

injured and innocent people; and though it was easy to advise them not to "mind Zibebu," Mr. Fynney's council was somewhat difficult to follow while Zibebu was so shamefully ill-treating them.

Their story continues: "Then Maduna assented with a heavy heart, saying, 'Very well, sir; I, too, see that I should not go on in defiance of two *amadoda* (*men* in a complimentary sense, i. e. Mr. Fynney and Mr. Osborn), who warn me not to go. I have no wish whatever to assert myself (*qwaga*, "bluster"), and I will go back—but not home, for I have no home left to go to. To what home should I go back, since I have no place (given to me) at all? Sir, if you send me back, it is you who should find a place for me to live in [i. e. me and my people]. And although I shall ask for the pass from Malimati, as I am told to do, will he give it, since he has already refused it more than once?'

"Said Mr. Fynney, 'No! what I say is, just go back. All this [trouble from Zibebu] is nothing. Do not, because you see a three days' rain frowning upon you, suppose that it will never be fine weather again. Just go back. I am giving you good advice. I wish that you should not put yourself the least in the wrong. You imagine that I have given you up (thrown you over). No, son of Mpande, I am just as before (as much your friend as ever).'

"Said Maduna, 'Sir, I speak because I really do not see where I am to go back to.'

"Mr. Fynney replied, 'That will be for you to decide [that is your own affair] when you have been to the Resident. When he has given you the pass,* it will be for you to decide whether you will rest for a few days, or whether you will come back here at once [and cross over into Natal].'

Of course they never got the pass. The object of Government was to make it appear that Sir G. Wolseley's

* But what if Mr. Osborn should *not* give them the pass, as in fact he did not?

settlement was a success, that Cetshwayo's return was not desired, and that the Zulus were becoming quite contented under the rule of the thirteen kinglets.

The advice given by Mr. Fynney that they should go back and remain quiet, however kindly meant, played into the hands of Government, as perhaps even did that of the Bishop of Natal, with this difference that he could (and did) show them how rightly and peacefully they might obtain the favours for which they begged, whereas for Mr. Finney to do so would have been for him to act in opposition to the wish of the Government under which he served, who did not desire that the petition for Cetshwayo's restoration should be brought forward, whether peacefully and properly or the reverse.

(B.) *Official and Zulu Accounts of Interviews between Mr. Osborn and the Great Deputation, compared.*

OFFICIAL ACCOUNT.

Notes of an Interview with Cetshwayo's Brothers and Zulu Chiefs by the British Resident [3247, p. 67], *Maritzburg, April 21, 1882.*

The Resident states: "I received the communications by Umfunzi and others on last Sunday, and subsequent days.† But before saying anything further, I

ZULU ACCOUNT. *

On Friday, April 21, sending on messengers to announce them, the whole party set out to present themselves to the authorities. They were met first by Mr. Osborn's induna, who hurried back to him; whereupon Mr. Osborn himself came out and met and stopped them at some distance from the city. He

* Given also in Blue Book [3466, pp. 29, &c.].

† This is in allusion to the messengers sent on beforehand by the chiefs of the deputation to announce its approach to the Government, and to beg Mr Osborn to introduce them on their arrival [p 168].

wish to know who are present from Zululand.”

Undabuko (Maduna), brother of Cetshwayo, and Usiwetu (Ziwedu), Tshingana (Shingana), Siteku, and Dabulamanzi, half-brothers, then gave the names of the chiefs and headmen present.

In answer to Resident:

Undabuko and his half-brothers state:—

“We were on our way to Maritzburg when you met us here just now.* We were going to see the Governor about the matters reported to you in town by Sobuza and the others who were sent by us. We sent to ask you to introduce us to the Governor. It was our intention to go first to you, and ask you to take us to the Governor. We wish you to open the gate for us to enable us to see the Governor [i. e. to use your influence on our behalf].”

Resident: “How can I do this? You came here without any reference to me, and against the directions I gave

took aside the representatives of the three kinglets, the five Princes, and all the chiefs and headmen. First he blamed the Princes for coming down without his leave; but they reminded him that they had asked him for a pass, and had sent again to tell him that they must now go down without one, and they stated further that they were now brought down by the three appointed chiefs.†

Mr. Osborn admitted that they had sent to tell him. Then he asked what had the deputation come for? What word did they wish to speak? Said they, “We have already reported to you, sir, our object. We have come to pray the English Government to give us back Cetshwayo. That is the one thing which we have come down about, for as to our other troubles, they all arise from want of him. And, besides, we have continually reported them to you, sir, and we say that all those

* Observe the correctness of the beginning of the Zulu account, omitted from this one.

† i. e. by their representatives, the appointed chiefs having a right to the Resident's permission to communicate with the Governor. (See “Instructions to Resident” [2482, p. 261, &c.])

you when you applied for my consent to come to the Governor. You know that you have done wrong in this, and that you should have awaited the Governor's reply.

Usiwetu: "It is true you said we were to wait for the Governor's reply to your letter; but, as you know, we are in great trouble, as I reminded you at the time. We did not like to wait, in consequence. We came here. We could not wait."

Resident: "Are the chiefs and representatives of chiefs who are present come here with the consent of the appointed chiefs in whose territories they live? I speak to you all."

Undabuko: "We all are here for the Zulu people to ask for Cetshwayo's return. We all have come of our own accord to ask for him who was the prop (insika) who kept up the Zulus."

Usiwetu: "We wish to speak to the Governor about two matters: the one, to ask for the Inkosi (Cetshwayo); the other, to tell him of the

matters are now in your hands." Mr. Osborn wrote, and then asked who were represented in the deputation, and wrote their names down as they were pointed out and named to him, all the chiefs and all the headmen. But when they said, "And we count also the other five appointed chiefs: we say that all the eight are with us, as before," he said "What is the good of your counting those, since they will deny it as before?" Said they "No, sir, they are with us at heart, and, when they denied, it was because they were frightened by Sir E. Wood, and by Sotondose (late induna at the Resident's), who warned them to deny." Then said Mr. Osborn, "Well, I hear your words, and I do not refuse to report you; but I do not know what the Governor will say, since you have broken his law by coming down without my leave. He will ask me, 'Where is their pass from you?'"

Then a man of Seketwayo's spoke, and said "No, sir!*

* Either "Yes" or "No" is frequently used as an exclamation at the beginning of a Zulu sentence, without any actual affirmative or negative meaning.

killing and ill-usage to which we are subjected. We did not think that we were doing wrong in coming here without a letter [pass], as we knew we should find you here, and that we could talk to you, and tell you our pressing wish to see the Governor, and we considered [? thought] that the Governor would see us. We are in such trouble as no other people ever have been. We have no homes, and we have the difficulty of providing food for our children before us. We had everything taken from us. You know the great trouble we are in. We all ask you to help us to get permission to see the Governor."

At this stage several of the chiefs present stated they

You should not find fault with the Princes; they have no word (responsibility) in this matter. They have not come down independently, in defiance of you, but are brought by these three appointed chiefs, indeed by the eight appointed chiefs; for did they not send down messengers and money [i. e. on the former occasion]?* And even Hamu, sir, ought to be counted, since he prayed for Cetshwayo's return to Sir E. Wood when he came to Zululand with the lady [the Empress Eugénie], and that fact was told to Cetshwayo by Sir E. Wood himself."† Mr. Osborn wrote again, and said, "Well, I will take your words to the Governor, and you shall hear

* The Zulus had at last learnt the necessity of putting the kinglets forward as the most important of the petitioners, but for a long time their respect for the King's family had made it very difficult to realise this, and no doubt the fact of their asking for passes in the name of Maduna (Ndabuko), in their eyes the greatest man in the country, had often supplied a plausible excuse for the Resident's refusals. He must have known the difficulty, and could readily have set them right had he wished to help them to obtain their desire, but, as that would have been quite contrary to the wishes of the Government, such kindness on his part was hardly to be expected.

† They had heard this from Mkosana, on his return from Capetown. Hamu, though a worthless fellow, would never have rebelled against Cetshwayo had he not been put up to it, and "egged on" by his white advisers.

and all there have come to ask the Governor to give back Cetshwayo to the Zulus. All the Zulus want him restored as their Inkosi. They, the chiefs present, ask to be allowed to speak to the Governor.

Resident: "You have broken the rule well known to you in coming here as you have done without a reference from me. By introducing you to the Governor as you wish me to do I also would break the rule.* This I cannot consent to do, and I therefore tell you that I cannot comply with your request. I cannot bring you to the Governor. If you, Undabuko and Usiwetu, had followed my direction when you made your application, things might have been different now.† Had you

from me. I do not know if I shall see him to-night or to-morrow, as there is a great deal of other business going on. You can send in some one to hear if I have any word for you." So on Saturday (April 22) they sent in Mfunzi, with some men whose names had not been taken down, and with the word which the men from chief Dunn's territory brought in addition to their prayers for Cetshwayo, viz. that they had heard on all sides that Dunn had said that they had paid taxes to him wishing to prevent Cetshwayo's return. They came to protest against this, as they earnestly desired to have their own King again and utterly disliked J. Dunn.‡

* In reading these and the like plausible sentences, it must be remembered how persistently the Resident had refused them passes or evaded their requests.

† Easy to say so, but not so easy to persuade these men to believe it, after the uniform repressive treatment from which they had suffered.

