

‘The best missionary the Society has’:

Arentz Tönnesen’s role in the Colenso controversy and Matshana inquiry

by Milner Snell

In a letter written from Bishopstowe in February 1866, John Colenso, Bishop of Natal, commented that Arentz Tönnesen was ‘the best missionary the Society has’.¹ Despite the fulsome praise, Tönnesen is generally forgotten.² He spent most of his career stationed on the KwaZulu-Natal South Coast where he ministered to the small white population associated with the developing sugar industry and served as missionary to the Thuli chiefdom. He was, however, pulled into two great controversies in the Colony. He supported Colenso after the bishop’s criticism of the Pentateuch and assisted him at an inquiry into the actions of Theophilus Shepstone’s brother, John, at a meeting

with Matshana kaMondise in 1858.

There are three objectives to this article. First, to discuss Tönnesen’s work among the Thuli and how they responded to his missionary efforts. Second, to understand Tönnesen’s interactions with Colenso, focusing on his doubts in the early years of the controversy; investigating the financial and social pressures placed on him to denounce Colenso; and to consider how much his support practically assisted the bishop in his work among his white parishioners. Third, to highlight that Tönnesen and Colenso’s recording of the testimonies of the witnesses at the Matshana inquiry ensured that the experiences of Africans in the Colony of Natal appeared in writ-

ten form free of Theophilus Shepstone's interference and distortions.



Arentz Tønnesen (Pietermaritzburg Archives Repository)

Arrival in Natal and farm manager at Ekukhanyeni

Arentz Tønnesen was born on 6 January 1827 in Flekkefjord, Norway. A carpenter and builder by profession, he came to Natal in 1854, with Sivert Samuelson and Johan Olsen, to serve as an assistant in the Norwegian Missionary Society.³ Ten years earlier Pastor H.P.S. Schreuder had arrived in Natal as the first missionary of the society. In 1851 the Norwegians commenced their work in the Zulu kingdom after King Mpande granted Schreuder permission to establish a mission at Empangeni because of the pastor's medical skill in treating his rheumatism.⁴ In the years that followed a number of stations were established, including Entumeni (1852), Mahlabatini (1860), Eshowe (1861) and Nhlazatshe (1862).

Tønnesen was sent to the Entumeni station near the Mhlathuze River. Upon his arrival, he stated that 'I feel

no higher desire than the coming of the Kingdom of God to the poor Zulus.'⁵ Although most of the missionaries from the society were sympathetic towards the Zulu, Tønnesen was considered unusual in his 'stronger feeling of attachment and devotion'.⁶ He wrote in 1854 that 'the more I learn about them [the Zulus] and their language, the more I get warm in my heart and zealous in my prayers ... While still in Norway I had no idea that I would come to love these black people so much. I have often thought that I would like to die for them if that could only bring them to salvation.'⁷

Tønnesen was present at the battle of Ndondakusuka, which was fought near the mouth of the Thukela River, in December 1856. The battle was a result of a succession dispute between Mpande's sons Cetshwayo and Mbuyazi. Cetshwayo, as the eldest son, was considered his father's heir and attracted many supporters among the men dissatisfied with Mpande's rule. His father attempted to counteract his influence by boosting the claims of his favourite son, Mbuyazi. The growing tensions between the two brothers and their supporters culminated in the battle of Ndondakusuka, at which Cetshwayo emerged victorious. A number of the missionaries at Entumeni were present at the battle including Tønnesen, although he 'was away at the back of the battlefield'.⁸

In 1857 Tønnesen left the Norwegian Missionary Society to join the Anglican Church under Colenso. It is not known exactly what motivated the move, but Ingie Hovland points out that mission assistants, who were generally tradesmen who had not attended the mission school in Stavanger, were accorded a low status in the hierarchical system of

the society and there was little chance of them being ordained and placed in charge of a mission.⁹ The Anglican Church offered greater responsibility and opportunities for advancement. Tönnesen's fellow mission assistant Sivert Samuelson also left the society in the same year for the Church of England 'having found that there was not sufficient scope for his energies'.¹⁰

