Postcolonial Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 107–130, 2009

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Remembering the Khoikhoi victory over Dom Francisco Almeida at the Cape in 1510

DAVID JOHNSON

In a speech delivered to the South African National Assembly to mark the retirement of Nelson Mandela on 26 March 1999, South African President Thabo Mbeki referred to the victory of the Khoikhoi over the Portuguese Viceroy Dom Francisco Almeida and his forces in Table Bay on 1 March 1510:

> We are blessed because you [Mandela] have walked along the road of our heroes and heroines. For centuries our own African sky has been dark with suffering and foreboding. But because we have never surrendered, for centuries the menace in our African sky has been brightened by the light of our stars. In the darkness of our night, the victory of the Khoikhoi in 1510 here in Table Bay, when they defeated and killed the belligerent Portuguese admiral and aristocrat, Dom Francisco de Almeida, the first Portuguese viceroy in India, has lit our skies for ever.[1]

Mbeki's tribute to this Khoikhoi victory is unusual, as Almeida's defeat at the Cape has been remembered only sporadically in the last 500 years. I examine three moments when it was remembered—by Portuguese writers in the sixteenth century, by British writers in the period 1770–1830, and by Southern African writers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Literary treatments of the early Portuguese explorers rounding the Cape have largely ignored Almeida's defeat, and have instead repeated versions of the mythic tale of Adamastor, the exiled Titan confined to Table Mountain in eternal punishment by Zeus for threatening to rape the white nymph Thetis. Having reflected on the histories of the Khoikhoi victory and the literary re-writings of Adamastor's defeat, I return in conclusion to the implications of Mbeki's invocation of the Khoikhoi victory over Almeida in post-apartheid South Africa. Mbeki is hardly the first politician to appropriate histories of resistance for post-independence political ends, but the long and complex reception history of this particular event casts his intervention in the postcolonial present in especially clear relief.

Portuguese accounts of the sixteenth century

There were detailed accounts of Almeida's defeat in the Portuguese history chronicles, with versions by João de Barros (1496–1570),[2] Fernão Lopez de

ISSN 1368-8790 print/ISSN 1466-1888 online/09/010107–24 © 2009 The Institute of Postcolonial Studies
DOI: 10.1080/13688790802657427

Castanheda (1501–1559),[3] Damião de Goís (1501–1573),[4] and Gaspar Correa (d. 1562).[5] They explain that Almeida's fatal journey to the Cape followed the protracted transfer of power in India to his successor Affonso d'Albuquerque, and describe how his three ships set sail from Cochin on 19 November 1509, making good progress until setting ashore for water on the south-western tip of Africa.[6] After successful exchanges with the Khoikhoi, of calico and iron for cattle, a group of about twelve Portuguese accompanied them to their village inland. What then transpired is unclear. According to Barros, a quarrel arose because the 'negroes took [the Portuguese's daggers], and also other things that pleased them'.[7] In condemning the Khoikhoi, however, Barros is in the minority, as the other accounts blame the Portuguese. Castanheda records the Portuguese leaders recognising that 'very likely their own people were at fault',[8] and Correa goes even further, conceding that the Khoikhoi legitimately 'feared we might wish to build a fortress there also and take their watering place, and thus they would lose their cattle'.[9] Describing the conduct of Almeida's sailors, he notes that 'as it is always the character of the Portuguese to endeavour to rob the poor natives of the country of their property, there were some sailors who tried to take a cow without giving what the negroes asked for it'.[10] The Khoikhoi chased the sailors back to their ships, where they at once begged Almeida to exact revenge. Almeida duly conducted a council of war in which (according to de Goís) he acknowledged that 'the fault lay with our people, whose habit it is to be disorderly and ill-conducted in strange countries'.[11] Despite these reservations, a reluctant Almeida and 150 men marched on the village, armed with swords, lances and crossbows. Upon reaching the village, the Portuguese seized a number of children and cattle, when 'the Hottentots, about one hundred and seventy in number, attacked them with stones and assegais of fire hardened wood, against which their weapons proved useless'.[12] The Khoikhoi deployed their cattle as moving shields, hiding behind them, and accurately throwing assegais and stones at the Portuguese. Retreating in disarray to their ships, sixty-five Portuguese were killed, including Almeida and eleven senior officials. Barros stresses the ignominy of their deaths: '[They were] killed by sticks and stones, hurled not by giants or armed men but by bestial negroes, the most brutal of all that coast.'[13]

The story of Almeida's humiliating end in Table Bay interrupted Portugal's sequence of military and naval victories in Africa and Asia, and the uneasy contemplation of its causes by the chroniclers adds weight to Reinhart Koselleck's suggestive hypothesis that, 'if history is made in the short run by the victors, historical gains in knowledge stem in the long run from the vanquished'.[14] Barros applauds Almeida's courage and sense of honour, but argues that his fate was meant as a lesson to future generations: 'God allowed this to happen as an example to the living, that they may learn to be more anxious to gain a good name than to acquire wealth.'[15] Barros's judgement is consistent with his lifelong commitment to serving Portugal's rulers by his writings, which were produced under the relatively generous patronage of Dom Manuel I, who reigned from 1495 to 1521, and Dom João III, who reigned from 1521 to 1557. Educated at the royal court, and then travelling to

Guinea in 1522, Barros settled into secure employment in Lisbon, first as court treasurer from 1525 to 1528, and then for thirty years as factor of the *Casa da India e Mina*. In contrast to Barros, both Correa and de Goís were much more critical. Correa hints that prior wrong-doing by Almeida caused his death: 'The negroes pursued the viceroy. . . . And by the misfortune caused by sin, it happened that a stone struck him on the knee and he fell.'[16] Unlike Barros, Correa worked most of his life in the East, remote from the European centre of power, and failed to win patronage for his writings, which were never published during his own lifetime. In his biography of Correa, Aubrey Bell concludes that, 'those in authority . . . were too busy enriching themselves to pay attention to [Correa's] carping; it was easier to lock up the manuscript, to brush the noisy fly from one's velvet sleeve'.[17] The most explicit condemnation of Almeida is by de Goís:

> [H]ere [the Portuguese] were slain by the hands of unarmed savages with stones and assegais of untempered iron, with so little resolution on their part that it would seem as if God had ordained that they should perish in that place, as a punishment for some cruelties or injustice of which they may have been guilty in their victories which He granted them.[18]

De Goís echoes Correa's criticisms, conceding that the Portuguese had a history of being 'disorderly and ill-conducted in strange countries', and attributing the deaths of Almeida and his men to past cruelties and injustices. Like Correa, de Goís spent formative years outside Portugal, in his case working in Portugal's diplomatic service in Sweden, Poland, Denmark and Holland, where he was influenced by humanist thinkers such as Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536). He returned to Lisbon in 1546 to work as Keeper of the Archives, and had his *Chronicles* published in 1566. He fell foul of the Inquisition in 1571 for alleged heresy, and died two years later in suspicious circumstances while imprisoned at the monastery of Batalha.