‡ It is to be observed that this feeling against J. Dunn and his misrepresentation of their motives in paying the taxes he imposed was strongly put forward at every interview, which fact is enough in itself to show how absurd were the suspicions to which Sir H. Bulwer tenaciously clung, in spite of the Bishop's full explanation, that Dabulamanzi and his party were prompted in their repudia-

waited a few days, the Governor's answer to your application would have been received, and I told you at the time I should ask him to grant it.* You have acted, knowingly, outside of my direction and the rule well known to you. I therefore cannot help you now. This is my answer so far as your request to me is concerned. I have informed the Governor of your messages received by me in Maritzburg and of your desire to see him. The Governor says you have come here without my consent and against the direction I gave to Undabuko and Usiwetu to await his reply to the application. Also that I was not informed of what now appears to be the main subject on which you all seek to see him, and which is a very important question.† He says that you have disregarded the

tion of J. Dunn at Bishopstowe, where, in fact, until after all these interviews, except the very last between Sir H. Bulwer and Dabulamanzi, the latter and his party had never been.

* And did so with the rider, "I must, however, at same time point out that Sir Evelyn Wood, in his despatch [3247, p. 60] to me of the 7th of November last, refused to grant a similar application from the same persons on the grounds therein stated by him."

† It is only necessary to read over Sir H. Bulwer's and the Resident's own despatches in Blue Books, 3247, 3466, and others, to see that this professed ignorance of the real desire of the petitioning Zulus was a mere farce.

rule well known to you all in coming here as you have done, and that for these and other reasons [? what other] he declines to see you."

Usiwetu then addressed me very earnestly. He dwelt upon the urgency and seriousness of the question upon which all the chiefs present wished to see the Governor—that they are not come for themselves alone, but are here for all the Zulus. He urged me to represent this to the Governor. They want to tell him the words of the Zulus. They have come to see the Governor and have "arrived at the gate." If I cannot open it for them, they wish me to tell the Governor these their words in order that some means may be found by which "the gate may be opened" for them. Siteku and Undabukospoke to similar effect but more briefly.

Several of the chiefs said they wish to see the Governor to tell him the request of all the Zulus. They ask me to say this to the Governor.

Resident: "I have heard your words, and I will tell the Governor what you have said."

(Signed) M. OSBORN,
British Resident, Zululand.

Notes of Interview between British Resident, Zululand, and Cetshwayo's Brothers and Zulu Chiefs this day, April 24, 1882, p. 70.

Resident: "I have informed the Governor of what you said to me on Friday last. The Governor says he cannot see you, but at same time he is willing to hear what you wish him to know. He says you must tell me what you want to represent to him, and I am to bring your words to him. You all know that, as the eyes and ears of the Government,* I have to hear for the Governor anything any one may wish him to know. I am now prepared to hear and write for the Governor to read the words you wish him to know."

A pause ensuing, the Resident said to Umpece, Sobuza, and Matshobana: "The Governor directed me to tell you that if the chiefs Seketwayo, Faku, and Somkeli † wish to see him, he will be glad to see them and hear them. If they cannot come personally, he has no objection to receive

On Sunday (April 23, 1882), Mr. Osborn's induna came and told them that Mr. Osborn said that "on Monday he would come out to them as before, but they must not bring the whole party to meet him." But when he came on Monday (April 24), the bulk of the people objected to being left out, saying, "We came of ourselves, we are all interested in the matter, we cannot be left out;" and sent Mboko to say so to Mr. Osborn. So he agreed, and called them, and they made a semicircle around him and the four indunas from the S.N.A. Office (Luzindela, Kilane, Dabe, and Tom), and a white youth who accompanied him. He then told the heads of the deputation to speak.

So Mbenge began, saying, "We have come, sir, I from Seketwayo, bringing these Princes. Seketwayo says, 'Sirs, you have corrected us enough; give us back Cetshwayo.'" Sobuza said, "I, sir, come from Faku; I bring these Princes because Faku

* Truly they had found him to be blind eyes and deaf ears hitherto to their side of the story.

† The three kinglets represented by the men addressed.

and hear any of their chief men they choose to send to appear for them provided the visit of the chiefs or their representatives be first arranged through me as you all know it is necessary should be done.*

says, 'Sirs, you have given us a lesson; a child is beaten, and then forgiven by its father. We say, it is enough, sirs; give us back Cetshwayo.' Then Matshobana said, "I come from Somkele. He says that he brings down these Princes. He says, 'It is our own friends who have so hurt us [i. e. our friends the English], but the child is now sufficiently corrected.' We ask for Cetshwayo, sirs, that you should give him to us into our hands." Mbenge then spoke again, saying, "We name these three chiefs, but they all [all the eight kinglets of the previous deputations] say the same. They are silenced only by that announcement that Cetshwayo was a scoundrel (ishinga), who had been turned out of his kingship."

Malimati: "But those chiefs themselves deny it. When they are asked they deny."

Mbenge: "Those chiefs saw that you, sir, punished people for that [praying for Cetshwayo's return]. How

* And which the Resident had refused to do, in spite of his "Instructions."

could they approach you with that word, when they saw others had been punished for it?"

Malimati: "I have spoken all your words to the Governor. I named the three appointed chiefs, and said that they had brought the Princes. He said to me, 'They have come by a bad road since they have come without your leave. Let the three representatives go back, and let the chiefs themselves come to me, or, if they cannot come themselves, let them send their chief men to speak to me.'"

"As you have come here without any such previous arrangement, the Governor cannot receive you."

Sobuza: "We, who are sent by Faku, Somkeli, and Seketwayo to pray for the 'Inkosi' (Cetshwayo) are chief men — there are no greater men. No others can be sent."

Resident: "The Governor would not object to see you if you are properly sent. In this case you came here without previous arrangement with me."

Umbenge: "I come from Seketwayo and am his brother. Sobuza is the brother of Faku, and Matshobana of Somkeli. Our chiefs said

Mbenge: "No, sir, they have no men higher than ourselves to send. Seketwayo sends me (his brother) of his own flesh. It is himself who has come, since I have come. Pray, sir, get leave for us to reach the Governor, since truly Seketwayo himself has come in me."

Sobuza: "And at home there is no headman better than I. I am Faku's own brother, and he himself as come, since I have come. We say, sir, that we have fulfilled all the con-

we are to ask you to help them in their prayer for Cetshwayo, and to enable us to approach the Governor to prefer the prayer. They say when a man beats his child he afterwards wipes his child's tears."

Resident: "I have already told you that I cannot take you to the Governor. The Governor will not see you unless you come to him in accordance with his conditions, which, although known to you, I have again explained to you."

Umbenge: "We heard that you were here, and we came to you to help us into the way to approach the Governor. We did not come here with the view of not applying to you in the first place."

Resident: "I have already told you what I have to say about this."

Sobuza: "We are all here, and we have found you here, and we ask you as a favour (ngo moya umuhle) to obtain for us an interview with the Governor. We have come

ditions,* since we have come to you here, you being the right person to introduce us to the Governor."

Matshobane: "We are, then, in the right, sir, since we have come to you, and ask you to take us to the Governor. We pray you to do so, sir. I am Somkele's own flesh—his younger brother; he has sent a piece of himself in sending me."

Resident: "Yes, I understand what you say there, and I must take these words back to the Governor."

And he first wrote, and then read over to them what he had written, all their words, and said, "Yes, I will go again, and ask the Governor to see you, as I did also the day before yesterday."

Then the whole assembly said, "We thank you, sir. We have not come in disregard of you, but have come to you, for you to take us on to the Governor."

Resident: "Very well, men! I understand that you have not come in disregard of me, but have come to me."

* The conditions, i. e. first, that the representatives of the kinglets should be chief men; secondly, that they should be introduced by the Resident, and come with his sanction.

here to see him, and cannot return till our hearts are satisfied."

[The following speech seems to have been accidentally misplaced, and should probably occur at page 309, opposite the speech of Mbenge, commencing: "Those chiefs," &c., in the Zulu account.]

Umbenge: "We, who are sent by the three [appointed] chiefs, would have gone first to you at the Inhlazatshe, but, hearing that you were here, we came straight to you, and we ask you, as 'umoya umnandi'* (favour or kindness), to help us to obtain an interview with the Governor. We came to you, and did not go to others first,† and we are still talking to you; we, and all of us here, wish very much to see the Governor to pray for our 'Inkosi' (King). The other (appointed) chiefs who joined our three chiefs in the former prayer for the Inkosi got frightened at General Wood's words, spoken

But I cannot take you in all at once, whether the Governor wills it or not. I am under him you know, and must ask him properly on your behalf. Let two men come in, that I may ask in their presence; for I am not deceiving you in any way, and the day before yesterday also I spoke your very words."

* "*umoya umnandi*" = "pleasant breeze."

† This is strictly true, in spite of Sir H. Bulwer's groundless assertion that they came, not to the Government, but to the Bishop, simply because they let him know, as their friend, that they were coming to Government.

at the Inhlazatshe meeting, and they therefore denied having joined in the prayer."

Sobuza: "Nothing wrong has been done [by us]. We found you, our chief, here. We came to you first. We ask you to help us to see the Governor, that we may satisfy our hearts. We ask you to do us this kindness."

Uvunda: "We thought that this time we were doing right, as you are here. We found you here, and seek through you an interview with the Governor."

Resident: "You have heard the Governor's decision. The Governor is willing to hear what you have to say, but it must be said through me."

Undabuko: "Will you tell us whether you reported to the Governor all our troubles as reported to you by us? Will you enumerate them to us now, so that we may judge whether you did report them?"*

Then he said: "We have now finished speaking of your prayer, so let us speak of your troubles up to to-day."