From 1857 to 1861 Tönnesen worked as the general farm manager of Ekukhanyeni.¹¹ Ekukhanyeni, the place of light, was an 8 500-acre grant within riding distance of Pietermaritzburg where Colenso built his episcopal residence Bishopstowe. A basic four-bedroomed house, with a view of Table Mountain in the distance, was started in 1854.¹² This was followed by additional buildings, such as a smithy, carpenter's shop, sheds, a school for religious and industrial training and a yellowwood chapel. From 1855 to 1858 a second more substantial house in the Gothic revival style was built.¹³ Tönnesen as a carpenter and builder contributed to the developing station.

Why do you not let us alone?: missionary to the Thuli of Mnini

In 1859 Tönnesen was ordained as a deacon and from 1861 to 1866 served as the first vicar of the lower Umkomaas. (Interestingly, Langelibalele unsuccessfully requested that Tönnesen serve among the Hlubi.)¹⁴ He was based at Umgababa and his duties included ministering to the Thuli adherents of Mnini. When the first white traders settled at Port Natal in 1824, the Thuli had been living on the Bluff, or Bubulungu, for four generations.¹⁵ The Thuli and their *inkosi* Mnini became closely associated with Henry Ogle in his early trading ventures. In 1846 the colonial

government appointed a commission to establish the boundaries of African locations and recognised the Thuli's territory between the Bluff and the Mlazi River. In 1847, 4 500 acres of Thuli land was granted to a Mr Ogle, despite the objections of Mnini.¹⁶ A few years later, in 1851, 1 500 acres of Thuli land was put up for sale, depriving the chiefdom of grazing and fresh water.¹⁷ This, as Duncan du Bois shows, 'constituted a survival crisis for the Thuli people'.¹⁸ Stephen Walcott, Secretary of the Colonial Land and Emigration Office, recommended that the Thuli be compensated with a grant of land in a new location.¹⁹ The Secretary of State for the Colonies endorsed the suggestion and instructed that Mnini be given more land than that 'of which he had been deprived'.²⁰ The Thuli were moved to a reserve of 7 977 acres along the coast 'from south of Isipingo to the northern bank of the Mkomanzi river'.²¹ Mnini left the Bluff 'not without sorrow'.²² Portions of the new reserve were leased to sugar planters for which the Thuli received little benefit. Mnini demanded of Tönnesen, 'If the land is mine, why does the white man come upon it?'²³ The chief commented to Thomas Jenkinson, priest at Springvale, 'that these days were no better than Chaka's'.²⁴

Tönnesen's work among the Thuli was, by his own admission, not very prosperous. He had sixteen pupils at his school and the average attendance on Sunday was from ten to thirty people. In 1864 there was not one baptised convert.²⁵ He did, however, receive £100 a year from the government to teach carpentry and agriculture to Mnini's followers, and there was an indication that he was encouraging the introduction of the plough for planting.²⁶ Whenever he visited the homesteads surrounding the

mission he was generally asked, 'Why do you come to trouble us? Why do you not let us alone?'²⁷ His work among white parishioners was also of limited success. There were only eight families in the neighbourhood that belonged to the Anglian Church,²⁸ although in 1862 he was responsible for overseeing the construction of the first church at Umkomaas, St Brides.²⁹

Colenso's criticism of the Pentateuch

It was while Tönnesen was at Umgababa that the Colenso controversy, in which he would become embroiled, began. In 1861 Colenso published a book entitled *St Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. The views he expressed in the book were in some instances not compatible with Anglican teaching. These included questioning the idea of eternal punishment and arguing that all human beings, Christians or not, could be considered righteous. The book caused some unhappiness, but it was his work *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined* published in October 1862 that caused a great outcry.³⁰ By detailed statistical analysis and emphasising the many contradictions found in the books of Genesis and Exodus, Colenso argued that the Pentateuch could not be interpreted literally. He believed the Bible 'was the channel of Truth, not the Truth itself'.³¹ The book caused a feverish reaction in Britain and South Africa. Jeff Guy argues that the harsh response was because the 'book was an attack not only on the spiritual and doctrinal, but also the social authority of the church'.³² The Church taught that the Bible was literal and so Colenso was questioning 'the ideas upon which men depended for positions in society and their authority over others'.³³ In April

1863 the Bishop of Cape Town, Robert Gray, served Colenso with a citation instructing him to stand trial for heresy. The trial began on 17 November 1863 at St George's. In December 1863 Colenso was deposed from his bishopric but was given four months to repent before the sentence took effect.