The poet Luis Vaz de Camões (1524–1580) read the historical accounts of the death of Almeida by Castanheda, Barros, Correa (in manuscript form) and de Goís,[19] and refers to it at three points in his epic *The Lusiads* (1572). In Canto One, an ominous note is introduced when Camões-the-poet lists all the Portuguese heroes, including 'the fearsome/Almeidas, whom the Tagus still laments'.[20] In Canto Five, the death of Almeida is predicted in more detail by Adamastor in his angry speech to Da Gama:

> 'As for your first viceroy, whose fame
> Fortune will beacon to the heavens,
> Here will be his far-flung tomb
> By God's inscrutable judgement,
> Here he will surrender the opulent
> Trophies wrung from the Turkish fleet,
> And atone for his bloody crimes, the massacre
> Of Kilwa, the levelling of Mombassa'.[21]

The third account of Almeida's death in Canto Ten is the longest, and is recounted by the nymph Tethys to Da Gama. Narrating the deeds of the Portuguese explorers who were to follow Da Gama, Tethys pays tribute to Almeida for his victories in Kilwa, Mombassa and Diu before describing his defeat and death:

> 'The Cape of Storms, which keeps his memory
> Along with his bones, will be unashamed
> In dispatching from the world such a soul
> Not Egypt nor all India could control.
>
> For there, brute savages will achieve
> What eluded more skilled enemies,
> And fire-hardened knobkerries do
> What bows and cannon-balls could not;
> God's judgements are inscrutable;
> Pagans, unable to comprehend,
> Attribute to ill fortune or mischance
> What providence ordains and heaven grants'.[22]

The use of the future prophetic voice and of three different narrators (Camões-the-poet, Adamastor and Tethys) to describe Almeida's death might complicate Camões's version, but the repetition of the idea that his death is beyond human comprehension, by both Adamastor and Tethys, imposes a consistently fatalistic vision. Notwithstanding these three references, the details of Almeida's defeat and more particularly of the character of Portugal's Khoikhoi adversaries remain opaque; as David Quint argues, Camões 'erases the historical natives by turning Adamastor into an image of Portuguese pride and achievement'.[23]

Unlike the disapproving chroniclers, Camões passes no negative judgement on Almeida. Elsewhere in *The Lusiads*, there are passages critical of Portugal's endeavours in Asia—the 'Old Man of the Restelo' berates the eastward bound sailors in Canto Four,[24] and Tethys admonishes Da Gama in Canto Nine to 'Keep Avarice under the strictest curb,/And Ambition too'.[25] Looking at the work as a whole, however, it is clear that these occasional criticisms are quibbles over strategic priorities rather than substantial ideological disagreements. In the closing stanzas, the poet-narrator exhorts Portugal to 'Hold your knights in high esteem/For their bloody and intrepid fervour/Extends not only the Holy Faith,/But the boundaries of your great empire';[26] and Islamic centres of power are identified as appropriate prizes—'destroy by way of Cape Espartel/The ramparts of Morocco or Taroudant'.[27] Politically, Camões therefore appears much closer to Barros than to Correa and de Goís, but the personal and social pressures determining his literary choices should be noted. Born into the untitled nobility (*cavalleiro fidalgo*), Camões embarked on a love affair with Caterine de Ataide in 1544, which (it has been speculated) contributed to his exile two years later. Fighting as a common soldier in Morocco, he lost his left eye in 1547, and returned home with reputation restored. This reprieve was short-lived, however, as his return

to Lisbon ended following a brawl in 1552, which led to a second exile, this time in India. Serving with distinction on a number of maritime military expeditions, Camões's next brush with authority saw him imprisoned in 1561–1562 when Viceroy Francisco Barreto took offence at a satire he had written. After his release from prison, Camões still failed to accumulate wealth, and he left Goa for Lisbon in 1567, spending two years in Mozambique *en route* in desperate poverty. Having spent at least a decade working on *The Lusiads*, Camões finally saw the work published in 1572. Camões's straitened circumstances were noted by his contemporary, the historian Diogo de Couto, who said the poet was so poor that he depended on his friends for food.[28] Without pondering too deeply the 'poetic intention' in *The Lusiads*, such pressures suggest that Camões had strong motives for writing to win patronage. If the chroniclers were obliged to pander to the prejudices of their patrons during the reigns of Manuel I and João III, the nation's greatest poet worked under even greater duress. Camões was faced with the challenge of writing for the young king Dom Sebastião, who ascended the throne at the age of 14 in 1568, and who has been justly described as 'one of the least auspicious audiences imaginable'.[29] Educated in an atmosphere of religious zealotry, Sebastião shunned commerce and humanism in favour of reviving the values of medieval chivalry, and Camões tailored his poem to the young monarch's tastes by casting Da Gama's voyage to India in the idiom of crusading patriotism.

Another key to understanding the range of judgements on Almeida's defeat might be located in the different generic imperatives of the historical chronicle and the epic poem. There was an obligation to glorify the powerful in chronicles and epics, but both genres also allowed some space to criticise. The Renaissance historical chronicle was driven by potentially conflicting aims, namely to record for posterity in annalistic order the deeds of the past, and secondly, to derive from these deeds morally instructive lessons for the present. The moral lessons here were all oriented towards exalting the Portuguese nation. In practice, the narration of facts in annalistic sequence, with little distinction between facts of major and minor importance, had the potential to undermine the ambition to moralise and exalt. The lessons derived by de Goís and Correa clearly did not always show Portugal's explorers like Almeida in an exalted light, and the contemporary reception of their work would appear to confirm the disadvantages of the chronicle as a genre for the vulnerable writer. By contrast, both Barros and Camões viewed the epic as more uncomplicatedly suited to glorifying the powerful. Early in his career, Barros had written the romance *Cronica do Emperador Clarimundo* (1520), which concludes with prophecies of Portuguese glory, but he later questioned the value of romances and lyrics and expressed a preference for the epic:

> Of old, at the tables of lords and princes the notable deeds of great men were sung in verse. . . . If this practice were introduced in Spain and all Europe there would be more profit in such music than in these lovelorn songs and lyrics.[30]

Like Barros, Camões in the early part of his career wrote in a wide variety of poetic and dramatic genres, but ultimately in *The Lusiads* embraced the epic as the genre most likely to win applause. Camões self-consciously followed Virgil's *Aeneid*, but whereas—as Bakhtin explains—the epic characteristically celebrates heroes engaged in feats of arms located 'on an utterly different and inaccessible time-and-value plane',[31] Camões celebrated recent Portuguese explorers and their relatively peaceful voyages of discovery. According to Richard Helgerson, the epic form predisposed Camões to imagine 'a Portugal that prefers *gloria* to *proveito* [and] Camões aims to bring such a nation into existence by showing it an ideal image of its heroic and nonmercantile self'.[32] Camões excelled in satisfying this requirement, as he claims repeatedly that the achievements of the Portuguese voyagers exceed not only those of earlier historical conquerors like Alexander and Trajan, but also those of classical heroes like Aeneas.