Mjubane (induna of Mnyamana): "But why, sir, should we begin and tell you our troubles all over again, when

* The Zulus do not report Undabuko as speaking here at all, and it is most improbable either that they should have omitted anything said by one whom they all held in such honour, or that he should have spoken himself in this way, instead of, according to Zulu custom, allowing his followers to speak for him. Whatever speech is here represented, is probably mistakenly put into the

Resident : “ I will not enumerate, but I can tell you that I did report to the Governor all you reported to me.”

Umtiyupana (Mjubane) : “I will give an account of our grievances: first, Uhamu, before he seized our, i. e. Umnyamana’s, cattle, sent word by Kwabiti and another to Umnyamana that the Resident had told him that he must use force against Umnyamana (bamba ngamandhla), and that he does not do so because Umnyamana is his father [figuratively speaking. This old Prime Minister of Umpande always calls the latter’s sons his own children]. Umnyamana said at the time he did not believe it, and suspected Uhamu of planning some evil against him. Uhamu demanded cattle from him for living in his territory [made his only by Sir G. Wolseley]. Umnyamana sent him 100 head. Umnyamana then sent to the Resident first 70 head and then 30 head of royal cattle. After

we have told them all to you from the beginning?”

Malimati : “That is just why you must repeat them to me now, that I may report them to the Governor.” And he insisted that they should do so.

Mjubane : “ Mnyamana’s trouble is Hamu, who began by making us pay cattle for living in his land, and Mnyamana paid 100 head. Next came messengers from you, sir, saying to Hamu, ‘ Why do you not eat up Mnyamana? Do you not see how Zibebu and John Dunn are acting?’ But Hamu objected, saying, ‘ How can I eat up Mnyamana, who is a father to me, and has always protected me?’ But at the fourth messenger from you, sir, he did it, and ate up 2800 head of Mnyamana’s cattle. Mnyamana then reported it to you, and you told him that you would speak to Hamu, and then would call him, Mnyamana. And when you called them, Hamu sent indunas, but Mnyamana

mouth of Undabuko, who, possessing much of his brother Cetshwayo’s quiet dignity, was most unlikely to make a hasty or defiant speech such as this is made to appear.

that Uhamu sent an impi to Umnyamana, and ate him up with his tribe. A large number of kraals got all their corn, &c., taken by the impi. The impi seized altogether over 2800 head of cattle from Umnyamana and his people. You, the Resident, inquired into the matter, and said you could decide nothing about it, as you are there only to see and hear. You would report to the Governor. Uhamu said he did all this on the Resident's order, but we could never find any messenger from the Resident with the eating-up parties. The appointed chiefs say they are sent by the Resident to eat us up. When we spoke to the Resident about this, he denied having authorised them to do this. He asked if we saw any of our seized cattle come to him, and we

came himself. And you questioned them, and heard, and denied that you had sent those messages; and a man of Hamu's jumped up and said, 'Did you not say it to me, sir, when I was at the Residency?'

Resident: "Yes, I know that they say that they were set on by me."*

Mjubane: "And you said, sir, that it was not your affair, you had only to report, and would report this to the Governor. And at last Mnyamana sent me to you with a young ox, to ask what had become of your report. And you said that the report was lost with the Governor, who was killed by the Boers, and that it was then four days only since you had sent a fresh copy. Then we waited, and waited, until Sir E. Wood came [to Inhlazatshe], who

* The Resident himself says on Sept. 27, 1881 [3182, p. 118]: "If it be true that the Aba Qulusi have eaten up Msebe's tribe, I am unable to advise Hamu against the adoption of such measures as to him may appear necessary, and within his power, to uphold his authority, and prevent rebellion within his territory." Yet the seizure of the cattle of the Msebe people (unattended by slaughter) was made in retaliation for the seizures made by Hamu the day before. And such words as those quoted by the Resident as his own, although a negative form of permission, would certainly convey a distinct consent to Hamu's proceedings.

answered 'No.' When the inquiry was over, the Resident said he would send the report to the Governor. Some delay occurred by the Boer war breaking out, and the Governor getting killed, and the matter remained over until Lukuni (General Wood) arrived at Inhlazatshe, when he decided it. He said the 'Inkosi' (Cetshwayo) was '*ishinga*' [a scoundrel], who was deposed for his wrongdoing. He also spoke badly of the 'Inkosi's' brothers. John Dunn and Usibebu he thanked for having killed Sitimela's party. To Umnyamana he awarded 700 head of cattle against Uhamu, leaving over 2000 still in Uhamu's possession. Awhile after this, the Resident, at Umnyamana's request, sent messengers with Umnyamana's men to ask Uhamu about the 700 head of cattle he had to hand over to Umnyamana. Uhamu's reply was that he would not restore the cattle, as he seized them from Umnyamana on the express order of the Resident. He had no wish to harm Umnyamana, as he was his father, but the Resident insisted on his eating him up.

said, 'Mnyamana, Hamu has done wrong in eating you up when you had not quarrelled, he shall give you back 700 head of cattle [out of 2800, of which he had been robbed by Hamu]. And when Mnyamana wanted to speak, and to say, 'Sir, what we want is Cetshwayo,' he was stopped, and was told to be silent. And at last, sir, you told Mnyamana to tell off four men, who should go with two of your policemen to Hamu for the cattle. And when they came to him he said, 'What have I done that Malimati takes the cattle from me to-day, when he ordered me to eat them up at first? It was altogether his doing, and he is responsible.' And you told Mnyamana to be quiet, and you would see about it, and that is the last that we have heard of it, sir."

Malimati: "Yes, but what can I do, since you heard that he accuses me? who can bear witness for himself? It must be done for him by others."

Mahubulmana: "And Hamu says that a fifth and sixth messenger came from you, sir, telling him to kill the Aba Qulusi."

Uhamu asked to have sent to him the messengers of the Resident who brought the orders to him. He also said that if any trouble arose out of what he had done, he would not be blamed alone. The Resident should also be blamed. The Resident had told him to use force, as Usibebu and John Dunn did. After this we heard that the Resident had sent again to Uhamu on the matter, but we do not know what reply he got. We have also heard that Uhamu asserts that the Resident ordered him to kill the Aba Qulusi, and that he will not give up the 700 cattle of Umnyamana, as decided by General Wood. The appointed chiefs eat us up and kill us, and they openly say that they do so by order of the Resident. Uhamu sent to say this to the Resident by his, the latter's, own messengers, and he did nothing about it. Uhamu asks to have the messengers sent to him who brought to him the Resident's orders that he must eat up Umnyamana, and they were not sent. You, the Resident, tell us that you did not give these orders to the chiefs, but we wish you to say this to

the Governor in our presence, to satisfy us. We therefore want to see the Governor."

Utyanibezwe (son of Umnyamana): "We did not believe that you did order Uhamu to 'bulala' (destroy) us; but as Uhamu openly says you did, and said so to your own messengers, and as you take no notice of it, we do not know what to think."

Resident: "I reported to the Governor everything Uhamu said about the matter."

Umtyupana [Mjubane]: "Umfanawendhlela sent Umpumpa to eat up some kraals of Umnyamana's people. This, it was said, was done on the Resident's order. Umnyamana spoke to Umpumpa, who told him that he personally received the order from the Resident himself. Umnyamana informed the Resident hereof, and he denied any knowledge of Umpumpa and having given any order of the kind. He also said that he would send for Umpumpa to inquire about it, but we have not heard that he has done so."

Uvoko: "The Chief Mgojana seized my cattle immediately after he left the Inhlazatshe at conclusion of

Mjubane: "And Mfanawendhlela also ate up cattle belonging to eight chiefs (naming them), and he said the same thing, that you had told him to do it. And Umnyamana reported this to you, sir."

Malimati: "Yes, that's what they all say, that I told them to do it." (Malimati was writing down all the time.)

Mvoko: "Mgojana himself told me, sir, that you had ordered him to eat up my cattle, because I had gone

General Wood's meeting. He said the Resident ordered him to seize my cattle because I worked with Undabuko in praying for the Bone, and that he, the Resident, gave my cattle to him (Umgojana) to keep for himself. The appointed chiefs do these things to us always after they have been to see you, and say they do them on your orders."

Marubulana: "Umfunzi's cattle were seized by Siunguza, who said he did so on order of the Resident. The chiefs oppress us and kill us, alleging that you order them to do these things. You will see now how proper it is that we should see the Governor. The chief Uhamu told us that it was on your order he acted."

with Ndabuko to pray for Cetshwayo, saying to him, "Eat up Mvoko, who has been reporting to the authorities that you too pray for Cetshwayo! Eat him up, since you deny it! For the authorities say that I should eat you up if you have prayed."

Malimati: "Who is this speaking?" They said, "Sir, it is Mvoko." Said he, "Yes, I know him," and was silent.

Mahubulwana: "And Siwunguza, when he ate up Mfunzi, said that you, sir, had sent to him, saying, 'Eat up Mfunzi—who has been going with Ndabuko to pray for the bone of that scoundrel (ishinga) whom we have turned out—since Mfunzi is under you!' Here, sir, is Mjwapuma, who was sent to say this to Mfunzi. And to me myself Siwunguza said, 'Malimati says, "How will you draw the spear out of your own body* if you do not punish Mahubulwana and Mfunzi, who have gone praying for the 'Bone'?"' Siwunguza went with us to the mis-

* Meaning, "How will you prove that you did not send the men to pray for the King, if you do not now punish them for going?"

sionary Zimela (Mr. Robertson), and spoke before him, saying, 'I am under orders to eat up Mfunzi, because he went with the Princes to pray for the Bone!' Zimela said, 'I have no voice in the matter if you have been ordered to eat him up; but I will write a letter to ask about it.' And he sent a letter.