The years of doubt

From 1863 to 1865, Tönnesen was undecided about where he stood about Colenso's writings or the bishop's legal position in Natal, changing his mind on numerous occasions in these years. In Natal the resistance against Colenso's writings and his continuation as bishop was led by Dean James Green of Pietermaritzburg. In June 1863 the clergy ministering in the diocese of Natal wrote a letter to Colenso in which they informed him that it was their duty to

protest most solemnly against the position taken by you in the publication of this book, and your determination to retain the office of Bishop; and we think it right to lay this our protest before the ecclesiastical authority to whom, next to your Lordship, we must look, the Metropolitan Bishop of Capetown.³⁴

Tönnesen signed this letter, but shortly afterwards publicly retracted his request for the bishop to resign.

Colenso, who had been in England from 1862, challenged Gray's decision in the courts. While the case ground on in London, Gray spent late April to early June 1864 in Natal on a journey of visitation. The point of his trip was to 'strengthen the hands of Dean Green and the Orthodox'³⁵ and 'to provide spiritual ministrations' to 'a distracted and neglected flock'.³⁶ On 18 May, Gray held a meeting at St Peter's in Pietermaritzburg at which all the clergy

were present, except Tönnesen, who had broken a collarbone, and the Reverend Barker who was ill.³⁷ At this meeting it was agreed that all those present would sign a statement in which they placed on record

our emphatic repudiation of the erroneous teaching of Bishop Colenso, and our conviction that, should it please God for the chastisement of our sins, to allow Bishop Colenso to return to this Diocese with legal authority, he must still be regarded as lying under a righteous sentence of condemnation and that we dare not acknowledge him as having authority in spiritual matters.³⁸

Tönnesen later put his name to the document. On the next day they were joined by a number of laity for a church conference. Tönnesen was still absent due to his injury. At the conference it was decided that the resolution signed the day before 'was not so strongly worded as some wished' and the following declaration was drawn up:

we, the undersigned, Clergy and Lay Members of the Church of England, being satisfied that Dr Colenso has widely departed from the faith of the Church, and that he has been righteously deprived of his office ... hereby declare our fixed resolve that we will no longer acknowledge him as our Bishop.³⁹

On 21 June, Tönnesen met Gray at the Isipingo mission and from there they rode to the Umkomaas. On the journey Gray used the opportunity to reprimand Tönnesen for his support of Colenso. Gray later recalled:

Mr Tönnesen to-day expressed his great regret for a foolish letter which he had written in one of the papers denying my jurisdiction and declaring that he should regard Dr Colenso as his Bishop if a civil court decided that he

was so. He has already expressed his regret publicly in the same paper. He told me that his mind had been greatly influenced by letters received from Dr Colenso, who told him that I had no jurisdiction whatever; and that all the lawyers he had consulted in England assured him that he would return as Bishop. I pointed out to him how unbecoming it was in a foreigner,⁴⁰ who had so recently joined the Church, to take upon himself to write a letter in the paper, attacking his metropolitan and all his brethren of the clergy; and told him that he should have sought counsel with them if he had been in any difficulty. He is, I believe, a good man, but naturally placed great faith in what he was told by Dr Colenso, who ordained him, and who keeps up a continual correspondence with him.⁴¹