A final key to explaining the range of interpretations of Almeida's defeat might be found in the competing ideologies of Portugal's ruling factions. There was a cleavage within Portugal's ruling class between feudal land-owners, who embraced military and chivalric ideals appropriate to the plunder of North Africa's Moorish centres of power, and an emergent merchant class sponsored by the Crown, who were committed to (relatively) peaceful long-distance trade.[33] Recent historians have stressed that the Portuguese language of honour and chivalry concealed a political economy based upon the violent plunder of North and West Africa. Malyn Newitt explains that, 'Portuguese expansion was a direct by-product of Portugal's poverty, not wealth. . . . With the land yielding poor returns, the nobility had always been inclined to seek its fortunes through armed exploits.'[34] These armed exploits involved slavery and kidnapping:

> The voyages of 'discovery' down the coasts of Africa, organised after 1430 by the Infante Dom Henrique and other noblemen, were openly and explicitly a series of raids designed to obtain slaves for sale or important 'Moors' who might be ransomed.[35]

The constant foe for Portugal was Islam, and the function of Portuguese writers was to justify Portugal's military expansion. Robin Blackburn concludes bluntly that, 'in a world menaced by Muslim intrigue [Camões] thought Portugal was justified in resorting to what, in another context, would be simple piracy'.[36] These militaristic values were celebrated in Gil Vicente's *The Exhortation to War* (1514), which has Penthesilea, Queen of the Amazons, address King Manuel, and exhort him to 'Gain the fame of fearsomeness,/Not of riches, for that's dangerous'; and Hannibal likewise declares that, 'No honour can come from gowns,/Nor the richest dresses,/But only from noble deeds'.[37] The same sentiments are expressed in Barros's conviction that it is more important to acquire a good name than wealth, and in Camões's Old Man of the Restelo warning Da Gama that 'You ignore the enemy at the gate/In the search for another so far away'.[38] By contrast, the ideology of peaceful trade was less stridently expressed. Supplemented by an emergent humanist discourse, it can be detected in de Goís's and Correa's

criticisms of the needless aggression of Almeida's sailors at the Cape, and in de Goís's opinion that Almeida and his men had been punished for 'some cruelties or injustice of which they may have been guilty in their victories'. To a substantial extent, however, the military and mercantile factions were compatible, and the occasional criticisms of imperial excesses by the likes of de Goís and Correa reflected little more than the views of a minority of Portuguese intellectuals who had been touched by European humanism. As Neil Larsen and Robert Krueger point out, these Portuguese humanists functioned 'as advisors to the nobiliarchical state until such time as their counsel proved more dangerous than useful to the reactionary interests which had hired them'.[39]

British accounts of 1770–1830

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there were occasional references to Almeida's death in Table Bay, and more generally to the Portuguese failures to establish a settlement at the Cape. For example, Thomas Herbert stopped at the Cape in 1627, and recalled Almeida's fate:

> *Almeyda*, one of the bravest Captains the Portugals ever had ... with eleven experienced Captains and other gallants upon a small affront putting some of the savages to death (who grew desperate in revenge) were unexpectedly set upon by these naked Barbarians, who had the *arma antiqua*, i.e. *manu*, *ungues*, *dentes*, and slain were every man of them.[40]

The Dutch sea captain Abraham Bogaert, who visited the Cape in 1702, praised the Khoikhoi when he referred to Almeida:

> These people [the Khoikhoi] hold freedom very much to heart, and are very jealous of it. They will obey no laws other than those of Nature. ... Also they keep the law of Nations so unimpaired, that they can rival the most civilised peoples of Europe. Furthermore, it has been seen that they are brave in battle as was experienced by Franciscus Almeida.[41]

These references, however, were no more than asides in texts which were principally directed towards asserting English or Dutch ascendancy in the colonial world over the increasingly marginal Portuguese.

In late eighteenth-century Britain, however, there was much more sustained interest in Portugal's 'voyages of discovery', and this was reflected in translations of Portuguese literary works,[42] descriptions of Portuguese history and society,[43] accounts of travels through Portugal,[44] and English literary works located in Portuguese settings.[45] The longest description of Almeida's defeat was provided by William Julius Mickle (1734–1788)[46] in his 158-page history of Portugal which introduced his translation of *The Lusiads* (called *The Lusiad* by Mickle). Mickle considers Almeida's record as a whole, and finds it wanting:

> Almeyda ... sailed for Europe, crowned with military laurels. But though thus plumed in the vulgar eye, his establishments were contrary to the spirit of

> commerce. He fought, indeed conquered; but he left more enemies of the Portuguese in the East than he found there.[47]

And in assessing Almeida's defeat in a footnote, he blames the Portuguese rather than the Khoikhoi for the fatal conflict:

> On his return to Portugal [Almeida] put into the bay of Saldanna, near the Cape of Good Hope, to take in water and provisions. The rudeness of one of his servants produced a quarrel with the Caffres, or Hottentots. His attendants, much against his will, forced him to march against the blacks. 'Ah, whither (he exclaimed) will you carry the infirm man of sixty years'. After plundering a miserable village, on the return to their ships they were attacked by a superior number of Caffres, who fought with such fury in rescue of their children, whom the Portuguese had seized, that the viceroy and fifty of his attendants were slain.[48]

Mickle's description of Almeida's death matches those of the Portuguese chroniclers, but he is more censorious of Almeida. Whereas Barros, for example, praises Almeida's martial spirit and describes him as 'a magnificent captain',[49] Mickle dismisses him as a violent glory-hunter. His hostility towards Almeida in no way derives from any sympathy for the Khoikhoi; indeed, he mocks the Khoikhoi and their supporters such as Rousseau—'the reveries, the fairy dreams of Rousseau, may figure the paradisiacal life of a Hottentot, but it is only in such dreams that the superior happiness of the barbarian exists'.[50] Mickle's criticisms of Almeida derive from his conviction that Almeida betrayed the god of profit, and he dedicated himself to the ideological re-definition of *The Lusiads* from epic of honour and conquest to 'the Epic Poem of Commerce'.[51] This project is even clearer in his later poem *Almada Hill* (1781), where he again praises Portugal as Europe's pioneering commercial nation.[52]

Mickle's emphasis on 'commerce' above 'honour' went beyond generalities, as he zealously promoted British chartered companies. In a pamphlet attacking Adam Smith, he stressed the unremitting hostility of the Indians and the Moors towards the European powers in Asia, and derided Smith's optimism regarding Britain's capacity to prevail by peaceful free trade: 'forts and warlike fleets have ever been, and still are, necessary to the very existence of the naval commerce of Europe with India'.[53] Notwithstanding their many mistakes, the Portuguese had at least been right in conducting their trade in the East by means of 'a *regal monopoly*, under the severest restrictions';[54] such regulation of trade along mercantilist principles and supported by military domination set a template which was followed so successfully by the English East India Company.

