Merensky (1837-1918) succeeded. By contrast, Wangemann’s son-in-law, Johannes Winter (1847-1921) did not. Winter practiced a Schleiermacherian theology that encouraged not only his surrender to Bapedi ways, his conception of Christianity as simply life (preferably without ecclesiastical structures, rules, regulations, and doctrine), but also his willingness to speculate about and risk new religious forms.

The Importance of the Theology of Kottwitz, Tholuck, Neander, and Schleiermacher for the Berlin Mission and, specifically, for Wangemann and Winter

The humanitarian Kottwitz, the eminent theologian Tholuck, and the church historian Neander, who together founded and supported the Berlin mission that Wangemann would later direct, were all deeply affected by Pietism. So too was Schleiermacher and Winter. Kottwitz was awakened by the Brethren. Initially wealthy, he spent most of his money on self-help schemes for weavers, Berlin’s unemployed, and poor students. To the first pupil missionaries and would-be theologians like Tholuck (1799-1877) and Neander (1789-1850), Kottwitz was an example of a practical, loving, and ascetic Pietist who combined childlike devotion with a powerful intellect and outstanding organizational skills.

It was the example of and close contact with Kottwitz that guided Tholuck towards Christianity. Tholuck’s life and teaching, therefore, exemplified the nineteenth-century drama of this process. Whatever Tholuck’s intellectual attainments, becoming Christian was a life-long struggle for humility, love, and
He was also befriended with Kottwitz and Tholuck. Neander became a renowned church historian and professor at the University of Berlin. He treated church history as a chain of Christian biographies. Wangemann, who was his assistant and student, learned two important things from Neander: first, that although the pursuit of knowledge was essential, it was nevertheless merely the basis of practical action; and, second, that Neander’s church history was a useful framework for working African converts into world history.

Neander also imbued Wangemann with respect for historical sources while at the same time seeing author and subject as kindred spirits. The aim of Neander’s approach was to lay bare the ‘innermost principle’ of a person’s life, not because he saw Christianity as born from the depth of man’s nature, but precisely because Christianity was a ‘power’ external to man that was capable of transforming him. The sensitivity with which Merensky, Nachtigal, and Wangemann listened to, and recorded, Bapedi dreams reflected their belief that dreams mirrored the transformation of the Bapedi soul. Furthermore, Neander’s approach pervades the works, and became the organizing framework, of Wangemann’s and other Berlin missionaries’ church historical writings.

The methods and theories that defined mission practice and writing during Wangemann’s administration were those of Kottwitz, Tholuck, Schleiermacher, and Neander. And of these, Neander’s approach was the most important as is suggested by the titles and subtitles of Wangemann’s books. Several of these have Lebensbilder (‘Life Portraits’ or ‘Biographies’) in their title or subtitle. Under Wangemann’s pen, Bapedi Christians became part of the church and cultural history of the nineteenth century (1876); or they reminded of the simplicity of the first apostolic fellowship (1869). Wangemann’s book about the cultural history of the nineteenth century (1876); or they reminded of the simplicity of the first apostolic fellowship (1869). Wangemann’s book about the zeitliche (simultaneous) events. When he writes about the potential Hochmutigkeit (pride) and separatistische (separatist) tendencies of awakened Prussians, it is not too farfetched to see here a reflection of Bapedi separatism.

A Short Lebensbild of Hermann Theodor Wangemann

Wangemann grew up at a time when German Romanticism, Idealism, and Pietism interfaced. While this age gave rise to such creative forces as Schleiermacher’s theology, Hegel’s philosophy of religion, the Awakening, and a new historical consciousness, it also made for discordance and friction. Hegel’s followers mythologised Christianity and created a new theological secularism. Schleiermacher’s thought ebbed into syncretistic forms of supernaturalism. The Awakening threatened to become too narrow, and the new historical consciousness too biographical.

Space does not permit a detailed biography of Wangemann, except to note that Wangemann had an uncanny ability to build his life, and later the mission, on a clear set of priorities. These included: a practical pietistic faith, based on a high regard for the pursuit of knowledge as empathetic and empirical history, within the context of humility (Demut) before God, stabilized by Lutheranism, but within a broader Protestant union guarding against secularism, on one hand, and separatist movements, on the other.

Significant for this part of the article are not only Wangemann’s rich student years at the University of Berlin, his affiliation with Neander, and his PhD in Halle in 1844. Rather it is his work experience in Cammin, Pomerania, as archdeacon and seminary director from 1849 to 1865. While this job had little