In March 1865 the judicial committee of the Privy Council ruled that Bishop Gray had no jurisdiction over Colenso and so in effect the deposition could not be legally enforced. Green, in May 1865, convened a meeting in Pinetown to denounce Colenso. Tönnesen refused to do so. Colenso returned to Natal in November 1865 and was met in Durban by Tönnesen and a large number of supporters. Colenso soon realised that he could rely on Tönnesen and wrote in February 1866 that 'I have heartily with me Tönnesen, of course, on all grounds'.⁴²

There were only fourteen Anglican priests and deacons in Natal in 1864. Green insisted that among the clergy there was 'little or no sympathy felt with Dr Colenso's views' and 'that the general desire is that he may never come back'.⁴³ Wyn Rees points out that this was partly as a result of Green securing control over the payments made to priests by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) and then using

this financial leverage 'to maintain due obedience to the authority of Bishop Gray among Natal clergymen'.⁴⁴ There was a handful of men who disagreed with Colenso's theological views but who considered him the legal Bishop of Natal. William Lloyd, the Archdeacon of Durban, clashed with Colenso but recognised him as the Bishop of Natal according to the courts. Reverends E. Robinson and A.W.L. Rivett also acknowledged Colenso's authority. William Nisbett, the military chaplain in Pietermaritzburg, particularly angered by Gray's interference in church affairs in Natal, assisted Colenso by reading prayers for him during services at St Peter's. Green reported him to the chaplain-general of the forces. Interestingly Lloyd, Nisbett and Robinson were not paid by the SPG. These men held ambiguous views towards Colenso, often determined by law rather than loyalty and conviction, and Tönnesen was the only clergymen who stood by Colenso unequivocally and publicly.⁴⁵ Green cut Tönnesen's stipend and in February 1865 Colenso lodged a formal complaint with the acting governor against Green, arguing that he 'is no longer a fit person to be Colonial Chaplain... as he does not govern himself according to the Queen's mandates'.⁴⁶ Besides the financial pressure placed on Tönnesen, there was also the threat of social exclusion by officials who supported Gray. According to Colenso, Tönnesen was driven from Umgababa by 'Moodie the Magistrate and Wylde-Brown' his clerk, both of whom were Dean Green's brothers-in-law.⁴⁷

'Better indeed than any one of us': Colenso's views of Tönnesen

In January 1866 Tönnesen was appointed to the position of rector of St

Peter's in Pietermaritzburg. Ordinarily this would have been a prestigious appointment, but these were not ordinary times, and the new rector was soon pulled into the conflict between Colenso and Green. On 10 February 1866 the *Times of Natal* reported that Tönnesen had been 'peremptorily dismissed' from his engagements with the SPG for reading prayers at services at which Colenso preached. In March 1866 Tönnesen received a letter from the SPG informing him

that reports have reached the Society which have induced them to write to our Natal Committee with reference to you. The Committee are desired to report to the Society whether there has been on your part any and what *overt act of adherence* to Bishop Colenso; and further, whether there be any and if any what proofs of your holding or teaching anything at variance with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.⁴⁸

Tönnesen continued to serve at St Peter's until August of 1867. In 1866 he sold his farm Glen Snowden, probably because of the financial difficulties he was experiencing. At St Peter's money was raised by subscription from the congregation to present him with a silver tea service.⁴⁹

From a series of letters written in 1866, we are able to get an idea of Colenso's views of Tönnesen. On 16 February Colenso commented that Tönnesen was 'a *first-rate* missionary, thoroughly practical, can turn his hand to any common work, besides being an excellent carpenter, and he has a thorough knowledge of Zulu – better indeed than any one of us'.⁵⁰ He went on to say that Tönnesen was the best missionary the SPG had in Natal 'yet at one stroke the Dean undertakes to

dismiss him'.⁵¹ In December in a letter to John Sanderson he wrote that he considered Henry Callaway and Tönnesen to be on a par with each other, and 'immeasurably above the rest' for mission work when taking into account their knowledge of the Zulu, their general ability, practical skill, and 'their power of influencing the natives'.⁵² Frances Colenso praised Tönnesen's intellect and desire for knowledge, writing 'Mr Tönnesen is quite a cormorant, he casts his eyes round whenever he comes up and pounces upon some book new to him... He quite astonished some good judges too in his congregation, by the quality of his sermons during the Bishop's absences on a visitation to the coast'.⁵³