Undabuko : "You wrote down the reports we made to you about our troubles, and said you would send them by letter to the Governor; after that we saw and got nothing but 'impis.'"

Usiwetu (Ziwedu) : "We wish you to show us your letters to the Governor. Let all of us here know what you wrote. We heard that you did send letters, but we do not know what answer was received about our having been eaten up. I ask an answer."

Resident : "The letters reporting the seizure of your cattle by Usibebu were sent to the Governor, and General Wood decided the matter. He was Governor at the time, and you all asked to have the question submitted to him."

Usiwetu (Ziwedu) : "I was not allowed to speak to

Makulumane : "Mfanawendhlela said that you ordered him to eat us up for going to meet [protect] Ndadabuko when he fled from Zibebu."

Malimati said "H'm!" only, but wrote always.

Ziwedu : "Before we go on, sir, you should tell us what has become of the report which you wrote when you heard us and Zibebu together since you told us that you had reported them. But Zibebu sent to tell us that 'we need not think that our words had gone in that letter, for that you, sir, had deceived us, and sent his words only.' And then we were called to meet Lukuni (Sir E. Wood), and then indeed it appeared that Zibebu's words had come true. It is of no use for us to speak here to you on the hillside, since

General Wood about the matter, and know not whether your letters to him contained the words I spoke to you. It must be on the words contained in your letters that we lost [our cause] before General Wood, and I do not know that my words were properly set forth therein, as I spoke them to you. When General Wood gave his decision, we were at once followed by destruction. Your letters, I suppose, will be with the Government, and it is therefore also that we should be allowed to see the 'Makosi.' We want your letters to the Governor about us to be laid open before the 'bandhla' (assembly) in the presence of the Governor, that we may see the things they contain, which caused our destruction immediately after General Wood's decision. Nothing but killing and eating up followed us."

Undabuko : " I agree in this, and say we cannot be satisfied with speaking to you as we are doing here. We are going in there [pointing to the town], and will speak to the Makosi, to satisfy our hearts. We will not talk over matters here in the

you yourself say that you cannot bear witness for yourself. But take us, sir, to the Governor, and let the whole business be made plain, since the persecutors all say that it is your doing."

Malimati : " I am quite willing. I will ask the Governor properly for you. You can only come if he allows it, and then perhaps I too shall get cleared."

But he did not write down Ziwedu's words.

veldt (sikoteni) with you. We want to talk before all the great men in town. We have come here to do this, and we are going to town at once with this object. You have always prevented us from seeing the Governor, and you are now doing it again. We will not be prevented. We are going into town to see the Makosi." Usiteku then spoke, several others speaking at the same time. No consecutive account could be taken of what he said. I distinctly heard him say, however, that I was purposely preventing them to get to the Governor [*sic*] to screen myself. I heard similar remarks by others.* Order being restored, Usiwetu (Ziwedu): "I was very sorry, as I knew not what I had done to merit the trouble

* For the reasons already given it is highly improbable that the speech above assigned to Ndabuko was actually spoken by him. Perhaps the remark which occurs at this point in the Zulu account (see p. 321), "*But he did not write down Ziwedu's words,*" may explain the mistake. If Mr. Osborn paused in his note-taking just here, as, apparently, he did, and wrote down one or two of the speeches from memory afterwards, such an error might easily occur; and, if a particularly vehement speech were recalled with any doubt as to the speaker, it would probably be set down to Ndabuko, whom Government, without, however, the smallest grounds except his near relationship to Cetshwayo, persisted in regarding as a most turbulent Prince.

that overtook us immediately after General Wood's decision. General Wood did not write the letters. You wrote them. They are with the Government. I want to see them in Maritzburg, not here in the veldt (open field)."

At this stage several exclamations came from the assembly: that they have come to see the Makosi in Maritzburg, and not to talk to me in the veldt, and they will not be prevented by me, but will all go straight into town.*

Resident: "You all know the Governor's words in reference to your coming here, as I have delivered them to you. I did not know that you were going to say these things against me. Under the circumstances I will report to the Governor what you have said. I advise you not to go into town, but send two men to me to-morrow to hear what words may be sent to you. I do not say that there will be anything to tell you by them, but there may be. As the sun is near setting, I

* It is curious, however, that they did not make the slightest attempt to do so, and that their *actions* throughout were characterised by the utmost patience and docility.

think the meeting had better disperse."

Undabuko and *Usiwetu* together: "We agree to your suggestion, and will send in two men to you to-morrow."

Dabulamanzi: "I and all these with me here are from chief John Dunn's territory. We pray for our Inkosi (ex-King). A man beats his child and says he is warned. When we left our kraals we heard John Dunn had said he would call to account any one from his territory who came to join in the prayer,† as he will not allow it. We hear that John Dunn says we pay taxes to him because we like him, and do not want our Inkosi (Cetshwayo) back. It is not true: we do want him back. Let John Dunn be sent for and confronted with us before the Governor. When we return, we fear, we shall be killed, as John Dunn killed the Umtetwas under Sitimela. He spared none. We want you to say this to

Dabulamanzi: "Yes, sir! * I speak for all the people living under John Dunn. We have come after you, sir, to beg you to speak for us to the Governor. We have come to pray for Cetshwayo. I speak for the whole of us. We have been deceived. For when John Dunn ordered us to pay taxes we did it for peace, that our huts might not be burnt over our heads; whereas now we hear that John Dunn says that we paid them to prevent Cetshwayo's return. He has hereby slandered us, and we are indignant at it, for our whole desire is for Cetshwayo."

Malimati wrote here.

Dabulamanzi continued: "We should like John Dunn to be called, and let him speak to our face, and let us

* A common form of commencement, not implying that anything has gone before.

† John Dunn had told them that they would "need a rope to reach from heaven to earth to climb to safety by," which speech was afterwards quite wrongly put into Ndaduko's mouth by Sir H. Bulwer.

the Governor. We told him (Dunn) we were coming, and did not hide it from him."

answer him. We do not wish to accuse him behind his back. The truth is that we are in trouble—unhappy—just for want of Cetshwayo." And the whole party from J. Dunn's district here held up their hands, saying, "Yes, sir, that is our word! We have come to the authorities to tell them our great grief, for our heart was broken when we lost Cetshwayo, and it has never healed. But as we crossed the Tugela to come here, John Dunn's *impi*, we heard, was arriving at our homes, saying, 'And, if you do go, let us see where you will come back to, if you fail in getting what you are going to ask for. We shall kill you!' And we see, sir, that we shall be killed,* as John Dunn has already killed people in Mlandela's tribe, men, women, and children. All this we pray you to speak for us, and let it be known that we have nowhere to go back to peaceably.

"Some of us went to tell John Dunn that we were coming here, and he answered

* In what page of history can be found devotion truer and deeper than that of these men who, for the sake of a shadowy hope of their King's return, thus risked homes, families, lives and all?

nothing. It was only afterwards that he sent to say he should punish us."

Malimati: "I have heard you, men. Let two men come into town with me."

The following comments are made officially upon these interviews:—

Sir Henry Bulwer writes [3247, p. 65] (April 29th, 1882), "The tone adopted by Undabuko and Usiwetu towards the Resident at the second interview was exceedingly disrespectful and overbearing. They charged him with not reporting their words to the Government. They demanded that his letters to the Government about them should be laid open before their assembly in the presence of the Governor. They said they would not talk over matters in the veldt with him, but *would* go into town and see the Governor, and talk before all the great men in town. They had come to do this and would do it.

"The behaviour of these men towards the Resident on this occasion accords well, I am told, with their general character and the pretensions to which, as brothers of the ex-King, they lay claim, Undabuko especially being well known for a most overbearing disposition;* and it will be remembered that it was their rebellious conduct towards their

* There are not the slightest grounds for this accusation. Undabuko (well known to the present writer) is a man of dignified but gentle manners, not unlike those of his brother, and his extreme forbearance and patient endurance under the most trying circumstances is only to be explained by his devotion to his brother's cause, and determination to do nothing to its prejudice. Of course, if the white men set over him by the fortunes of war expected *servility* as well as courtesy from him, and that he would naturally play the part of the "common person" whom they had the ill-breeding to tell him that he had now become, they would be disappointed.

appointed chief, Usibebu, which led to their being obliged to leave his territory." *

Again, Mr. J. Shepstone writes, on April 28th, 1882, "I informed them that Mr. Osborn had reported . . . that at the second meeting they had behaved discourteously towards him," &c. [*ibid.* p. 73], but closes his account with the words, "These men were most respectful in their behaviour," &c., while his memorandum of his interview with the Zulus two days later contains the following passage from their mouths [*ibid.*, p. 74]: "We are told particularly to say that there was no desire or intention to behave disrespectfully to Mr. Osborn, for Undabuko and others, at his (Mr. Osborn's) request, simply repeated the grievances that had been repeated to him in Zululand. † . . . We see that we have done wrong [in coming without a pass] now that it is pointed out to us by you, but, in following Mr. Osborn into Natal, we did not think we were doing wrong. We have nothing further to say. All we had to say, and have had to say, even in Zululand, we have stated to Mr. Osborn, and it was on being asked by him what we had come about that led us to think [*sic* in Blue Book] that the grievances that we had reported to him in Zululand had not been forwarded to the Governor."