59. Wangemann, Gustav Knak, 7; Wangemann, D. Dr. Wangemann, 80.
60. Richter, Geschichte, 177; H. Petrich, Hermann Theodor Wangemann (Berlin, 1895), 16; Wangemann, D. Dr. Wangemann, 65, 70, 72-3, 76, 78, 83-4.
63. Neander’s method was also practical. It allowed Wangemann to sell life portraits as tracts or books.
64. H.F. Wangemann, Maleo und Sekukuni: Ein Lebensbild aus Süd-Afrika (Berlin, 1869).
65. The sense of living a first-century Christianity is also there in Merensky’s portrayal of the beginning of the Bapedi mission (1899-72). Merensky, like Wangemann, described how Berlin missionaries were refused permission by the Swazi king to start mission stations in Swaziland, but several Bapedi, who had first heard about Christianity in coastal cities, welcomed them.
70. Wangemann’s mother and father came from Brethren families. His father’s family, once prosperous, had gone down in material, but not social, terms (Wangemann 1899:2). Hermann Theodor soon had intimate friends in high places, twice married into aristocracy, and was acquainted with Bismarck.
71. Wangemann’s first wife died two days after the birth of the daughter who later married Johannes Winter. His second wife died after a long illness. His third wife, with whom he had a very happy and fulfilled marriage, was Merensky’s sister.
72. Wangemann, D. Dr. Wangemann, 76.
73. Ibid., 80.
74. Ibid., 99, 108.
75. Ibid., 111, 127.
76. Ibid., 179.
77. Ibid., 183. This source, Wangemann’s eldest son’s book, D. Dr. Wangemann, is useful because in agreement with his father’s method, the book relies primarily on excerpts from Wangemann’s diaries and letters.
to do with mission *per se*, it had everything to do with how he would approach the Berlin mission endeavour.

It is here that he for the first time developed a curriculum, an ecclesiastical pedagogy, and a set of house rules that reflected his rigorous administrative style and his warm personal contact with students. Here too he had to think through his position on separatism or secession from the Union of numerous awakened Lutherans. Strategies had to be developed to keep the flock in the church. To this end, Wangemann met with such luminaries as Hengstenberg and Stahl with whom he shared an interest in Lutheranism but, contrary to them, not at the expense of the Prussian Union nor of ecumenism. In Wangemann's view, all those who separated from the 'body of Christ' suffered from Hochmut, and he used his great gift for organization to hold things together and imbue them with new life. His position on separatism was further affirmed by his study of the Berlin mission's history. In 1855 the mission society itself faced separatist tendencies from staunch Lutherans.

To Wangemann, the mission church in Transvaal was a natural extension of Christendom. He applied his outstanding organizational skills as effectively to the mission society in Berlin as to the structuring of the mission endeavor in Transvaal. During his first extensive and superbly organized inspection tour in the 1860s, he noted the same tendencies toward awakenings, emotional agitation, even Roman Catholic asceticism, and Gesetzesstrenge (rigorous legalism) among the Bapedi as among Pietists and Lutherans at home. He also understood that it was primarily Merensky's calm and common sense Christianity and management that prevented this living charismatic community, in many ways an example to Europeans, from igniting into so many separatist movements. Wangemann's attitude foreshadows his criticism of Winter who, rather than braking Bapedi separatism, torched it.

Wangemann's favourite teacher, Neander, wrote eight volumes of a general history of the Christian religion and church (1842-1845). Of these, volume five, which covers the spread of Christianity to a totally 'raw people' (roher Volksstamm), shows his and the Berlin mission's approach best. These raw, wild, or primitive peoples were the Germanic ones who were converted between 590 and 814. What Neander shows is that Christianity, by sharing the seed of godly life, creates the germ of all human *Bildung*, that is, learning, culture, breeding and erudition, not by imposing a finished product on a people from without, but by emerging fresh from within, accommodated to the peculiarity of a people.

The most practical aspect of Neander's method is his emphasis on language training: ancient languages (Greek, Latin, Hebrew) from whence the tradition came; the modern languages (English, Dutch, German) of the current transmitters; and indigenous languages (Sesotho, Mandarin, Tamil) to which the tradition is transmitted. In the 1860s, the Berlin Mission Society made the explicit decision that only those who had a gift for the learning of languages were trained to become missionaries. The study of seven languages – Greek, Latin, Hebrew, German, English, Dutch, and at least one indigenous language in which the new missionary had to give his first sermon before he was ordained and permitted to marry – was central to their five-year programme of study.

Knowing the indigenous language was the means to heed 'the other'; to think and experience the specific culture of the people (Eigentümlichkeits des Volkes). In practice it meant acquiring an intimate knowledge of the people's language, grammar and narratives. Berlin missionaries were instructed, not only to (ablauschen), to listen and take down a people's language, that is, to take in the 'whole beauty, complexity, and regularity of a language,' but also to 'hear their way into' the intricacy of that people's stories.
Berlin missionaries were aware that they were to plant the Christian tradition into new regions. How they were to do so was worked into their long seminary training. Wangemann built on and developed the programme soon after he entered office in 1865:

For men, who are to build up Christian churches in new areas of the world, who often have to lay the first foundations, it is most important that they are not strangers to the experiences of the early centuries, which is why church history is taught ... Instruction covers especially the age of the apostolic and church fathers, as well as that of the reformers ... especially emphasized are life portraits of important men in the development of the Christian church.96

Along with the emphasis on both apostolic fathers and 'church reformers',97 Berlin missionaries were also instructed to be receptive to the spiritual needs of their followers:

... in the presence of otherwise untrained listeners, he (the missionary) has to enter the special school of the Holy Spirit. There he will learn to discern their (the Africans') spiritual needs through prayer and receptive listening and find the means to their hearts.98

Wangemann was obsessed with achieving photographic-nearness to his data and he thought this could be done in three major ways: first, by taking down conversations and working them into publications; second, by learning the 'grammar' not only of language, but also of drawing and music;99 and third, by using intimate sources like diaries and letters.