Although there is no doubt about Tönnesen's loyalty to Colenso, there is some question to what extent he was able to assist the bishop practically. According to Guy, Tönnesen's 'English was imperfect and therefore hardly one to carry out the tasks which Colenso needed most urgently – to relieve him of some of the preaching and pastoral work amongst Natal's settlers'.⁵⁴ In a letter written in January 1866, Frances Colenso mentions:

Mr Tönnesen and his family are here on their way to P.M.B. The Bishop wants him here to read prayers for him and to superintend the native work at St Mary's. Unfortunately, Mr Tönnesen has a slight foreign accent which makes him not acceptable as a preacher, and the Bishop's congregation is therefore dependent on himself alone'.⁵⁵

Return to Umgababa

After his dismissal from St Peter's, Tönnesen returned to Umgababa and continued his work there. Colenso wrote in June 1867:

Mr Tönnesen will now be settled at his old place on the Umgababa, where Messrs Savory and Co. are engaged in important sugar work... We have let so much of the land for sugar-growing that we shall be able to maintain Tönnesen entirely and allow him help for building himself a house. He will teach the natives to grow coffee, of which we have some thousands of plants there already. It is a satisfaction to me to know that he has lost nothing and gained much by his faithfulness, though he bravely *hazarded* the loss of all. As it is, he has had £250 per annum instead of about £200, which he had before and will now have again – only free henceforth from any dependence on S.P.G., from whom he drew £180 of his former income. He will have acquired many excellent friends, and greatly raised his own position in the colony, and he will have pocketed one year's extra income from S.P.G. (£180), and a half year's from me (£125). I mention this because, of course, my friends would like to know that he has been liberally dealt with.⁵⁶

Colenso showed his own loyalty to Tönnesen by making him one of his canons in 1869.

'Remarkable, brave and convincing': the Matshana inquiry

In late 1875 and early 1876 Tönnesen assisted Colenso in an inquiry held into the actions almost twenty years earlier of John Shepstone. The inquiry was an outcome of the trial of Langelibalele kaMtinkhulu. It has been well recorded that the prosperity and independence of the Hlubi attracted the envy of white settlers and officials, who used Langelibalele's supposed refusal to register guns and disobeying orders to report to Pietermaritzburg to break up the chiefdom.⁵⁷ For Theophilus Shepstone

the crisis reached a point that demanded a response when his messenger, Mahoyiza, was ill-treated and stripped by the Hlubi.⁵⁸ A force consisting of British troops, colonial volunteers and African levies was sent at the end of October 1873 to arrest Langalibalele. He fled across the Drakensberg into Basutoland and sought refuge with Chief Molapo. Molapo handed Langalibalele over to a detachment of the Frontier Armed and Mounted Police who in turn handed the chief to officials in Natal in December.

Langalibalele's trial for treason began in January 1874. Very early in the trial Colenso became concerned by the inconsistencies in Mahoyiza's testimony that he had been ill-treated by Langalibalele.⁵⁹ Christian converts and Hlubi refugees on Bishopstowe informed him that Mahoyiza had been well treated and that he had only been told to remove his coat to see if he had any concealed weapons. This, Colenso was told, was because in 1858 John Shepstone, now prosecuting Langalibalele, had called Chief Matshana kaMondise to a peaceful meeting, but produced a concealed weapon and shot at him while trying to arrest him. Matshana escaped, but thirty of his men were killed in the ensuing skirmish. Theophilus Shepstone in his official report had never mentioned that his brother was armed.⁶⁰

Colenso became convinced that Theophilus had conspired to protect his brother, but more importantly that Langalibalele's refusal to meet colonial officials and his flight from Natal was motivated out of fear because of what had happened to Matshana.⁶¹ Governor Benjamin Pine rejected requests by Colenso to establish an inquiry into Shepstone's actions and so the bishop corresponded directly with Lord Carnarvon, Secretary of State for the