Again, at page 229 of Blue Book [3466] appears a despatch from Sir H. Bulwer to the Earl of Kimberley, enclosing reports from Mr. J. Shepstone, Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, and Mr. Osborn, upon the "Account of the great Zulu deputation from a Zulu point of view," namely,

* Not at all. On the contrary, it was Zibebu's wanton ill-treatment that obliged the Princes to leave his territory, i. e. Zibebu drove them out with fire and sword, without provocation on their part.

† This mention of Undabuko's name does not necessarily imply that he was one of the actual speakers upon the grievances. His name, in this "statement," is put forward throughout, owing to the ineradicable feeling of the Zulus, that the King's immediate relatives were the most important persons amongst them.

the "Zulu account" given in these pages, and Sir H. Bulwer writes, "The British Resident points out and corrects the more important inaccuracies and errors which the account contains."

On turning to the "reports" [*ibid.*, p. 231], it may readily be observed that the objections made to the Bishop's account are either simply frivolous, or else absolutely without foundation. In illustration of the former assertion may be quoted the following passage from the Resident's report [*ibid.*]: "In the statement of Mvoko and Umsutynana to the Bishop it is alleged that I had refused to grant a pass to the applicants for it (Umsutu and Umyamana), but told them that, as 'I was going down myself to Maritzburg, I would speak of their affairs and troubles to the new chief, Sir H. Bulwer.' That this version of the reply given by me is untrue I need scarcely say. Your Excellency is aware that my answer to the applicants for the pass was as follows:—

" 'I am going to Maritzburg at once, and will lay your application before the Governor, and recommend him to grant it. I will tell you his decision when I return. It is necessary that I should first ask the Governor whether he will permit you to come to him.' "

The unofficial mind will find it somewhat difficult to understand in what lies the *untruth* of the first version quoted. It may be said to be condensed, or even incomplete, but why "untrue"? Mr. Osborn himself has made singularly *incomplete* quotations on this same subject, as when he writes to Sir H. Bulwer * as follows, on April 11th, 1882, upon the application of Undabuko and Usiwetu for a pass to go to Maritzburg and see the Governor: "I told them that I would recommend their application to your Excellency's favourable consideration, which I have now the honour to do. I must, however, at the same time point out that Sir Evelyn Wood, in his despatch to me of the 7th November

* Alluded to in note to p. 306, *supra*.

last, refused to grant a similar application from the same persons on the grounds therein stated by him."

It would have been impossible to more completely neutralise the effect of his professed "recommendation," yet he had told the Zulus that he would give the said recommendation, and takes credit for having done so, afterwards, in his speech to them on April 21st, 1882: "I told you at the time I should ask him to grant it" [3247, p. 67].

As an instance of entirely groundless assertions may be quoted the following from Mr. John Shepstone's report [3466, p. 230], that the deputation had "sent messengers to the Bishop *from Zululand* to say it was on its way"; in another place that "those messengers (i. e. the ones who came to Hamu and Zibebu professedly from the Resident, with suggestions for the punishment of those who prayed for Cetshwayo) did not inform the Resident nor the Secretary for Native Affairs that they were sent by any one," and that "no threats were used towards chief Dunn in the presence of the Governor as stated." While, amongst many other errors in the Resident's report, it will be enough to quote the monstrous statement, "I say it distinctly, that Umnyamana is opposed to Cetshwayo's restoration as King," and that "the announcement [of the deputation's approach] was sent to the Bishop (received by him on 11th April), and not to the Government, the Government being entirely ignored, and it was not till the 16th April that messengers came to me in Maritzburg and stated that the party had arrived, no previous intimation of their approach having been made."

Umnyamana's devotion to Cetshwayo, from first to last, has been proved a thousand times, and the statement about "the Government being entirely ignored" is too absurd, seeing that it rests on the simple fact that, *five days only before* the official announcement of the deputation's *approach* was made to Government, a private message was received by their friend the Bishop, telling him what they hoped to do. Mr. Osborn, by his phrase, "the party had arrived," without the words, "*at the Umgeni*," which should have followed, greatly exaggerates the situation, making it appear that the

Zulus had actually "arrived" at Maritzburg without giving notice of their approach, whereas they had only arrived at the Umgeni, ten or twelve miles distant, and waited there for permission to approach the city.

Of the really important differences between his own and the Zulu report, Mr. Osborn makes no mention, beyond asserting that he "made full and accurate report of everything. . . . All that was said at the different interviews on both sides was carefully written down by me at the time the words were spoken, and I took especial care to omit nothing. The account of the interviews given by the Zulus to the Bishop, I know not how long after they occurred, was from memory, and I assert that it is incorrect in every particular wherein it differs from the reports furnished by me."

This is an easy statement to make, but it is necessary to examine the two reports before giving it entire credit.

In those of the first meeting between the Resident and the whole body of Zulus, and the first portion of the second interview, it is plain enough that there is no serious divergence, nothing beyond a fuller report given of certain things, sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other, with the one serious exception, that the Zulus describe the Resident as *obliging* them to speak of their minor grievances (i. e. those other than Cetshwayo's absence, although resulting from that), while the Resident's report implies that they forced their complaints and accusations upon him.

As reasons for confidence in the accuracy of the Zulu report on this point may be mentioned, first, that they repeatedly allude to the fact of Mr. Osborn's having expressly questioned them upon these grievances;* secondly, that throughout their visit to Natal they showed keen anxiety to induce the Resident to stand their friend, and were, therefore, very unlikely to offend him if they could avoid doing so; and thirdly, because the Government policy throughout had been, and continued to be, to ignore as much

* See Blue Book 3247, p. 74, &c.

as possible all prayers for Cetshwayo, and to drag other matters into the foreground to the exclusion of his cause. It would have been so entirely in keeping with his own and Sir H. Bulwer's behaviour throughout* that the Resident should endeavour to divert the attention of the deputation from that great and inconvenient question to those smaller but more immediate troubles which were making the applicants' daily lives a burden to them, that it is hardly possible to doubt that he did so, perhaps hardly supposing that the Zulus would dare to speak out as they did when forced to speak at all.

This point of difference is the only one which has any bearing of the smallest importance on the real merits of the case until we come to the angry speeches attributed by Mr. Osborn to Undabuko, Ziwedu and Siteku,† towards the end of his report of the second interview.

English readers—not apt to expect or require absolute *servility* from the princes and chiefs, even of a conquered race, and taking into consideration the injuries these men had received, and all their vain efforts, during several years, to obtain a fraction of justice, or even mercy—may not readily discover the so-called insolence and disrespect of these speeches, as reported by the Resident. But in point of fact, there are certain reasons for thinking that a very much modified form of the said speeches might have been given with greater accuracy, and that even in the modified form they may not have been spoken by the men into whose mouths they are put in the official report.

It will be observed that up to a certain point (p. 320) the Zulus report that the Resident wrote down their words, and then occurs the mention of his ceasing to do so. Further on (p. 324) they say again, "Malimati [the Resident] wrote here." Now it is a fact worth remarking that it is in the

* Notably in the latter's interview with Dabulamanzi and his party.

† Three of the five Princes.

portion of Mr. Osborn's report which precisely corresponds with that which, according to the Zulus, *he did not write down at the time*, that the greater divergence between the two reports, and the angry speeches attributed by the Resident to the Princes, occur. It is impossible for any one to suggest that the Zulu account is garbled to produce this effect, for it was given immediately after the interviews, written down by the Bishop and Miss Colenso, and sent to England months before the publication of the official report.

What does seem probable is that this part of the Resident's report was filled up from memory afterwards, and was coloured, perhaps unconsciously, by his own annoyance at the charges which he had brought down upon himself, and the steadfast attitude of the Zulu petitioners. The universal omission of the respectful "Sir" ('Nkos'), also greatly takes from the air of respect with which the Zulus would certainly speak on such an occasion, all the more, perhaps, that they feared that what they had to say might not prove altogether palatable to those whom they desired to propitiate for Cetshwayo's sake, as well as for their own.

It is not difficult to account for the speeches which, in the Resident's account, directly accuse him of having instigated Zibebu and Hamu to "eat up" Cetshwayo's loyal subjects, but which, in the Zulus' own account, draw the delicate (and probable) distinction of *quoting the accusations of the persecutors*. We need not accuse Mr. Osborn of deliberately and distinctly bidding any of the four unpatriotic kinglets—the "knaves" afore-mentioned, chiefs Dunn, Hamu, Zibebu, and Mfanawendhlela—to punish those who "prayed for the King." Without any such definite action on his part it is easy to imagine that—steeped to the lips, as his every despatch and action show him to have been, in the (Natal) Government policy of prejudice against Cetshwayo and suspicion of all who favoured his cause—his every-day conversation, shared, of course, by Zulus, since there was hardly any white companionship at hand, would be coloured by his opinions on these subjects. Aversion to Cetshwayo, annoyance against those who especially upheld

his cause, approval of the summary (and violent) proceedings of chief Dunn & Co.,* and, perhaps, implied contempt for those kinglets who did not follow his example in crushing out the fire of devotion to Cetshwayo from the hearts of those Zulus over whom they ruled (or destroying them, if their loyal hearts resisted)—all these feelings are freely displayed in the correspondence between the Resident in Zululand and the Governor of Natal, and were assuredly not banished entirely from the daily conversation of the former; and there would be but little difficulty in construing such expressions into distinct encouragement, or even command, on the part of a people so given to figurative language and suggestive speech as the Zulus, and the only certain safeguard against such results as actually followed would have been a sincere regard on the Resident's part for the exiled Zulu King, and an honest desire to discover how large a proportion of the Zulu people would pray for his return if they dared speak out their minds.