For example, the entry in his diary for Thursday, 10 January 1867, includes the following conversation with Chief Mahasche at whose kraal Wangemann had preached the previous day and who was now returning Wangemann's visit:

He: I have come to thank you for the pleasing words that we heard from your mouth yesterday.
I: Yesterday I asked that you think further about the Word, did you do that?
He: Yes, I have found that all teachers speak but one Word, and the same always has one goal.100

In their reports to the mission, Bapedi national helpers often used this very style.101

As pointed out earlier, the Neander method of writing church history as a string of 'photography-near' life portraits is particularly obvious in the works of Wangemann.102 Like Neander, Wangemann made use of his own findings, diaries, and experiences, as well as such source materials as the diaries and letters of other missionaries. These were readily available to him in the archive of his mission society.

Wangemann and other Berlin missionaries achieved these portraits by recording detailed conversations that captured the expressions and thought pattern of the Bapedi in order to lay bare, like Neander, the 'innermost principle' of their life.103 The Bapedi were bestowed, thought Wangemann, with the gift of accurate retelling of conversations and happenings.104 Since the contact between pioneer missionaries and early converts was extremely close, the latter told their stories to the missionary who wrote them down the same day.105 As a result, argued Wangemann, 'one has on paper and before one's eyes the whole drama of the transformation of the Bapedi soul. This romantic drama consisted of two kinds of struggle. The internal struggle was reflected especially in the dreams of Bapedi Christians. These dreams show them following, in childlike devotion, the call of God.106 The external struggle had to do primarily with persecution of African Christians by Bapedi chiefs and non-Christians, and with the wars between the Bapedi and Boers.107

Short Lebensbild of Johannes Winter

According to Greschat, Richter and others, Martinus Sewuschane and Johannes Winter together played the main roles in the secession.108 Wangemann, however,
blamed the secession and the drawing up of the secession letter to the Committee in Berlin by national helpers solely on Johannes Winter. Who then was Johannes Winter? And why did Wangemann blame him?110

Johannes Winter (1847-1921) was the son of the Berlin missionary August Wilhelm Winter who, with his wife Anna Schüttge, was among the first missionaries sent to South Africa. Johannes Winter was born in South Africa and played freely with African children, but from the age of five grew up in Germany where his father returned in 1852. Eventually, Johannes Winter studied theology at the University of Berlin and in 1873, aged 26, he was sent to South Africa by the mission. Following his ordination, he married Anna Maria Dorothea Elisabeth Dolorosa Wangemann, the daughter of Director Wangemann and his first wife, 'a princess of Mecklenburg'.111

When the national helpers' seminary was started in Botshabelo in 1878, Johannes Winter became its first head. After the defeat of the Pedi paramount chief Sekukuni by the English in 1879, however, the mission asked Johannes Winter to found a station near Sekukuni's capital, Thaba Mossegue. This he did in 1880 while missionary Mars replaced him at the seminary. But, unlike Merensky, G. Knak, or Tholuck, Winter had neither the talent nor inclination for organization and religious economy. Nor did he use Neander's historical method. What he did do is learn, and give himself over to, Bapedi ways.112 Consequently, from 1882 onward, the Committee in Berlin had to handle frequent problems involving Johannes Winter113 – problems which they usually tried to solve by attempting, unsuccessfully, to move him or to persuade him to return to Germany.

Johannes Winter was a theologian in the tradition of Schleiermacher. He had the superb gift of assimilating to and portraying the African mind with its strengths and weaknesses, free of denigration. Even when he declares, for example, that Africans are foolishly superstitious, he does so without insult, for in the very next sentence he compares them to the old Athenians who likewise were foolishly superstitious and yet had 'high mental capabilities'.114 Superstition, writes Winter, 'does not always ... indicate mental incapacity'. Rather, 'it shows a feeling of dependence on unknown powers' that 'Schleiermacher regards ... as the root of all religions'.115

It is clear from Greschat and Kamphausen,116 as well as Winter's own letters and reports, that an independent Church was discussed for years by various national helpers and elders, as well as by Chief Kholokhoe and his councillors.117 According to Winter, it was done without his knowledge or that of other Berlin missionaries. There were ample opportunities for meetings of national helpers to discuss church politics among themselves. Furthermore, by 1886, superintendent Nauhaus had instituted a conference for national helpers which met for the first time on 4 August of that year under the chairmanship of Johannes Winter.118 It met regularly thereafter.