Although no other British writers of this period discussed Almeida in the same detail as Mickle, there were further sympathetic descriptions of Portugal's imperial past, notably in *An Historical Disquisition concerning the Knowledge which the Ancients had of India* (1791) by William Robertson (1721–1793).[55] Robertson praises the pioneering Portuguese voyagers even more lavishly than Mickle: their spirit of enterprise, 'encouraged by success, became more adventurous, despised dangers which formerly appalled it,

and surmounted difficulties which once it deemed insuperable'.[56] He describes Da Gama in particularly glowing terms as 'an officer of rank, whose abilities and courage fitted him to conduct the most difficult and arduous enterprises'.[57] Robertson proceeds to locate the different races inhabiting Portugal's imperial world at different stages of development. Africans in the west and south of the continent are located at the earliest stages, described variously as 'the rude inhabitants of the western shore of [Africa]' and 'slender [in] the progress which they have made in the arts of life'.[58] Africans further north up the east coast, however, are more developed—the people of Melinda are 'so advanced in civilization, and acquainted with the various arts of life, that they carried on an active commerce, not only with the nations on their own coast, but with remote countries of Asia'.[59] Although he shares Mickle's Eurocentric assumptions, Robertson therefore represents a liberal variant of Scottish Enlightenment thought, which expresses his conviction that societies in Africa and India can 'progress' to 'the more advanced' stages of commercial civilisation. What Robertson's universalising colonial discourse denies, however, is any room for difference, as Richard Waswo succinctly sums up: '["the primitive"] must develop (fast) or perish; coexistence is precluded'.[60]

Whereas Mickle provided a conservative-mercantilist, Anglocentric version of Portugal's history, and Robertson a liberal-imperial, Scottish Enlightenment version, Robert Southey (1774–1883) in his writings on Portugal set out a third variant. Southey spent two periods in Portugal, in 1795–1796 and in 1800–1801.[61] The first visit was an unhappy one, with Southey's youthful radicalism severely challenged by the poverty and corruption of Portugal. He wrote of the Portuguese that, 'the higher classes are despicable, and the whole body of people depraved beyond all my ideas of licentiousness'.[62] Southey's writings on Portugal have been interpreted as establishing a binary between rationalist Protestant Britain and superstitious Catholic Portugal, a binary that he applied subsequently to other nations and races confronting Britain's imperial expansion: 'Portugal confirmed Southey in a belief in Englishmen's superiority to the Irish as well as to "Negroes", Indians, Tibetans and the Portuguese themselves.'[63] His disdain extended to Portuguese heroes of the past, including Da Gama, whom he describes as follows:

> Stupid he must have been to mistake a Hindu temple for a Christian church and say his prayers to figures with more arms than Briareus. . . . [F]or deliberate cruelty I think him more atrocious than Pizarro. The Portuguese had a physical-European superiority to the people of the East, and plied their guns better, in everything else they were lamentably behind hand.[64]

Southey's opinions moderated in the course of his second visit, as he established himself (in his view) as the leading British authority on Portuguese history and literature, to the extent that he undertook to write the definitive history of Portugal.[65] Southey elaborated the inadequacies of the Portuguese-as-colonisers (and also of the Spanish and Dutch) in his lengthy reviews of the Cape travel writings of John Barrow and Robert

Percival. Southey compares the claims of Britain's European competitors, noting that:

> Spain and Portugal have acted cruelly in their colonies heretofore, and all the instances of fervent and disinterested faith, of individual virtue, and of national heroism wherewith their annals abound, have not been sufficient to counteract the painful and indignant feelings which the history of their tyranny excited against them.[66]

He continues that the Portuguese and Spanish have been superseded by the Cape Dutch as the most shameful perpetrators of cruelty against colonised subjects: 'Of all degenerated Dutchmen the African boor is the most thoroughly detestable: the breed, indeed, is the most abominable that can be conceived.'[67] Southey declared his sympathy for the indigenes of the Cape, endorsing Barrow's view of the 'Hottentots'—'a more gentle or docile race ... does not exist, nor any class of men, savage or civilized, in whom the moral sense seems to be less degraded'.[68] Summarising one of Barrow's accounts of a fatal encounter between Dutch villainy and 'Hottentot' honour, Southey describes the 'Hottentots' as 'insurgents', and explains that 'when that name is applied to men struggling against oppression, be it in Switzerland, or St. Domingo, or Caffraria, it is a most honourable appellation', and then concludes his summary of the encounter by noting, '[h]ad this fact occurred in Grecian history, how often would it have been quoted for admiration'.[69] Southey sets out his ultimate ideal for the disparate groups at the Cape. The Dutch should first be subdued by violence; the 'Kaffers' and the 'Hottentots' would then feel secure and eager to trade, and their new-found security would encourage new settlements based upon peaceful exchange:

> At these meeting-places villages would immediately grow, and towns at no distant period; and here schools should be established. In a few generations English might be made the language of the settlement, and the African boor might be reduced to the shape of man, and exalted to the character of a civilized being and a Christian.[70]

Although Southey engages with the specificities of the indigenes and settlers of the Cape to a greater degree than Mickle and Robertson, for all his promises of civilising the 'African boor' and bringing honest trade to the 'Hottentots' and 'Kaffers', his bucolic communities in the wilds of the Cape Colony remain a resolutely British projection, constituted for securing British trading profits and backed by British military violence.[71]

In much the same way that the sixteenth-century Portuguese chronicles of Almeida's death and Portugal's 'age of discovery' were adapted by Mickle, Robertson and Southey to suit Britain's imperial project, Camões's epic poem was re-worked to serve the same ends. Mickle's translation of *The Lusiads* followed the approach set out by William Tytler, who argued that in the act of translation 'the subtle spirit of poesy evaporates' unless the translator infuses the work with 'a new, or an original spirit'.[72] Confidently inhabiting the role of 'an original spirit' in translating *The Lusiads*, Mickle inserted 300 extra

lines. In addition to elevating the benefits of trade above the glories of conquest wherever possible, Mickle also followed the example of Alexander Pope's translations of Homer in muting the violence of the original, 'harmonising a stormy and often savage text with gentler, enlightened tastes'.[73] His translation of Almeida's death as described by Adamastor is typical, as Almeida is cast as the passive victim of Africa:

> 'With trophies plumed behold an Hero come,
> Ye dreary wilds, prepare his yawning tomb.
> Though smiling fortune blest his youthful morn,
> Though glory's rays his laurel'd bows adorn,
> Full oft though he beheld with sparkling eye
> The Turkish moons in wild confusion fly,
> While he, proud victor, thunder'd in the rear,
> All, all his mighty fame shall vanish here.
> Quiloa's sons, and thine Mombaze, shall see
> Their conqueror bend his laurel'd head to me;
> While proudly mingling with the tempest's sound,
> Their shouts of joy from every cliff rebound'.[74]

Rose Macaulay contrasts Mickle's translation unfavourably with Sir Richard Fanshawe's—'[c]ertainly, Mickle reads more smoothly; bland and moralizing eighteenth-century pompousness has taken the place of naïf, colloquial seventeenth-century charm'.[75] Macaulay's dismissal of Mickle's language can be supplemented by Lynn Festa's more historicised explanation for the decline of the epic and its gradual replacement by the sentimental novel in the late eighteenth century. Festa argues:

> The transition from an aristocratic model of conquest to one grounded in commerce meant that the epic was of diminished service to eighteenth-century discussions of colonialism. . . . As the terms used to justify empire shifted from the acquisition of specie to commerce, from evangelization to enlightenment, from notions of barbaric others to a shared and potentially civilized humanity, sentimentality comes to the fore.[76]

Festa's snapshot here of Britain's imperial history in the years 1770–1830 understates the extent to which violent military plunder continued to alternate with commercial forms of colonial engagement into the nineteenth century,[77] but her generalisation about the generic shift away from the epic does explain the awkwardness of Mickle's translation of *The Lusiads*. In Festa's terms, 'an epic of commerce' is an oxymoron; Mickle would have been more in tune with the *zeitgeist* had he written a sentimental novel encouraging trade.

Like Mickle, Southey grappled at length both with Camões specifically, and with trying to renew the epic as a genre more generally. Unlike Mickle, Southey refused to venerate Camões as a great poet:

> [Mickle] raises [Camões] to a profound equality with Homer, and Virgil, and Milton; but Camoens must not be lifted up so high, neither must Homer, and

> Virgil, and Milton, be degraded into such company: though Camoens may, perhaps, come the next to Tasso.[78]

He singles out the Adamastor episode for particular ridicule: 'when Gama interrupts [Adamastor], demanding who he is, a tale follows which would only be tolerable in a school-boy's imitation of Ovid'.[79] Southey never tried to translate *The Lusiads* himself, but believed that the translations of Camões's poetry by Mickle, Strangford and Adamson substantially improved Camões's original:

> [Camões's] poetical character can neither be estimated by [Strangford's] volume, nor by [Mickle's] English *Lusiad*: the merits of the one must be assigned to Mickle, and the other to Lord Strangford .... Being acquainted with the Portugueze poet, we were well pleased to discover originals where we only expected translations.[80]

Southey's irritation with *The Lusiads* is in part based upon his impatience with its epic elements, as when he notes Camões's addition of Venus and Bacchus to Da Gama's history, and asks in exasperation: 'What can be more puerile?'[81] Against these epic intrusions, Southey defends the primacy of history, arguing that

> there is no incident in modern history more impressive than the voyage of Vasco da Gama; but to feel and comprehend it, it must be read with all its details in Castanheda or Barros, where it comes to us with the deep and abiding interest of truth. The slightest admixture of fiction debases it like an alloy.[82]

Southey's metaphor here echoes that of William Jones, who had argued that, '[t]he poetical fables of the old Persians ... ought not to be mixed, like glittering drops, with the pure ore of true History'.[83] In other words, whatever the value of combining fragments of history and fiction in the writing of epics, the unalloyed ore of 'true History' must be uncontaminated by any admixture of fiction.

Southey's disparaging of the epic qualities of *The Lusiads* was not an isolated attack, as he also criticised exemplary heroic epics like Virgil's *Aeneid*, and praised as alternative models Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and the romance epics of Ariosto, Tasso and Spenser.[84] However, Southey's antipathy towards Camões and the epic genre was complicated by the constant shifting and blurring of the demarcation between history and epic in his own output, as he produced both major epic works like *Thalaba the Destroyer* (1801), *Madoc* (1805) and *The Curse of Kehama* (1810), and lengthy works of history like his three-volume *History of Brazil* (1810–1819). But it should be noted that Southey's confidence in his ability to sift history from fiction in his own epic poems was not shared by all his readers. Thomas Love Peacock, for example, argues that:

> Mr. Southey wades through ponderous volumes of travels and old chronicles, from which he carefully selects all that is false, useless, and absurd as being essentially poetical; and when he has a commonplace book full of monstrosities, he strings them into an epic.[85]

Byron's contempt for Southey's epics went even further. In *Don Juan* (1819–1824) he mocks his 'epic brethren gone before [because] they so embellish, that 'tis quite a bore'; but unlike Southey, Byron treats the competing truth claims of history with equal irreverence, as he appeals ironically in the next stanza 'to history, tradition, and to facts'[86] to confirm the transparently fictional tale of Juan's elopement with the Devil.

For all their differences, Southey and Byron attest to the difficulties of negotiating the inherited laws of genre theory in the early nineteenth century. Jacques Derrida has observed how the history of genre theory 'is strewn with these fascinating outlines that inform and deform reality, a reality often heterogeneous to the literary field';[87] and the contortions of the epic genre in the period 1770–1830 exemplify how 'reality' pressurised the received genre theory, precipitating the emergence of new genres and new theories of genre. Byron's sense of the mortality of the epic as a genre was indeed prescient—according to Hayden White, after the Enlightenment, 'the Epic form, it was generally agreed, was not suited to the representation of historical events',[88] and most of the subsequent Southern African reiterations of Almeida's death and Portugal's 'voyages of discovery' turned to the genres of the novel, the lyric poem, and the satire.