There are such overwhelming proofs that the Natal Government (including the "Resident" in Zululand) did *not* desire to elicit the real feeling of the Zulu people but to force them to submission to Sir Garnet Wolseley's "settlement," and to, at all events apparent, forgetfulness of Cetshwayo, that it would seem wasted labour to demonstrate so self-evident a fact, but for the tone of professed impartiality adopted, and the virtuous indignation displayed by the authorities when accused of directly or indirectly coercing the Zulus. It is absolutely necessary to show what their real policy was because their repudiation and denial of it has been made to serve the turn of the King's opponents. Sir H. Bulwer throughout assumes that the 2000 Zulus who formed the Great Deputation had no right to that title on the grounds that they were not a party selected to represent a larger whole, but were themselves all the Zulus who, by every kind of

* Already (let us hope, under very mistaken notions of their nature) highly commended at the Inhlazatshe meeting by Sir Evelyn Wood.

pressure, could be persuaded or deceived into praying for the King, including amongst them, according to Sir Henry's view, many who did not really desire the King's return, but, believing it would take place, thought to be on the safe side. Mr. John Shepstone supported this view, stating that "Undabuko busied himself in inducing all he could to accompany him" [3466, p. 230]; while Mr. Osborn takes the same tone, putting into Undabuko's mouth J. Dunn's well-known speech that "defaulters had better manufacture a very long rope by which they might escape up to the sky," &c. [*ibid.*, pp. 83, 84], and stating that he had "ascertained that Undabuko fined two men one head of cattle each for having failed to take part in the demonstration at Pietermaritzburg," by way of showing what Sir H. Bulwer calls [*ibid.*, p. 82] "the means employed by Undabuko to collect people to accompany him into Natal." Supposing Ndabuko really to have fined two men one head of cattle each, whether for this or some other offence, it could only have been done amongst those who voluntarily elected to obey him, and it is far more probable that the real explanation of the circumstances is that the two head of cattle were brought to him as offerings to show the good-will of men who had been unable, or perhaps afraid, to join the deputation to Natal. This supposition, with the number of the cattle, is much more in keeping with Zulu customs than would be the explanation given by the Resident. On the other hand it cannot be denied that the four disloyal chiefs, J. Dunn, Zibebu, Hamu, and Mfanawendhlela, *did* fine the people under them heavily, not in one but many head of cattle, in some cases amounting to complete "eating up" and in others including terrible slaughter of the people themselves, for joining in the "prayer." Mr. Osborn, in a despatch dated March 15, 1882 [3247, p. 44], says that four chiefs* "have

* The four chiefs here mentioned are Zibebu, Hamu, Mfanawendhlela and *Chingwayo*, their names being brought in about another matter (to be considered later), but the sentence quoted above would be more accurate were the name of Dunn substituted

strictly prohibited, under severe penalties, any of their subjects or persons living in their territories from having any communication with the Government or others with the view of effecting Cetshwayo's restoration." While even the one or two kinglets who,* out of fear and (what, at all events, they *believed* to be) obedience to their white conquerors, inflicted fines on their own messengers on their return from Natal did so to an extent before which the single head of cattle said to have been demanded by the Prince from each of two of his followers sinks into insignificance.

It is necessary to enter thus minutely into this subject since it makes all the difference whether, as Sir H. Bulwer asserted, the 2000 Zulus who composed the Great Deputation were all who could possibly be brought to express a wish for Cetshwayo's return, many even of that number having been coerced or frightened into doing so, or whether, as from all the facts of the case there can be no doubt was the actual truth, every form of coercion had been used to prevent and suppress the "prayer," and the 2000, instead of constituting Cetshwayo's adherents "all told," were simply those amongst them who were brave and devoted enough to disregard all threats, and to dare all danger and loss, and who represented a great number of others who, although they feared to speak out, would every one of them have voted for Cetshwayo's return could they have done so under the ballot system, and would all of them have done it willingly, and most of them joyfully. In fact "All Zululand" *did* pray for their King's return, but only a comparatively small number, the 2000 of the Great Deputation, were ready to risk all on the chance of procuring it.

To express shortly the view of the whole case which the foregoing pages are intended to prove, the Government policy

for that of Chingwayo, who was with the King at heart, though afraid to show it by his actions since Sir Evelyn Wood's "meeting" at the Inhlazatshe, and what followed.

* See p. 84, *supra*.

was to uphold Sir Garnet Wolseley's "settlement" at all costs (to the Zulus), to suppress every sign of a desire for Cetshwayo's return amongst them, yet to parade before the eyes of the British public that the utmost possible freedom was allowed to the people, and the strictest justice and impartiality exercised towards them as far as British authority interfered at all*—in fact, that the nation generally did not pray for Cetshwayo because they did not want him instead of because they were coerced into silence from the time of the Government declaration in 1880, that the subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed. The rule which forbade Zulus to visit the Government without a pass from the Resident was quite in keeping with this object, for, if they obediently waited for permission to go to Maritzburg, they did not get it, and therefore had no chance of speaking, and if they went without the pass their having done so was a sufficient reason for refusing to hear what they had to say. It must be apparent to every reader that although, if Sir H. Bulwer wished for an excuse for not showing the smallest favour towards any Zulus who desired Cetshwayo's return, their coming to him as they did provided him with plausible grounds for refusing to see them, yet that it would have been quite as easy to find sufficient grounds for putting aside the strict letter of a purely arbitrary law, had he felt one spark of kindness or pity for the brave and devoted followers of a conquered and imprisoned king.

One further comment may close this painful portion of a painful subject. The official despatches and reports already quoted [3247] lay great stress upon what the writers seem to consider unpardonable insolence on the part of the Zulus in daring to suspect the Resident of having suppressed their grievances and messages to the Natal Government. Judging from the Blue Books, Mr. Osborn and his superior officer were

* Directly and openly but a very little way, but indirectly enormously.

sufficiently of one mind on these Zulu matters to exonerate the former from this charge, but it was perfectly natural that the Zulus should have the suspicion. Indeed, their having it was a strong proof that they still believed in and respected the Governor of Natal, as representing the British Government, since to exonerate the Resident from the charge was simply to transfer it to the Governor. The Zulus could not believe that the latter would play so false and heartless a part towards them as would be the case if all their miseries had really reached his ears, yet months and even years went by bringing neither comfort nor redress. They, therefore, naturally suspected that the middle-man had played them false.

As to the supposed insult to the Resident of the suspicion on such matters, the Natal Government reaps only what she herself has sowed, notably in the treacherous attempt in 1858 by Mr. John Shepstone to seize Matshana (who escaped into Zululand), which was proved before Sir George (then Colonel) Pomeroy-Colley in 1875. Nor was the effect of that shameful lesson decreased by the mock indignation expressed by the Court which, in 1874, pretended to try the chief Langalibalele against that unhappy man * for *daring* to suspect bad faith on the part of Government officials, although the Crown Prosecutor, Mr. John Shepstone, and at least one of the judges, Sir Theo. Shepstone, while they nevertheless kept silence, were well aware that the grounds of the prisoner's plea, *fear on remembering what happened to Matshana at a friendly meeting with Mr. Shepstone*, were perfectly true and valid. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the principal men of the Great Deputation were not people of no account, fearing to raise their eyes to the white man's face, or to speak for themselves in a firm and manly way, but Princes and men of rank, for the most part courteous and quiet in manner, but certainly with no notion of cringing or slavish fear to speak what they believed to be the

* Still a miserable prisoner at the Cape, and said to be now out of his senses.

truth.* In judging of these reports and their differences, it must not be forgotten that although one is given by a British Government official, whose word has been accepted by his superiors, the other also demands and deserves consideration, in that it was ratified by a number of men of rank and respectability, some amongst whom at all events are considered by those who know them well, as incapable of intentional falsehood as an Englishman—should be.

(C.) *The Bishop of Natal's Letter to Lord Derby.*

BISHOPSTOWE, April 7, 1883.

SIR,—I have the honour to request that your Excellency will be pleased to forward the enclosed letter to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, together with three printed copies of the same, which are also enclosed as more convenient for reading.

I have, &c.,

H.E. Sir H. BULWER, K.C.M.G.
&c. &c. &c.

J. W. NATAL.

BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL, April 5, 1883.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to request your Lordship's consideration of the following statement in reply to certain charges which His Excellency Sir Henry Bulwer has brought against myself and my daughter in the Blue Book [C. 3466] which has just reached this colony. I very much regret that His Excellency did not submit to me these accusations, and thus give me an opportunity of explaining or

* Very different men from the native witnesses—one of them half-witted, two others paid subordinates of the S.N.A. Office, and spies—all men of no position or rank, whose absurd stories Sir H. Bulwer persisted in believing against the Bishop of Natal, in spite of the latter's direct contradiction and full explanation.

rebutting them, before sending them to the Secretary of State, six or nine months before I could know that they had been made. But their publication in the new Blue Book happily enables me, as it also makes it imperative for me, to contradict emphatically without delay some of the statements in question, and to rectify others, in respect of which His Excellency has been misinformed. I shall confine myself, of course, only to those passages which reflect upon myself or my daughter personally, and (not to trespass unduly upon your Lordship's time and patience) only to the most important of those.