For the year 1886, Winter's journal shows vividly his Hingabe to the Pedi and the profound effect on him of one of the heightened moments that epitomizes Schleiermacher's view of religion.119 The occasion was Winter's contraction of malarial fever which resulted in a heightened sensitivity to nature, people, and fellowship which he described in a moving Romantic prose that captures the Pietistic and Schleiermachiyan concept of Ergriffenheit.120 Job Pududu, Jakob Morabane and other men gathered to pray for him. Their concern for Winter, who saw himself as having done 'so little for them', moved Winter to tears.121 The moment culminated in Winter being carried on a stretcher on the shoulders of eight men to Chief Kholokoe's home and from there to his own where he was met by many converts.122 There can be no doubt that the wave of emotion released by this occasion profoundly shaped Winter's religion.123

110. BMB (1891), 318ff. The archive of the Berliner Missionswerk has an unpublished collation of any Berichte that mentioned Johannes Winter. The document, without author or date, is titled Historische Angaben über Missionar Johannes Winter. Wangemann's attitude is expressed on pp. 34 and 36 of this document, which is taken from BMB (1891), 318ff. See also No Name, 'Historische Angaben über Missionar Johannes Winter: Entnommen den Missionsberichten der Gesellschaft zur Beförderung der evangelischen Missionen unter den Heiden' (Typewritten accurate excerpt) (Berlin, n.d.).

111. J.P.D. Winter, 'True Stories of Life and Hunting in Sekukuniland in the Old Days' (unpublished manuscript, [1977]).

112. Reuter's letter dated 16 Aug. 1883, to Director Wangemann, describes in great detail the appallingly impoverished and dilapidated conditions in which Winter lived. Also his health was bad, his children naked and unable to speak German, but, wrote Reuter, Winter had collected superb data, like no other missionary: Band 1: Acta Personalia betreffend P. Reuter, Abt. II, Fach 3, Nr. 21, 1875-1942 (Berlin: Archive Berliner Missionswerk).

113. These problems resulted from Winter's adoption of Pedi ways. He rejected the mission's rules and regulations: Wangemann, D. Dr Wangemann, 377.
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He describes his growing appreciation of Chief Kholokoe, and the easy friendship with Petrus Thutoane, as well as Salamo Motlane in whose hut he stayed during his illness. The illness also became the occasion for long and intimate discussions with Salamo, Chief Kholokoe and, importantly, Winter’s rivals, the Wesleyans Nathanael and Adam.

The national helper closest to Winter was not, it would seem, Martinus Sewuschane, but Job Pududu. It was the latter whom Winter taught to read and write German and to play chess. In contrast to his warmth for Pududu, Winter was rather distant toward Martinus Sewuschane. Winter could not understand Sewuschane, but Job Pududu. It was the latter whom Winter taught to read and friendship with Petrus Thutloane, as well as Salamo Motlane in whose hut he

The church, he advised them to delay the matter for a year to be better prepared. As they were not prepared to do this, the secessionists turned to Winter.

**Founding of the Bapedi Lutheran Church: Intruders, Rivals, and Chiefs**

In the *Berliner Missionsberichte*, Wangemann reviewed his policy of educating national helpers by comparing Lovedale College in the Cape with Botshabelo in the Transvaal. In the past, Wangemann argued, he had believed that a seminary or university was not the best way to educate national helpers because such institutes did not conform to the traditional character (Volkstümlichkeit) of South African tribes. The African way demanded a tight personal link between the person being educated and his teacher who must be father and chief to the student.

In the mid 1870s, however, Wangemann began to change his view. On the one hand, his admiration at the successful way Wesleyans were producing dynamic national helpers and ordained preachers like Carl Pamla, and his concern, on the other, for Basotho returnees who knew little more than an emotional high, may have had something to do with it. He was afraid that the latter’s Christian ideas were too immature and, therefore, would be mixed indiscriminately with non-biblical ideas. The result would be a wild and wonderful Christianity that threatened to become ‘a plague’ rather than ‘salt’ for their fellows.

Wangemann was aware of the phenomenal success of Wesleyan missionaries and their African assistants in building large mission stations with populations of up to 14 000. He admired Wesleyan organization which included building integrated communities. He also admired their practicality and the ease with which Wesleyans raised money even among blacks. It was also the policy of the Berlin mission to build Christian communities in harmony with other denominations. Indeed, Merensky and Wangemann knew that the Berlin mission’s small budget in Transvaal was facilitated by Bapedi who had been converted by Wesleyan or other British missionaries. What worried Wangemann

---

129. No Name, ‘Historische Angaben über Missionar Johannes Winter’, 10. In his interviews with Lutheran Bapedi ministers in 1996, van der Heyden was told that after secession Winter and Sewuschane had little to do with one another. Kadach (1851-1905) was the hapless missionary who was assigned to Lobethal, a mission station built up by Sewuschane.
136. *Ibid*.
137. *BMB* (1881), 258-72.
138. Space does not allow description of Wangemann’s positive assessment of Lovedale, by comparison with which the Botshabelo effort was tiny. The Berlin mission had an infinitely smaller budget.
139. *BMB* (1881), 261.
was that the phenomenal success of Wesleyans was often ephemeral. The *Gefühlsrausch* ('emotional intoxication') soon ‘cooled down’ or turned into *Hoffährigkeit* or *Hochmutigkeit* ('pride').