Colonies, in London. Carnarvon eventually ordered that an inquiry, headed by Colonel Pomeroy Colley, be held into Shepstone's actions against Matshana. By this stage John Shepstone admitted to having been armed but claimed it was because there was a plot to kill him.⁶² Colley concluded that Matshana had not planned to kill Shepstone but at the same time Shepstone had not fired at Matshana but at his men who were trying to seize police arms. Colley's inconclusive findings were generally interpreted by the colonial press in Natal as exonerating John Shepstone. Actually, his testimony was clearly full of falsehoods, but it did not impact negatively on his later career and he went on to serve as the secretary for native affairs.⁶³

Tönnesen and Colenso later wrote up the testimonies presented at the inquiry in a 199-page document entitled 'The history of the Matshana inquiry'. There was very little public interest in the inquiry and Tönnesen and Colenso's findings were not widely read or known among white settlers. However, the inquiry was, and still is, significant as it allowed Africans to record what had happened all those years before. Guy has shown that few of Shepstone's contemporaries had his linguistic skills and so he used his knowledge of African languages to hide his dealings with Africans from white officials and settlers, while at the same time using his literacy to keep Africans ignorant of what he was writing in his official correspondence and reports.⁶⁴ His reports often excluded African perspectives completely or were revealed on his own terms.⁶⁵ Most literate English speakers who generally did not have Shepstone's depth of knowledge of Zulu were unable to question his reports. 'The history of the Matshana inquiry' put on record the

experiences of the Africans of Natal for the first time. Shepstone was acutely aware that the inquiry was a threat to his reputation and influence; testimonies by African witnesses put into question the veracity of his own reports, revealed his strong-arm tactics and threatened his role as the mediator between the oral and the literate.⁶⁶ He responded by either trying to discredit African witnesses or intimidate them into not testifying at all. Despite Colley's findings, the entire process was 'remarkable, brave and convincing'.⁶⁷

'My position as a gentleman': the later years

In 1876 Tönnesen returned to Norway. The decision was made after 'a long struggle of incessant worry' and was motivated by a concern over his mother's health and financial difficulties.⁶⁸ It seems that he hoped to broach the subject of money with his mother but found he could not discuss business with her 'due to her age and health'. By July 1877 he was back in Natal for on the 13th of the month he wrote a letter to the attorney-general asking to re-enter the government service. According to his letter, he was prepared to accept a post 'anywhere sufficient to enable me to hold my position as a gentleman'.⁶⁹ By November 1877 Tönnesen was employed as an agent for the Natal Native Trust in the county of Durban. We know very little about this work except that in November 1877 he complained that as he did not have power of attorney he could not 'proceed against any person or persons who may cut and remove wood on the trust lands without his sanction'.⁷⁰ Tönnesen resigned his position in the church in July 1882 and bought the farm Bosch Hoek in the Mzimkhulu

area. In the same year he was a founding member of the Umzimkulu Farmers' Association and served on the first committee.⁷¹ He died four years later on 14 July 1886 at Umzinto from a snakebite, three years after the death of his bishop and friend.

Conclusion

Tönnesen was disappointed by the Thuli's response to his missionary efforts. The mission certainly did not flourish as he wished, but his work was not a complete failure as he did assist a number of men to acquire practical skills in carpentry and agriculture. The betrayal of the Thuli by local white officials probably contributed to their resistance to Tönnesen's teachings. Despite his initial misgivings, Tönnesen eventually supported Colenso unequivocally and paid a heavy price for his loyalty. His main source of income was removed; he faced censure from the church; was socially ostracised by prominent officials and was dismissed from the prestigious position as rector of St Peter's. His foreign accent prevented him assisting Colenso among the white parishioners of Natal, although he was in the words of Mrs Colenso 'a noble friend' who 'risked everything'.⁷² Colenso's trust in Tönnesen's mettle to stand against social pressures and his faith in him as a Zulu linguist is probably what motivated him to ask him to assist in the Matshana inquiry and to co-author the recording of the testimonies of African witnesses. Although the Shepstone brothers survived the inquiry politically, Tönnesen and Colenso's efforts and the bravery of the witnesses revealed the workings of the Native Affairs Department and allowed African voices to be heard.