Southern African accounts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

There were a couple of brief descriptions of Almeida's death in nineteenth-century writings at the Cape. In an unpublished history of the Cape written in 1806–1807, Samuel Eusebius Hudson provided the following inaccurate summary:

> [Dom Manuel I] determined to plant a Colony at the Cape of Good Hope. The Portuguese, naturally pusillanimous, had conceived that the natives of this new found land were Cannibals, resisted for some time the order of their sovereign. ... However, a more formidable body of adventurers under the Command of Francis d'Almeijda, who was at that time Viceroy of Brazil, effected three landings under some difficulties from the natives who took every opportunity to annoy them with their spears and Missile weapons. After some skirmishing they were shameful defeated, their Viceroy and fifty of his Men killed in the engagement.[89]

A shorter but much more widely read description was provided in John Philip's *Researches in South Africa* (1828). Philip uses the Khoikhoi confrontation with Almeida to establish the defining opposition in his work between virtuous indigenes and rapacious colonisers:

> When the Portuguese first visited the Cape of Good Hope, they found the inhabitants rich in cattle, living in a happy and comfortable manner, and possessed of sufficient spirit to repel aggression and to resent unjust treatment.... It was said, that they were remarkable for the excellence of their morals, that they kept the law of nations better than the most civilized peoples, and that they were valiant in arms. Of this latter quality, they gave a memorable proof in the year 1510, when Francisco Almeida, the first viceroy of the

> Portuguese India, was defeated and killed in an obstinate engagement with the Hottentots, near the Salt River, in the neighbourhood of where Cape Town now stands.[90]

Aside from these two references, there are no signs of interest on the part of white settler writers in the Khoikhoi victory over Almeida. There are, however, any number of re-workings of the Adamastor myth, with poems by John Wheatley (1830) and D F C Moodie (1887) explicitly invoking Da Gama and Adamastor,[91] and an 1859 magazine essay in praise of Camões's mythic creation.[92] In the years preceding the Union of South Africa in 1910, the historian George McCall Theal wrote a short summary of Almeida's death, presenting it as the result of a misunderstanding—'unfortunately a quarrel arose between the two parties, and two of the white men were severely beaten'.[93] His view on the fate of the Portuguese-as-colonisers was elaborated in more detail in his ten-volume *Records of South-Eastern Africa* (1898–1904), where he attributes their decline to miscegenation with African slaves in the fifteenth century:

> The slaves, on embracing Christianity, had various privileges conferred upon them, and their blood became mixed with that of the least energetic of the peasantry, until a new and degenerate stock, frivolous, inconstant, incapable of improvement, was formed. In the northern provinces . . . a pure European race remained, fit not only to conquer, but to hold dominion in distant lands, though too small in proportion to the entire population of the country to control its destinies.[94]

According to Theal, the consequences of such racial mixing were devastating for the Portuguese: 'long before the end of the sixteenth century they had ceased to be participants in the great progressive movement of the Caucasian race'.[95] Their replacement in India by first the Dutch and ultimately the British was therefore inevitable. This historian's view of the Portuguese was repeated in other genres, notably in novels such as John Buchan's *Prester John* (1910). Buchan's representation of Africans in the novel has rightly been criticised, but it is arguable that the hero Richard Hannay's Portuguese adversary Henriques is an even more negative stereotype. Hannay describes Henriques on their first encounter as 'the most atrocious villain I have ever clapped eyes on . . . whose skin spoke of the tar-brush',[96] and later contrasts him unfavourably with the African Adamastor/Prester John figure Laputa:

> I was consumed with a passion of fury against that murdering yellow devil. With Laputa I was not angry; he was an open enemy, playing a fair game. But my fingers itched to get at the Portugoose—that double-dyed traitor to his race.[97]

A part of the explanation for the intensification of this racialised discourse in British writings on the Portuguese lies in the escalating tensions between Britain and Portugal over the land between Mozambique and Angola.[98]

Camões experienced a rather different fate from the Portuguese nation in South African writing, with the most extended endorsement provided in two 1909 articles by literature professor John Purves. Purves argues that

The Lusiads is a 'demonstration of the life of a nation';[99] Camões is to Portugal what Shakespeare is to England and what Dante is to Italy, and '[i]t is the alliance of these two elements—national spirit and feeling for the past—which gives equilibrium to the genius of Camoens, making him superior to the best exclusive spirits of the Renaissance'.[100] Purves is concerned to rescue Camões from Mickle's identification of *The Lusiads* with commerce; for him, the true heart of Camões's epic lies in its celebration of nationalism. Purves argues that, 'the inspiration of Camoens was a deliberate reaction against the depressing influence of "mercantilism" .... He saw nationalism being strangled by self-interest ... and he wished to recall his countrymen to the earlier and more heroic example of the fifteenth century.'[101] Purves concludes his argument by claiming *The Lusiads* for the about-to-be-constituted Union of South Africa: '*The Lusiads* is then ... not only the first but also the greatest of South African poems. It is our portion of the Renaissance.'[102]

Purves's sense of a firm bond between Portugal and South Africa was endorsed in Lucio Lupi's report on Portuguese President Craveiro Lopes's 1956 tour of African colonies. According to Lupi, critics of Portuguese colonialism foolishly 'persist in following the teachings of the "Old Man of Restelo". They are the unfortunate people, the ever-indignant ones, still-born creatures who continue to wander among the living like ghosts—souls in pain who hate the past and fear the future.'[103] Lopes's tour of Africa culminated in Pretoria, where the South African Governor-General Ernest George Jansen endorsed Lupi's arguments:

> Must the European powers in Africa relinquish a civilizing mission which is creating roads, railways, new sources of power, industries, schools, hospitals and homes for the people of this Continent? ... You, Sir, [Lopes] in your determination to maintain and develop your ancient Empire, and we in our equal determination to build a lasting civilization in our part of Africa, can give only one answer. It was indeed a happy accident of history that made us neighbours in Southern Africa. I believe that together, in the fullness of time, we shall enjoy the vindication of history.[104]

Such sentiments were not restricted to apartheid ministers; other South African writers of the period were similarly well disposed to Portugal's heroes. Both Sidney R Welch's history *South Africa under King Manuel, 1495–1521* (1946) and the poems of Roy Campbell represent the Portuguese in a positive light. Welch recounts Almeida's death in detail, and provides a sympathetic interpretation of Portuguese conduct, explaining that the conflict 'arose out of the guileless friendliness of the Portuguese sailors'.[105] Welch's account is even more generous to them than Barros had been in the sixteenth century, and although he does not register the possibility of a competing Khoikhoi version of the battle, he is sensitive to triumphalist British historiography. In a footnote, he approves of the fact that 'Portuguese historians applied the same moral law to allies and enemies [whereas British history] has one law for the "fierce avarice" of Portuguese and Spaniards, but another law for similar deeds of the Anglo-Saxons'.[106] Like Welch, Campbell displayed a keen sympathy for the Portuguese in general, and for Camões in particular. In the

poems 'Rounding the Cape' and 'Tristan da Cunha' in the collection *Adamastor* (1930), Campbell expressed his great pleasure in *The Lusiads* and especially the figure of Adamastor, and in the poem 'Luis de Camões', in *Talking Bronco* (1946), he claims to share with Camões the Romantic formula of transmuting isolation and suffering into poetry: 'I find a comrade where I sought a master/. . . /[He] Wrestled his hardships into forms of beauty,/And taught his gorgon destinies to sing'.[107]