To prevent emotional or doctrinal confusion, the Berlin mission determined to place thoroughly educated, biblically grounded, national helpers in those specific places where Africans were beginning to long for ‘Christ’s salvation’. In the past, these national helpers had been personally educated by capable missionaries. In fact, missionaries Knothe and Merensky educated some national helpers so thoroughly that they passed their public examination before the assembled synod. The examination qualified national helpers to assume positions of evangelists, teachers, or national preachers. By 1878, there was enough pressure from national helpers as well as from Knothe and Merensky to warrant starting national helper seminaries in Botshabelo and Mphome. The former was directed by Johannes Winter, the latter by Winter’s brother-in-law Carl Knothe.

In 1881 Martinus Sewuschane, the main player in the secession process, wrote a letter to the *Väter*. It was translated by missionary Trümpermann (1841-1923) and published in the *Berliner Missionsberichte*, with Trümpermann’s footnotes and commentary. This letter and Sewuschane’s report about his (Lobethal) station, also published in *Berliner Missionsberichte*, give important insights into Sewuschane’s ambitions. The context is Sewuschane’s and other national helpers’ experiences of local conflicts and competition from, especially, independent black missionaries associated with the Wesleyan or London missions.

In his 1881 letter, Sewuschane reviewed the history of Botshabelo, emphasizing the important work done by Mafadi, Mantladi, and himself, before Merensky’s arrival. He described how Merensky educated him and how, since then, his education had stagnated, lacking depth. Then he asked for two things – a church bell and, importantly, a teacher, specifically, Johannes Winter. He asked for Winter because he ‘knows Sesotho well, writes well, and is capable of telling me what something shows [means]’. After his brief review of Mafadi, Mantladi, and his work, before Merensky, Sewuschane makes a telling comment:

150. *Väter* (Fathers) or Committee, the decision making body of the Berlin mission. Trümpermann, who could not have been much younger than Sewuschane, had a great talent for languages and music.
152. *BMB* (1882), 474-5.
153. *BMB* (1882), 42.
156. Words in brackets are Trümpermann’s clarification.
157. *Ibid.*, 43. Trümpermann mentions that Sewuschane’s letter was so incoherent and poorly argued that he had to meet with Sewuschane and one of his Sesotho teachers, Joh, to first let the two of them rewrite the letter into clear Sesotho. Then he translated it into German. Sewuschane’s obfuscation may have had to do with the fact that he was between a rock and a hard place because he wanted to communicate potential independence to the Committee in Berlin without raising suspicions of his real intention among local Berlin missionaries who would be his translators.
158. *BMB* (1882), 46. Sewuschane was ordained by Wangemann himself in 1885.
159. A founding figure or prophet figure must also be understood as the first to have built a religious community.
and built a church that would later receive support from Methodists. Unlike in earlier times, the two independent missionaries co-operated closely with subchiefs Marishane and Motshatshi who, in turn, were in conflict with Chief Moreoane, Sewuschane’s father-in-law and supporter. Also part of the pattern at the time was the support sought by African independent missionaries from white missionaries. Loto looked to Londoners and Wesleyans, Sewuschane requested Johannes Winter.

Contrary to Sauberzweig-Schmidt, the first Africans to initiate independent churches were precisely those national helpers who had close ties to missionaries who spoke their language and from whom they received personal education. But now national helpers pressed for secession only after they also had secured the support of a chief. The best of the national helpers, among whom Sewuschane must be included, despite Trümpelmann’s doubts, understood the need for further education, but wanted it on their own terms from a dedicated missionary. They also wanted apostolic sanctions which English and American (bishops) were more willing to dispense than Germans.

In the *Berliner Missionsberichte*, Wangemann edited another report about the ‘reliable’ Sewuschane’s station, Lobethal. We learn that, despite Trümpelmann, Sewuschane’s ordination had been considered for some time. We also learn that the rivalry between Chief Marishane with his independent missionary Loto and Chief Moreoane with his national helper Sewuschane split the latter’s 200 strong Gemeinde (‘fellowship’). Wangemann explains further that Wesleyan independent movements have gone on for some time, for the Wesleyan Letshebele told one of the Berlin missionaries (Bauling of Leydenburg) that he had been called by Sekukuni’s and Dinkoanyane’s people to become their missionary.

In 1886, after Wangemann’s return from South Africa where, in 1885 he had ordained Martinus Sewuschane and the personal student and confidant of Knothe, Timotheus Sello, the Berlin mission was faced with the largest deficit in its history. To rectify this situation, Wangemann published a long report on the state of the Berlin mission. The goal was to persuade German donors to give more at a time when the political climate had decidedly turned against the Berlin mission’s activities in foreign lands at a time when Germany was annexing its own colonies. The document ends with practical suggestions for the reorganisation of the mission’s fund-raising bodies in Germany. These suggestions were carried out and the debt was eliminated.

In the meantime, the national helper movement among the Bapedi progressed. It was especially helpers close to Winter who would found the Bapedi Lutheran Church. That they worked closely together, one reads in their short *Berichte* to the Committee in Berlin. For example, in his report of 30 December 1889, Johannes Madinoane visits dying congregants with Thomas Selepe or reports hiding a boy, whose chief demands his circumcision, with Petrus Thuloane. Likewise, Thomas Selepe reports on the same date that Kadach (1851-1905) sent him with Petrus Thuloane and Johannes Madinoane to enquire about the chief’s mother’s desire that he ‘throw away’ his wife and marry the mother’s brother’s daughter.