NOTES

- 1 John Colenso to George W. Cox, 16 February 1866 in George W. Cox, *The Life of John William Colenso, D.D.: Bishop of Natal* (London: W. Ridgway, 1888), vol. II, p. 17.
- 2 In Norwegian documents he is referred to as Arnt Tønnesen. In Natal he was generally referred to as Arentz Tønnesen. There are references to Argentz Tønnesen, Arentz Toneson, Arentz Tonnesan and Argentz Tonneson. Later generations of the family generally used the spelling Tonnesen.
- 3 Ingie Hovland, *Mission Station Christianity: Norwegian Missionaries in Colonial Natal and Zululand, Southern Africa, 1850–1890* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), p. 63.
- 4 Frederick Hale (ed.), *Norwegian Missionaries in Natal and Zululand* (Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society, 1997), p. 21.
- 5 Torstein Jorgensen, 'Contact and conflict: Norwegian missionaries, the Zulu kingdom and the Gospel, 1850–1873' (D.Th. thesis, University of Oslo, 1987), p. 99.
- 6 *ibid.*, p. 167.
- 7 *ibid.*, p. 168.
- 8 Mr Bond's testimony in *The James Stuart Archive* edited by C. de B. Webb and J.B. Wright (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1976), vol. I, p. 75.
- 9 Hovland, *Mission Station Christianity*, p. 99.
- 10 Robert C. Samuelson, *Long, Long Ago* (Durban: Knox, 1929), p. 5.
- 11 Ruth Edgecombe (ed.), *Bringing Forth Light: Five Tracts on Bishop Colenso's Zulu Mission* (Pietermaritzburg, University of Natal Press; Durban, Killie Campbell Africana Library, 1982), p. 196.
- 12 Brian Kearney, "'The general appearance of things is as of old": the Colenso homestead at Bishopstowe' *Natalia* 39 (2009), p. 12.
- 13 *ibid.*, p. 13.
- 14 Norman Etherington, 'Why Langa libalele ran away' *Journal of Natal and Zulu History* 1 (1978), p. 18.
- 15 Harry Lugg, *Historic Natal and Zululand* (Pietermaritzburg, Shuter & Shooter, 1949), p. 13.
- 16 Duncan du Bois, *Sugar and Settlers: A History of the Natal South Coast, 1850–1910* (Bloemfontein: Sun Press, 2015), p. 37.
- 17 *ibid.*, pp. 37–8.
- 18 *ibid.*, p. 38.
- 19 Duncan du Bois, *Portraits of Colonial Natal* (Wandsbeck: Reach Publishers, 2017), p. 45.
- 20 *ibid.*
- 21 Du Bois, *Sugar and Settlers*, p. 39.
- 22 Thomas B. Jenkinson, *AmaZulu: The Zulus, their Past History, Manners, Customs, and Language* (London: W.H. Allen, 1882), p. 26.
- 23 Robert Gray, *Journal of a Visitation to the Diocese of Natal in 1864* (London: Bell & Daldy, 1864), p. 93.
- 24 Jenkinson, *AmaZulu*, p. 26.
- 25 Gray, *Journal of a Visitation*, p. 99.
- 26 *ibid.*
- 27 *ibid.*, p. 92.
- 28 *ibid.*, p. 94.
- 29 Du Bois, *Portraits of Colonial Natal*, pp. 81–2.
- 30 John Colenso, *St Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Newly Translated, and Expanded from a Missionary Point of View* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1861); John Colenso, *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined* (London: Longmans, Green, 1862).
- 31 Jeff Guy, *The Heretic: A Study of the Life of John William Colenso* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1983), p. 125.
- 32 *ibid.*, p. 186.
- 33 *ibid.*
- 34 Augustus T. Wirgman, *Life of James Green: Doctor of Divinity, Rector and Dean of Maritzburg, Natal from February, 1849 to January, 1906* (London: Longmans, Green, 1909), vol. II, p. 145.
- 35 A.E.M. Anderson-Morshead, *A Pioneer and Founder: Reminiscences of Some Who Knew Robert Gray D.D., First Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of South Africa* (London: Skeffington, 1905), p. 89.
- 36 Gray, *Journal of a Visitation*, p. 1.
- 37 *ibid.*, p. 28.
- 38 *ibid.*, p. 29.
- 39 *ibid.*, p. 37.
- 40 It is interesting that Gray felt it necessary to point out that Tønnesen was a foreigner. The bishop was in great 'pain' that Colenso had chosen as his representative at his trial in Cape Town Dr Bleek, 'a foreign layman' (Anderson-Morshead, *A Pioneer and Founder*, p. 88).
- 41 Gray, *Journal of a Visitation*, pp. 93–4.
- 42 John Colenso to W.H. Domville, 22 February 1866 in Cox, *The Life of John William Colenso*, vol. II, p. 15.
- 43 Gray, *Journal of a Visitation*, p. 12.
- 44 Wyn Rees, *Colenso Letters from Natal* (Pietermaritzburg: Shuter & Shooter, 1958), p. 90.
- 45 Guy, *The Heretic*, p. 157.
- 46 Frances Colenso to Katherine Lyell, 26 February 1866, in Rees, *Colenso Letters from Natal*, p. 106.
- 47 John Colenso to W.H. Domville, 29 June 1867 in Cox, *The Life of John William Colenso*, vol. II, pp. 148–9.