In the final years of apartheid, South Africa's historical connections with Portugal were again the focus of attention, most elaborately in the 1988 Dias Festival,[108] but also in several Southern African publications: Ungulani Ba Ka Khosa's novel *Ualalapi* (1987), Malvern Van Wyk Smith's anthology *Shades of Adamastor* (1988), André Brink's novel *The First Life of Adamastor* (1993), Anthony Fleischer's novel set in Mozambique, *Children of Adamastor* (1994), and poems by James Greene (1987) and Kelwyn Sole (1992 and 2006). There was also a major artwork entitled *T'kama-Adamastor* by Cyril Coetzee, which was commissioned for the Cullen Library at the University of the Witwatersrand and accompanied by a collection of essays in 2000.[109] Van Wyk Smith's anthology has the Adamastor myth as its organising principle, and makes no reference at all to Almeida's defeat. The introduction outlines early modern European images of Africa; there is an unreliable summary of *The Lusiads* (with Thetis of Canto Five conflated with Tethys of Canto Ten); and the anthology includes Guy Butler's translation of Canto Five of *The Lusiads* (the Adamastor section) as well as a number of South African poetic re-workings of the Adamastor theme. In many of the poems, the connection with Adamastor is extremely tenuous, and in the final section, which includes poems by black South African poets, it is all but impossible to discern even the faintest shade of Adamastor. Van Wyk Smith concedes as much—'throughout Africa black poets seem to have paid little attention to the exploits of the Portuguese, but where they have the fall-out has been sulphurous'[110]—so that the anthology ultimately stands as testimony to the decline of a resilient but solipsistic settler myth. A similar trajectory is to be found in André Brink's relationship with Adamastor. Like Van Wyk Smith, Brink neglects Almeida's defeat in favour of a protracted engagement with Adamastor, a choice consistent with Brink's theoretical elevation of Literature above History.[111] Brink identifies Adamastor as the key European image to be re-defined in contemporary South Africa:

> In the case of Adamastor, Camões set the example by offering a mythopoetic response to an historical challenge . . . . The time is now ripe to look again at that watershed event in our history . . . and to reimagine that event from inside our African experience. Redefining that moment, redefining and reacknowledging Adamastor, is part of the demand that we redefine ourselves.[112]

As a contribution to redefining South African identity in the 1990s, Brink produced *The First Life of Adamastor*, which was 'intended originally as only the first part of a novel which would trace, through thirteen avatars, the continuing hold of Adamastor on the southernmost tip of Africa'.[113] Attempting to re-tell from an African point of view the first encounters

between the indigenes of the Cape and European explorers, Brink adopts as narrator an Adamastor figure called T'kama. Like Brink's novels with contemporary settings, *The Rights of Desire* (2000) and *Before I Forget* (2004), the plot in *The First Life of Adamastor* is as much concerned with sex between an older man and a younger woman as it is with interrogating Eurocentric history. T'kama worries about his ability to have sex with the white woman castaway character, asking 'But how to cleave her cleft with that enormous tree of mine?'[114] Brink has written seven novels since *The First Life of Adamastor*, many of them engaged with South Africa's past, but the stories of the subsequent twelve avatars of Adamastor remain uncompleted. Like Van Wyk Smith, Brink has struggled to find a continuing relevance for Adamastor as white settler authority has declined in the post-apartheid political dispensation.

It is arguable that although Camões remains (like Shakespeare) an entrenched institution, satire and pastiche have been the literary genres employed most frequently in Southern African re-workings of the Adamastor story, lending weight to Fredric Jameson's argument that 'the older generic categories do not, for all that, die out, but persist in the half-life of the subliterary genres of mass culture'.[115] Douglas Livingstone's 1964 radio play 'The Sea My Winding Sheet' includes 'a debased twentieth-century Adamastor',[116] and James Greene's 1987 poem 'Camões's Birthday' declares: 'These elderly or middle-aged [Portuguese] children/Display their wounds like medals/and in their Camões, imperialism's flunkey, recognise themselves'.[117] A different angle is provided in Khosa's novel *Ualalapi*, which implicitly rejects Adamastor as any kind of model for African anti-colonial resistance, and instead uses the Adamastor myth obliquely in order to reflect critically upon the nineteenth-century Mozambican nationalist icon Ngungunhane.[118] In his short poem 'A White South African Poet Rounds the Cape', Kelwyn Sole satirises the portentousness of Campbell's original poem: 'On this page/between two tinctured, smoking seas/at last/I grant myself/a glimpse of what I long to be/the mythopoeic—/and inspired/ begin to adamastor/bate'.[119] Fourteen years later, Sole assumes the voice of a demoralised game reserve guide in 'The Dream of the Big Five', and explains, 'so when Adamastor Tours expanded and offered me a bit more pay to guide people around the Kruger I thought it might make sense'.[120] Sole's sense of Adamastor's decline from Myth of Africa to marketing brand is confirmed by O J O Ferreira, who points out that the *Adamastor Trading Company* sells plants in the Cape Town Company Gardens, and that *Adamastor Atelier* in Northcliff, Johannesburg makes television commercials.[121]

The decline of the Adamastor myth coincided with Mbeki's reference to Almeida's defeat. By recounting the history of the Khoikhoi victory over Almeida rather than the literary tale of the encounter between Adamastor and Da Gama, Mbeki replaces a white settler myth of the first colonial encounter in Southern Africa with the indigenous history of the first moment of black anti-colonial struggle. Mbeki's reference to the Khoikhoi victory is not an incidental remark; it is a significant element in a much broader

political narrative which underwrites his ideological project of the African Renaissance.[122] Officially launched in August 1998 at a made-for-television banquet,[123] Mbeki's African Renaissance strives to reverse the destruction wrought by colonialism and apartheid by recovering and re-valuing Africa's cultural riches and histories of resistance.[124] Mbeki explains that 'an essential and necessary element of the African renaissance is that we must all take it as our task to encourage her ... to rebel, to assert the principality of her humanity—the fact that she, in the first instance, is not a beast of burden, but a human and African being'.[125] The Khoikhoi of 1510 exemplify this impulse to rebel, and Mbeki goes on to invoke many other African (and not exclusively South African) anti-colonial struggles. For example, he recalls that 'African armies at Omdurman in the Sudan and Isandhlwana in South Africa out-generalled, out-soldiered and defeated the powerful and arrogant British Empire in the '70s of the last century'.[126] Mbeki's revision of colonial history is interspersed with approving quotations from the works of anti-colonial intellectuals, notably Frantz Fanon, Kwame Nkrumah, Amilcar Cabral, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, Marcus Garvey, Walter Rodney, W E B du Bois and Malcolm X. For Mbeki, the key message is to connect historic feats of resistance and contemporary political challenges, including the challenge of reconstituting post-independence African identity. Opening the African National Congress (ANC) archive at the University of Fort Hare, for example, he declares that the archive speaks in 'the language of the reinforcement of the pride and identity of the formerly oppressed and despised, because in it will be found much which says that, after all, indeed, we were never conquered'.[127]