Two other reports are very telling. The first is by Petrus Thuloane, the other by Martinus Sewuschane.

Petrus Thuloane includes in his report, dated 29 December 1889, a conversation with a Black Wesleyan in whom Thuloane suspects of wanting to create his own community:

A man who was under the whites in (Moscheschland) came back. His name is Philemon Motsepa; the same said to me: ‘Show me a place among the heathens where I can live and teach.’ I: ‘I should do this?’ He: ‘Yes.’ I: ‘Wait and tell me tomorrow, but think about it first.’ Another day he came and talked with me. Thus, I: ‘To whom will this town (religious community) belong?’ He: ‘To you.’ I: ‘No, you are cheating me, for if I were to find people, could I baptize them?’ He: ‘Yes.’ I: ‘No, you are cheating me, why did you go to Rasadi (?) To Mr. Lowe?’ He: ‘You are right.’ I: ‘Why do you cheat me, would not Mr. Lowe come and baptize them, when you say to me: give me a place, that I may teach; or would Mr. Kadach baptize them?’ He: ‘Yes.’ (With reference to the latter). I refused, however, and said: ‘You are looking for discord, even here, where there is none, you are

162. *BMB* (1882), 45. Motshatshi was the son of a chief who was deposed by the British. Motshatshi was in conflict with Moreoane who was given the deposed chief’s position by the British. Moreoane, now quite old, was father-in-law of Sewuschane, while Loto (also spelled Lotho, Lothi, Lothi) is the son of the Induma (chief councilor) of Marishane: Jooste, ‘Missionary Pioneers’, 129.
163. Sauberzweig-Schmidt, *Der Aethiopismus*.
164. Wangemann, *Lebensbilder aus Suidafrika*.
165. *BMB* (1883), 332-3.
166. Ibid., 333.
168. Petrich, *Hermann Theodor Wangemann*, 72. The deficit was 219 000 marks; previously deficits were around 26 000 marks: *ibid.*, 73.
170. Ibid., 329.
173. Greschat spells his name ‘Madingoane’: Greschat, ‘Eine Siidafrikanische Kirche’, 537. In the report written in Sutterlin the name is spelled ‘Madinoane’. Letters were translated from Sesotho into German by a missionary. The handwriting is not Johannes Winter’s. It might be missionary Kadach who was disliked by national helpers.
Kadach are one. And the people that you would find belong to Mr. Kadach and will be
44
belongs to him who baptizes and, second, that he, Thuloane, would be the future
don't love strife.' I: 'And yet, it would happen just so, if I placed you here, for I and Mr.
of which not a single missionary has an inkling, for even I was only told about it in
ately.
cooking) and when the right time for their work has passed, then: (a Pedi saying) ...
converts (and ordained) is the head of the independent church-to-be. The time to
There is a movement afoot among several (approximately 30) national helpers in the synod
into the letter, he addresses the Committee as
them), even if it were 5. For you are the first here in this land. Wesleyans came later, all
away in fear that they (the ordained) may sin or become proud
I am concerned, I say: that which drives a person to become proud
is this, when you let them become hard (like a meal that only becomes harder from
They want to push us aside, while they provide the children of this Volk with beautiful
realized; it is not in my power to discuss the matter further. I am not permitted to do so and
it would not serve any purpose. 178

On 1 April 1890, on behalf of several national helpers and elders, Job
Pududu crafted a letter in Sesotho to the mission which Winter translated and forwarded. Wangemann quotes from this letter the following unambiguous
statement: ‘We want to build the Bapedi Church as an independent one with its
own constitution and laws.’ 179 The writers of the letter thanked the mission for its
thirty years of work among them. They advised the Committee, however, that
their missionaries should now leave. They (the Bapedi) were ready to look after
their own affairs. The letter was signed by 47 men, of whom eight were national
helpers and 39 were elders of thirteen congregations.
The seven-page letter dated 1 April 1890 is too long to translate and quote in full. What follows are some of its highlights. Unfortunately, much of the
dramatic imagery of the letter has to be omitted for the sake of brevity.

Using the analogy of a child that grows and matures and becomes
independent of its parents, Bapedi elders and evangelists, through Johannes
Winter, argued that they were ready to take on full responsibilities for the
founding of an independent (selbständige) and free (freie) church. They justified
this argument further by pointing out that the last great missionary sent to them
was Merensky. Since then, and while many elders had served faithfully for six
to seven years, or 12 years, and in the case of Martinus Sewuschane 32 years,
they had received no recognition for their achievements. On the contrary, their
growth in knowledge and understanding was denigrated.

They then reminded the Committee in Berlin that it was Martinus
Sewuschane who, ‘although not taught by missionaries in the beginning but by
God,’ caught the ‘first game’. All congregations, from Bothshabelo onward, ‘were
seeds that he sowed’ along with his friend Merensky. And yet Sewuschane was
always removed from the congregations he founded, so that ‘the bees (Berlin
missionaries) could move in, settle in the beautifully prepared nest ... because
they ... were unable to create nests of their own’.