I. On page 103 there is printed a letter of mine, dated July 22, 1882, in which I had said that His Excellency had been misinformed when he had stated in his despatch to Lord Kimberley, of May 12 [C. 3247, pp. 85-6], that on Wednesday, May 3, "a meeting of the principal Zulus, at which Dabulamanzi was present, took place at Bishopstowe," and implied also that Dabulamanzi, &c., were counselled by me or mine on this occasion to reject on Thursday, May 4, the advice which His Excellency had given them on the previous Tuesday, viz. to submit themselves to the rule of chief John Dunn. I stated that no such meeting, and, in fact, no meeting of any kind, had been held on Wednesday at Bishopstowe—that the Princes had arranged to come to be photographed, but, the day being very wet, had sent to excuse themselves, as Dabulamanzi and party did to the Secretary for Native Affairs. I said also that, as no Zulus were present when the photographer with his companion drove up, I sent for two old men, lodging about a mile away, who came and were photographed, as Ziweddu and Siteku, and afterwards, when they had gone, Ndaduko, Shingana, and many others, were the next day, without Dabulamanzi and party, who on that day took in their reply to the Governor.

His Excellency at the time was pleased to reply [p. 127]:—

"I accept, of course, your Lordship's assurance that no meeting of Zulus took place at Bishopstowe on Wednesday, May 3, and Dabulamanzi's rejection of the good advice that I gave him on the previous day could not, it is clear, have

been decided at a meeting which, as your Lordship says, did not take place."

In transmitting this reply, however, on August 1 to the Secretary of State, His Excellency says [p. 126]:—

"I concluded that some mistake had been made by those from whom my information was derived regarding the date of the meeting. Strange to say, however, those who informed the Government adhere most positively to their statements that a meeting did take place on that day, and will not admit that they have made any mistake as to the day."

Thus, in face of my positive denial, His Excellency still implies that a meeting was held at Bishopstowe of the principal Zulus, at which Dabulamanzi was present, and at which he was counselled by me or mine how to reply to His Excellency's advice, though his informants may have made a mistake as to the day.

I must say, therefore, that it was impossible that they should have mistaken the day, inasmuch as Wednesday was the *only* day between Dabulamanzi's receiving His Excellency's advice on Tuesday evening and returning with his reply on Thursday morning. And I may add also that at the time, in consequence of some remarks in the *Times of Natal*, supposed to be under quasi-official influences, the photographer, Mr. Ferneyhough, stated in a letter to that journal the main facts of the case, exactly as I had stated them to His Excellency, and mentioned, moreover, the name of his "companion"—which I had suppressed—viz. Captain Colvile, of the Grenadier Guards, Lieutenant-General Smyth's aide-de-camp, to whom I might have referred the Private Secretary during some months afterwards, though he is now stationed at Capetown. Captain Colvile, I am sure, would have confirmed my statement that the day was wet and blustering; that no Zulus were present when they arrived, and only two old men, with their three or four attendants, came some time afterwards when called; and that these were photographed by himself and Mr. Ferneyhough, together with one of Cetshwayo's female attendants, just sent

back invalided from Capetown, who was sleeping at Bishopstowe, while waiting to be taken back to Zululand by her brothers forming part of the Great Deputation.

II. But, three months afterwards, on November 7, His Excellency writes again [p. 223]:—

“The meeting of chief John Dunn, Dabulamanzi, and other people belonging to Dunn’s territory, took place at Government House on Tuesday, May 2. Dabulamanzi delayed making his answer to the advice which I gave him at the close of that meeting till Thursday; and *I never had any doubt, and have no doubt now, that his answer, rejecting my good advice, was influenced by advice received outside during the interval.*”

I can only say that there is not a shadow of ground for the above opinion (italicised) of His Excellency as regards myself, or any member of my family, or any one acting under my instructions or within my knowledge.

“I mentioned in my reports at the time that two meetings of the principal Zulus had been held at Bishopstowe—on Wednesday, the 3rd, and on Thursday, the 4th of May—at one of which photographs were taken of the party. Bishop Colenso afterwards denied that two meetings had taken place. *He said that the meeting which was to have taken place on Wednesday had, on account of the rain, been put off, and that it took place on the Thursday;* and he implied that, therefore, the inference which was to be drawn from my reports, that Dabulamanzi had been influenced by the Wednesday meeting, could not be sustained.”

I may here observe that I did not say in my letter [p. 103] that “the meeting which was to have taken place on Wednesday took place on the Thursday;” for I totally deny that any “meeting,” in the serious sense in which His Excellency uses the word, ever took place at Bishopstowe either on Wednesday or on Thursday; and I said that the coming together of Zulus merely to be photographed “was the ‘meeting’ on Thursday of which your Excellency speaks in the above extract”—thus, in fact, plainly demurring to the use of the expression, as applied to such a motley crowd,

as if met for deliberation, when one of the five Princes was absent altogether, and, of the other four, two left at noon, before the arrival of the other two, and not a word of advice of any kind, as I assert, was spoken.

His Excellency continues (*ibid.*):—

“I, of course, accepted the assurance of Bishop Colenso that no such meeting had been held on the Wednesday. I must mention, however, that the natives, whose statements I enclose, are positive on the point of a meeting having been held at Bishopstowe on the day following the meeting at Government House. — lives on the Bishopstowe lands, and both he and — declare they saw the Zulus going that morning to Bishopstowe. Some of the Zulus forming the party even slept at —’s kraal, and these also, — says, went to the meeting. However, it is quite certain from Bishop Colenso’s denial that, if there was any meeting that day at Bishopstowe, it was without his knowledge. But Miss H. Colenso, who is the eldest daughter of the Bishop, has taken a very active part in the movement for Cetshwayo’s return. . . . And it was Miss Colenso, according to the testimony contained in one of these statements, who told Dabulamanzi what he was to say in reply to me. Whether this was done at a meeting, or not, does not perhaps much matter, as Dabulamanzi was actually staying at a kraal on the Bishopstowe lands at the time, and I have no doubt that the influence that guided him in his answer to me, as well, I may say, as the influence which guided his conduct and proceedings generally at that time, was Bishopstowe influence.”

With all due respect for His Excellency’s expression of opinion, I may be allowed to say that it does “much matter” whether Miss Colenso advised Dabulamanzi, as asserted, at a meeting, or not; because the same witness, on whom His Excellency relies for proof that such advice was given at all, states also [p. 225] that on the Wednesday in question he “saw Dabulamanzi, Ndabuko, Ziwedu, Shingana, and Siteku”—i. e. the five Princes, who had *never* been at Bishopstowe together—“go to Bishopstowe, accompanied by many of

their people. Those of them who slept at my kraal also went. It was on that day that the Bishopstowe natives were not allowed to be present at the meeting"—every portion of which statement, I assert, is absolutely false, and, if so, then not mistakenly, but deliberately and of set purpose, false. Probably, having given at first a false or mistaken report, they stuck to it, when questioned three months afterwards, perhaps adding a few embellishments. But if His Excellency does not consider my own categorical denial to be worth more than the testimony of these native informants, I must refer, as above, to Mr. Ferneyhough, living in Maritzburg, for confirmation of it; since it is hardly likely that, if the five Princes came to Bishopstowe on Wednesday or Thursday, they would not have been all photographed, as four of them were on Thursday, or that, if they came "*accompanied by many of their people,*" they should have escaped altogether Mr. Ferneyhough's notice.

III. But your Lordship will perceive [p. 225] that the *names* of the natives, whose statements have been taken down and reported to His Excellency by Mr. John Shepstone, are, for some reason or other, *suppressed*. It would be absurd to suppose that they have been suppressed because the authorities feared that, should the facts become known, I might wreak my vengeance upon them, as a supreme chief might have done. The only punishment I could have inflicted, if I thought proper to do so, would have been to turn off my tenant, as a Government spy, from the Bishopstowe land, when, of course, he would have been protected by the Government and provided with land to live on elsewhere. I can only suppose, therefore, that the names have been suppressed because it was not desired that the men should be made known—as being not independent natives, but mere underlings of Mr. John Shepstone.

For your Lordship will observe that one of these two natives says [p. 225], "Those of them that slept at my kraal also went"—a statement wholly false, as I have said, but which has helped me to identify them both as being, one (*Mtungwana*) a petty official under the Government, and the

other (*Tom*) an induna of Mr. John Shepstone, the former being described [p. 225] as "residing on Bishopstowe lands" the latter as "staying in ——'s kraal on Bishopstowe lands." Accordingly "Tom" was staying at the time in the kraal of "Mtungwana," though both have been absent, for some months past, with Mr. John Shepstone in the Zulu Reserve, in which they have been promised lands, according to the current native report both in Natal and Zululand. In fact, the *three* statements [pp. 225-6], which seem as if made by *three* different men, appear to have really come from these *two* natives, who belong to the office of Mr. John Shepstone.

I have long had reason for believing that Mtungwana was a spy, who reported to S.N.A. Office whatever he thought he had discovered as to my doings in Zulu matters. Having had nothing to conceal, I have not cared to take any steps to prevent his reporting anything which he really had seen or heard. In point of fact, as will be seen from the Blue Book, he has not been able to report anything of this kind which is of the slightest importance. But, certainly, I did not expect that he would report a mass of falsehoods, or that Mr. John Shepstone would receive and report them to His Excellency in July and August [pp. 225-9], or that, three months afterwards (November 8), His Excellency would transmit them to the Secretary of State as important and truthful statements, without inquiry being made in the interim either from myself or from the two Europeans close at hand, who would have told the whole truth upon the subject.