- 48 John Colenso to Sir Charles Lyell, 14 May 1866 in Cox, *The Life of John William Colenso*, vol. II, p. 26.
- 49 Frances Colenso to Lady Lyell, Michaelmas Day 1867 in Rees, *Colenso Letters from Natal*, p. 150.
- 50 John Colenso to George W. Cox, 16 February 1866 in Cox, *The Life of John William Colenso*, vol. II, p. 17.
- 51 *ibid.*
- 52 Quoted in Shelagh O'Byrne Spencer, *British Settlers in Natal, 1824–1857* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 2001), vol. 7, p. 97.
- 53 Frances Colenso to Katherine Lyell, 25 October 1866 in Rees, *Colenso Letters from Natal*, p. 123.
- 54 Guy, *The Heretic*, p. 157.
- 55 Frances Colenso to Katherine Lyell, 31 January 1866 in Rees, *Colenso Letters from Natal*, p. 101.
- 56 John Colenso to W.H. Domville, 29 June 1867 in Cox, *The Life of John William Colenso*, vol. II, pp. 148–9.
- 57 Etherington, 'Why Langalibalele ran away', pp. 2–5.
- 58 Jeff Guy, *Theophilus Shepstone and the Forging of Natal* (Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2013), p. 390.
- 59 Guy, *The Heretic*, p. 207.
- 60 Ruth Gordon, *Shepstone: The Role of the Family in the History of South Africa, 1810–1900* (Cape Town: A.A. Balkema, 1968), p. 230.
- 61 *ibid.*, pp. 229–30.
- 62 Norman Herd, *The Bent Pine: The Trial of Chief Langalibalele* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1976), p. 129.
- 63 *ibid.*, pp. 130–1.
- 64 Guy, *Theophilus Shepstone and the Forging of Natal*, p. 2.
- 65 *ibid.*
- 66 *ibid.*, p. 407.
- 67 *ibid.*, p. 452.
- 68 Pietermaritzburg Archive Repository, AGO 1/8/20 Ago 11A/1878, Letter from Arentz Tönnesen to the Attorney-General of Natal, 13 July 1877.
- 69 *ibid.*
- 70 *ibid.*
- 71 *Kokstad Advertiser*, 7 November 1882.
- 72 Frances Colenso to Katherine Lyell, 26 February 1866 in Rees, *Colenso Letters from Natal*, p. 103.