Then followed a list of the leaders’ anxieties and complaints:

They want to push us aside, while they provide the children of this Volk with beautiful
houses and paradisiacal lodgings so that they remain ... They have no confidence in that
which is done by us, they expect nothing from it, they remove it out of envy, so that one
can not point to something that is done by our efforts. Any understanding between us has
ended; even what they tell you about us and our communities is that which they do without
our agreement. We are treated like animals that cannot speak. How can there be agreement

179. BMB (1891).
when one doesn’t sit together, doesn’t ask one another for advice, doesn’t converse about one another’s lives and activities. These are the reasons why a gulf developed between us, more than anything that existed at the time of our Father Merensky. At that time there was a good sense of community between teachers and parishioners; since he has left, a terrible lowering among religious communities has occurred. A teacher dealt so cruelly with a community, that even when a parishioner was near death, he did not show mercy, be it then that the parishioner paid him his last three pence to thank for church and place …

Then the elders continued: ‘... And we are tired of the harsh control, the wretched small laws, the foolish payments, that have grown in our midst through them …’ 180 We want to stand on our own feet, we don’t want to be carried on backs until we have grey hair. We want to build the Bapedi church as a united, common, and free church, ruled by its own laws’. All missionaries should leave, as the Apostle Paul too left Macedonia. Since the teaching of ‘our dear father Dr. M. Luther’ is ‘our mother’, ‘we shall die in the Lutheran faith’. Therefore, no missionaries need remain in Bopedi, except Johannes Winter ‘who has a heart that shows us love’. He arrived to save our souls and to be poor for our sake. ‘Let us have him’ and ‘give him two assistants’ that he may ‘ordain among us those who are ready’ to carry on the work. 181

Sewuschane’s and Thuloane’s reports written before the secession letter, take on great importance when we look at them in the light of missionary Kadach’s journal for the last quarter of 1890. 182 Kadach reports that a particularly fierce battle flared up near the station Phokoane 183 to which Petrus Thuloane, who was ordained in the independent Bapedi Lutheran Church on 24 August 1890, returned to make true his claims of 1889. Apparently, Thuloane’s claim to be the sole cleric had the support of a Boer (from whom the community rented its plots) and a Feldkornet Bosshof. But Chief Phokoane opposed Thuloane and threatened to move away with the major part of the congregation rather than accept Thuloane as teacher. 184 This changed the Boer’s mind and he then agreed to let Daniel Phuphuto, a national helper who remained loyal to the Berlin mission, teach there. Phuphuto was put under severe pressure from the Bopedians to join them, as were many others, including especially, Timotheus Sello. But that is another story. 185

On 26 March 1890, Martin Sewuschane wrote the following letter to missionary Kadach who resisted the secession: ‘Now you are no longer insulting people but God. My story you will hear from others, for this story will be talked about in the whole world, in Africa and in Europe. The work that I started in 1856 I have now completed’. 186

In that letter, which roots the Bapedi Lutheran Church in a time before the arrival of Berlin missionaries, Sewuschane also made clear that the movement was inspired entirely by Bapedi. What is most important, is the fact that Sewuschane saw independence as the end result of his life’s work.

What Winter saw was similar but Schleiermchanian, a new form of Christianity that emerged naturally from a specific culture and people. Wange­mann reports that Winter ‘dreamt about the new national church in Bopedi as a glorious fruit of the Berlin mission’s efforts the likes of which he had not seen in any other mission’. 187 Well, it was not that. As for Winter, he would soon be a nuisance to the Bapedi. 188 But that too is another story.

Conclusion

This article is neither the last word on the formation of the Bapedi Lutheran Church nor on how to use specific mission archives. Rather, its aim is to point us in a direction from which we can view, with more academic integrity and less arbitrary imagination, the complex meeting of global forces with local ones. The intention is to free ourselves of attitudes that judge Western Christianity, colonialism, and postcolonialism as patriarchal, paternalistic, hegemonic, racist, and oppressive without understanding the paternalism, accommodation and ambitions of, in this instance, Bapedi national helpers. Accusations of racism and paternalism are only too easily made. Thus Sauberzweig-Schmidt even argued

180. One of the reasons why Wangemann blamed Winter for the secession is because these parts of the letter contain specific German expressions and reflect Winter’s refusal, from the beginning, to assume fiscal and administrative responsibility: No Name, ‘Historische Angaben über Missionar Johannes Winter’, 35. Winter was unable to persuade Bapedi helpers to man stations where they were needed: ibid., 13. He did not collect money from his community nor instil in members the need to learn financial responsibility, a serious break with the theology of Kottwitz, Tholuck, and Wangemann: ibid., 35. Since the Bapedi under, or With, Winter gave nothing or very little, the complaints reflect Winter’s theology. If one keeps in mind the phenomenal effort Wangemann put into organizing the collection of money in Germany for work in Africa, and Kottwitz’s and Tholuck’s practice, Winter was at best ineffectual.
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that the main reason for church independence or Ethiopianism was black opposition, 'not far different from race hatred', against whites. 189

In fact, however, the interaction between Berlin missionaries and national helpers was complex for several reasons. There were the contradictions within Christianity itself. 190 Then there were the contradictions in the Berlin approach. Finally, there were the ambitions and ambivalence of Bapedi Christian leaders.