IV. The first native statement [p. 225] was made on July 13 by the induna "Tom," who repeats some words said to have been spoken to him by Magema, "who lives on Bishopstowe land," "some three weeks since," when he ("Tom") "told him the news which he had heard in town [at the S.N.A. Office] about Zululand." I am not responsible for Magema's expression of opinion, which, however, I believe to have been shared at the time by many, both white and black, in the colony.

The second statement [pp. 225-6] was made evidently by Mtungwana, and (except the first two and the last three lines) is false from beginning to end. I have shown this

already with respect to lines 3-7, as also with respect to lines 19-23, in which he makes one of my native printers, "Masoja," say that "Miss Colenso had [on Wednesday, May 3, 1882] advised Dabulamanzi what to say in reply to the Governor's words to them the day previous," professing to quote Masoja's words, and adding, "On hearing this, Dabulamanzi came in here the next day [Thursday, May 4] and spoke as he did." All this has been already, as I have said, shown to be false.

With respect to the statement in lines 8-18, where Mtungwana states that he "went to the printing-office at Bishopstowe, and entered into a conversation with two printing-office boys named 'Christian' and 'Masoja,'" it may be enough for me to say, after the above disproval of the rest of this man's statement, that "Christian" is not a "printing-office boy," and never was in my employ, but is merely a waggon-driver, one of the tenants on Bishopstowe land—that "Masoja" and "Christian" both positively deny that they ever were together with Mtungwana in the printing-office, though "Masoja" had often been at Mtungwana's hut, where beer-drinking was pretty frequent, and, no doubt, plenty of gossip went on about Zululand, and Mtungwana had come to the house of "Christian" (a native convert), expressly to inquire about Zulu matters—and that "Masoja" denies ever having said the words about Miss Colenso attributed to him. In fact, *he could not have said them*—unless, indeed, he merely *invented* them, which, from comparing his character with Mtungwana's, I do not believe—since, being only a junior and inferior printer, he has never been called in to assist when I myself or my daughter have spoken with Zulus.

The last three lines of this statement are correct. But "the station people" were in the habit of going for their own convenience for the afternoon service on Sundays to the girls' school attached to the house of Jonathan, "the Bishop's Catechist" (not "induna," as Mtungwana says); and on the Sunday referred to (April 30) they were told to go there for the morning service also—not for any purposes

of secrecy, as the formal mention of this otherwise unmeaning and insignificant fact would seem to suggest, but simply because three of the Princes, Ndabuko, Shingana, and Dabulamanzi, had notified that they were coming to take leave that morning, and the school chapel was wanted in which to receive them, as also the service would have been disturbed by the babble of their numerous followers—the whole Deputation not “numbering, followers and all, some 800 people,” as His Excellency states [p. 75], but 2000, as reckoned by myself [p. 28], as also by Mr. John Shepstone, who says that Ndabuko “actually brought the large party of 2000 people with him” [p. 230].

The third statement is, apparently from “Tom,” who is reported to have said [p. 226], “As I was leaving —’s kraal to come into town *I saw many Zulus going to Bishopstowe*. I myself did not see Mpande’s sons; but *I know that they were at Bishopstowe on that day* [Wednesday]. The weather, though overcast, did not prevent my coming to town, nor was it sufficiently damp to deter any one from travelling.” The statements, italicised by me above, are absolutely false, as Capt. Colville and Mr. Ferneyhough would testify. And they would also state that, as they left town, about 9 A.M., the hour when the duties of “Tom,” as induna of Mr. John Shepstone, would begin at the S.N.A. Office, the sky, which was lowering, seemed likely to clear, and so they started, but, before they reached Bishopstowe (five or six miles), the weather changed to a heavy downpour.

I need hardly say that it would have been easy for His Excellency to have asked me to bring in my two men, “Masoja” and “Christian,” to the Office of the Secretary for Native Affairs, where they might have been confronted in my presence with the two Government informants, and the true facts of the case would have been elicited.

V. On the second of the above worthless statements, however—and on that alone, as far I can see—His Excellency has based a conjecture [p. 224] that, whereas Ndabuko had “said over and over again in the Zulu country,” after his return with the Great Deputation, that

he had been authorised to "take up arms" by the "Amakosi at Pietermaritzburg," these "Amakosi" must mean—not myself, who, "His Excellency was convinced, would not deliberately and intentionally counsel any of the Zulus to proceed to an open act of violence, which could not but be attended with bloodshed," but—my daughter!—who is as utterly incapable of giving such advice as I am myself.

That His Excellency can ever have persuaded himself to make such an accusation, based on such flimsy evidence, I confess, amazes me, as also that he should have been allowed to do this by his chief adviser in Zulu matters, Mr. John Shepstone, who must know perfectly well that the plural word "Amakosi" could never have been used by any Zulu of a mere individual like myself, unconnected with the Government—whose only power of helping them, as they had often been told by myself and others, lay in his caring for them in their troubles, and speaking the truth on their behalf—but could only have been employed with reference generally to the "Government" or "authorities," as it is usually translated in official papers, or to the Governor and other high officials, such as Mr. John Shepstone, Mr. Osborn, or magistrates. It seems highly probable (from the evidence given in this Blue Book) that the assertion, that Ndabuko, &c., had been authorised to "take up arms" by the "Amakosi at *Pietermaritzburg* (N.B.)," was freely made at the time in Zululand, as it was in Natal. But the phrase can only have referred to Government authorities, as above. And I think it very possible that such an assertion may have been based upon the circumstance recorded towards the end of their own account of their interview with His Excellency and the other "Amakosi at Pietermaritzburg," as follows [p. 35]:—

"Then John Dunn asked 'But, if one of them refuses to submit to me?'

"The Governor: 'In such a case he can leave your district, taking with him all his property.'

"But at this we exclaimed, 'No, sirs! Listen to that! Do you not perceive that this is how he means to eat us up, one by one? But we will not have it, and we wish you to

know that the first one of us whom he attacks we shall defend, and shall turn out John Dunn, and drive him out of the country back into Natal.'

"At this the Governor said nothing."

It may be that they took this silence of the Governor to mean consent. They started on their return on Sunday, May 7, intending to go straight, as ordered, to the Regency, and there repeat their prayer for Cetshwayo. "They feared, however, that they might meet with opposition from John Dunn, Hamu, and Zibebu, and might be perhaps obliged to defend themselves, and get rid of those three chiefs, though they have no wish or intention to fight, if they can avoid doing so" [p. 36]. And it is only right to say that Mnyamana and the Princes have never "taken up arms" for the purpose of attack, but only in self-defence, having reason to fear that themselves or some of their party would be attacked, when they returned, ignominiously sent back by His Excellency, as John Dunn, Zibebu, and Hamu had threatened beforehand.

VI. Some pages of this Blue Book are filled with a charge, which (on incorrect information) His Excellency has alleged against me, of having sent a secret message to Mavumengwana, by a Natal native, Faneyana.

I was not in the least aware, until I saw the statements in the Blue Book, that His Excellency entertained such a view, on the report (originally) of chief John Dunn, who stated that this man had come with a message to Mavumengwana and Mnyamana "from the Amakosi in Natal (this was private)" [p. 53], and had admitted that he had been "a constant messenger of Sobantu (the Bishop) and Mr. Offy Shepstone, sent to different headmen at different times in Zululand" [*ibid.*]. Accordingly His Excellency reports the matter to the Secretary of State on July 22, 1882 [p. 101], adding:—

"When before the Resident, Faneyana denied that he had been sent by the Bishop with any message, and moreover denied that he had admitted having said so a few days before. *There can be no doubt that the man has been frequently at*

Bishopstowe; but whether he was ever sent by the Bishop of Natal with this message is best known to the Bishop." And a certain Zulu headman states [p. 156] that Faneyana "came repeatedly from Sobantu." So Siwunguza says [p. 162] that "the Natal Kafir Faneyana, who was arrested by chief John Dunn, came to him last summer [? Jan. 1882], and told him that he was sent by Sobantu to call Ndabuko and his brothers and Mnyamana, as *Cetshwayo had arrived and was with Sobantu. Faneyana said that he had with his own eyes seen Cetshwayo at Sobantu's.*"

One might have thought that so absurd a statement as the above (italicised)—if really made (as I suppose) by Faneyana—would have satisfied the authorities that this man was *lying*. Accordingly a correspondence was given [pp. 167–9] between His Excellency and Mr. Offy Shepstone C.M.G., M.L.C., in which that gentleman indignantly repudiates, as far as he himself was concerned, a statement made by chief John Dunn in the *St. James's Gazette* of July 12, 1882, on the authority of Faneyana, that "the Bishop, Mr. Fynney, and Offy Shepstone are the cause of all the troubles of Zululand," and asserts [p. 167], "I have no knowledge, either personally or otherwise, except that gained from the public newspapers, of the messenger alluded to." His Excellency replies [p. 169] that, "in view of Mr. Shepstone's universal disclaimer," he "attaches, of course, no importance to the statement of Faneyana that he was 'once sent by Mr. Offy Shepstone,'" and describes Faneyana himself as "a Natal native of *apparently doubtful character.*"

In like manner, when I found that Mr. Saunders, M.L.C., had stated in the Legislative Council that this supposed emissary of mine had been caught "red-handed," I wrote to one of the Maritzburg papers, stating that I had never sent Faneyana to Zululand on any business or with any message whatever—that, in fact, I knew little or nothing about him, and should not be likely to make a confidant of a mere stranger. Faneyana came first to Bishopstowe at the end of 1880, during the absence of myself and eldest daughter in the Cape Colony, professing