One of the major contradictions within Christianity is the obvious fact that the faith has to be practised by imperfect people within institutional forms modelled on secular social organizations. As Wangemann and Knak expressed it, 'the treasure of the gospel was held by the church within earthly containers.' 191 Despite this awareness, or perhaps because of it, Wangemann was critical of Neander's and, especially, Schleiermacher's idea of immersing the global Christian tradition into a specific local setting in order to develop a fresh and authentic local form of Christianity. In Wangemann's day, German theologians were caught up in conflicts over the invisible church - a notion associated with German Romanticism, Schleiermacher and Neander - and the visible church, that is a church based on visible structures. 192 To Wangemann, the invisible church, as faith or charismatic movements, was a formula for separatism and Hochtmut. Its prevention required a strong man like Merensky or a visible church with rules and regulations. Local Berlin missionaries opted for the latter, and the latter had Prussian form.

This is precisely what Johannes Winter, a Schleiermachian, opposed. Instead, he gave himself over entirely to a Christianity that was taking on aspects of Bapedi thought, structure, and culture. His diaries and reports, even his few publications, show this well. 193 So too does the secession letter. Bapedi national helpers and Reverend Sewuschane complained bitterly and graphically about various rules and regulations that became, in the final analysis, Prussocentric Christian measures used to gauge Bapedi Christianity.

The most obvious contradiction in the Berlin approach was that between its emotive and scientific methods of understanding with, according to the nineteenth century ideal, photographic nearness, while yet gauging converts' Christianity in terms of Prussian Christian measures. It meant that Wangemann and other Berliners who used Neander's historiography worked the dynamic process of Christianizing the Bapedi into world (church) history. It also meant, however, that thorough localization was to be braked lest it result, as it did, in an African independent church. The Berlin mission achieved some depth of understanding the Bapedi and of working them into world history. But the Berlin missionaries failed in the final two steps, namely to enable localization whatever its consequences, and to allow the Bapedi to understand things Prussian in order to slough them off rather than turn them into accusations of missionary bloody-mindedness.

A final factor adding to the complexity of Berlin missionary-Bapedi interaction, is the fact that national helpers had, of course, their own ambitions and ambivalence. From the beginning, Christianity was used by them in local contests for power. This became most explicit in Sewuschane's and Thuloane's reports of 1889 where it was made quite clear that he who baptized would 'own' the community. The 'ownership' notion was preceded, however, by years of ambivalence vis-a-vis subordination to the mission for the sake of knowledge, or freedom from it because other arrangements were possible. Sewuschane coped with this business from various angles, as his reports show.

Despite the limited source material of their (translated) letters and reports, we cannot free ourselves of the conclusion that Sewuschane, who survived the other African founders of the Bapedi mission church, saw himself called, from the beginning, to be an apostle, a black missionary in the Merensky sense, a founder of an African independent church within the larger (Lutheran) Christian tradition. While black Wesleyan missionaries may well have been the refining fire of Sewuschane's and other helpers' ambitions, these ambitions played a decisive role in Bapedi accommodation to a specific European mission-based tradition and its selective adaptation to the specific local Bapedi situation.

Perhaps a few words need to be said about race and racism. Even Höckner, following a careful examination of Reuter's Prussian patriotism and conservatism, had to conclude that, while the word 'race' was on the lips of German academics, missionaries, and politicians after 1860, 'racism' was not Reuter's — and, we must add, neither Wangemann's nor Winter's — problem. 194 Wangemann did, however, oppose 'democracy', 'liberalism' and 'socialism'. Unlike in Britain and France, in Germany these political forces, which included the renowned Wissenschaftler, among many others, were radically and vocally anti-Christian and, importantly, anti-mission. 195 In the 1860s it reached
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its climax in a *Weltanschauungskampf* over an unnecessary opposition between a scientific and biblical worldview. Wangemann left no stone unturned to end the fight without sacrificing either science or Christianity.196

... we gave a good deal of money to the men .... we were an independent political party but we received no recognition. Most of us were in favour of women’s suffrage. Hertzog decided that when the vote was granted we had to join the men. Most of us were against it .... General Hertzog was of the opinion that it would be dangerous for the men and women to remain separate in two strong organisations. We were always better organised than the men for example at elections .... The Women’s Part[ies] built the National Party. They were the power behind the scenes.1

**Introduction**

The Enlightenment expectation was that political identity based on ethnic nationalist sentiments would gradually give way to more ‘rational’ forms of association. That expectation has, in the late twentieth century, proved somewhat premature. The explosion of ethnic nationalist conflicts onto the international stage in the post-Cold War era has brought with it a renewed intellectual interest in the politics of nationalism and ethnicity. In response to the need for new avenues of inquiry amidst a vast and growing literature, Anthony Smith’s work on national identity appeals for a research agenda which treats nations and nationalism as cultural phenomena as well as forms of politics. The symbols,