The appeal of Mbeki's African Renaissance cannot be over-estimated, but certain cautions are necessary. For one, Mbeki's teleology of rebellion and struggle might run from the Khoikhoi of 1510 to Mandela in the late twentieth century, but it unsurprisingly foregrounds the ANC at the expense of the many other anti-colonial and anti-apartheid movements. Expressions of commitment to Pan-African ideals and of solidarity with anti-colonial struggles around the globe co-exist in his speeches with a monolithic, ANC-dominated version of South African struggle history.[128] Secondly, Mbeki's project of cultural and historical rejuvenation has been accompanied by neo-liberal economic policies—free markets, privatisation, deregulation of exchange controls, and cuts in public expenditure. Consequently, some of the most zealous supporters of Mbeki's African Renaissance have been South Africa's moneyed elites of all races, who have interpreted his words as a clear endorsement of their profiteering in sub-Saharan Africa, so that between 1998 and 2000 South Africa's trade with the rest of the continent increased by 36 per cent, earning an estimated cumulative surplus of R60 billion (£4 billion).[129] For the poor of Southern Africa, however, the African Renaissance has had less appeal, for as Njabulo Ndebele points out, 'the call for black roots has less effect than the provision of water and sanitation, electricity, telephones, houses, clinics, transport, schools, and jobs'.[130] In other words, remembering distant victories over European invaders offers

limited consolation to those living in poverty and confronting a state with limited and maladministered public welfare provision.

Conclusion

In the last five centuries, the lessons drawn from the Khoikhoi victory over Almeida in 1510 have mutated remarkably: that the Portuguese failure to value honour above money caused their deaths at the hands of 'bestial negroes' (Barros, Camões); that the Portuguese pursuit of military glory rather than commercial profit resulted in them being killed by 'barbarians' (Mickle); that the Khoikhoi were noble 'insurgents' justified in resisting Portuguese tyranny, but ultimately best served by accepting benevolent British rule (Southey, Philip); that the 'guileless friendliness' of the Portuguese enabled uncivilised indigenes to murder them (Welch); and that the heroic Khoikhoi overcame great odds to defeat 'belligerent' Portuguese aggressors (Mbeki). And at least as significantly, that for two centuries the key lessons of the colonial encounter were learnt not from the history of the Khoikhoi victory, but from the European myth of Adamastor's defeat (Wheatley, Campbell, Brink). Rather than add to this long list of lessons, I would suggest finally that the most urgent task now is to understand how Mbeki's post-apartheid appropriation of this polysemic event functions ideologically to obscure the dissonance between the inclusive ideals of his African Renaissance and the structural exclusions generated by South Africa's economy and the ANC's commitment to neo-liberalism.

Acknowledgements

My thanks are due to the AHRC project 'The Indian Ocean: Narratives in Literature and Law', which funded research trips to Cape Town and Lisbon. I am grateful too to Richard Brown, Anita Pacheco and Kelwyn Sole for reading and commenting on earlier versions of this article.

Notes

[1] Thabo Mbeki, 'A Farewell to Madiba! Statement of the President of the African National Congress', Cape Town, 26 March 1999, www.info.gov.za/speeches/1999/990326530p1001.htm

[2] João de Barros, *Da Asia: Of the deeds which the Portuguese performed in the conquest and exploration of the lands and seas of the East* [1553], in *Records of South-Eastern Africa: Vol 6*, G M Theal (ed and trans), Cape Town: Struik, 1964 [1900], pp 298–306. For Barros's biography, see C R Boxer, *João de Barros. Portuguese Humanist and Historian of Asia*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing House, 1981.

[3] Fernão Lopes de Castanheda, *History of the Discovery and Conquest of India by the Portuguese* [1551], in *Records of South-Eastern Africa: Vol 5*, G M Theal (ed and trans), Cape Town: Struik, 1964 [1901], pp 466–469. For Castanheda's biography, see Ana Paula M Avelar, *Fernão Lopes de Castanheda: Historiador dos Portugueses na Índia ou Cronista do Governo de Nuno da Cunha?* Lisbon: Edições Cosmos, 1997.

[4] Damião de Goís, *Chronicle of the Most Fortunate King Dom Emanuel of Glorious Memory* [1566], in *Records of South-Eastern Africa: Vol 3*, G M Theal (ed and trans), Cape Town: Struik, 1964 [1899], pp 134–140. For de Goís's biography, see Elizabeth F Hirsch, *Damião de Gois. The Life and Thought of*

a Portuguese Humanist, 1502–1574, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967; and Marcel Bataillon, *Damião de Goís: humaniste europeén*, Paris: Jean Touzot, 1982.

[5] Gaspar Correa, *Legends of India* [1858], in *Records of South-Eastern Africa: Vol 2*, G M Theal (ed and trans), Cape Town: Struik, 1964 [1898], pp 45–47. For Correa's biography, see Aubrey Bell, *Gaspar Correa*, London: Oxford University Press, 1924; Gaspar Correa, *The Three Voyages of Vasco da Gama and his Viceroyalty*, H E J Stanley (trans and intro), London: Hakluyt Society, 1869; and Murray Kriegel and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, 'The Unity of Opposites: Abraham Zacut, Vasco da Gama and the Chronicler Gaspar Correa', in A Disney and E Booth (eds), *Vasco da Gama and the Linking of Europe and Asia (Vasco da Gama Quincentenary Conference)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp 48–71.

[6] Castanheda identifies their landing place as Table Bay; Barros as Saldanha Bay. Karel Schoeman explains the apparent confusion—the watering place in Table Bay for much of the sixteenth century was known as Aguada de Saldanha (at the intersection of the present-day Adderley and Strand Streets in central Cape Town). See Karel Schoeman, *Armosyn van die Kaap: Voorspel tot Vestiging, 1415–1651*, Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1999, p 15.

[7] Barros, *Da Asia*, p 298.

[8] Castanheda, *History*, p 468.

[9] Correa, *Legends*, p 46.

[10] Correa, *Legends*, p 46.

[11] De Goís, *Chronicle*, p 136.

[12] Castanheda, *History*, p 468. Note that 'Hottentot' was the pejorative European term used to describe the Khoikhoi.

[13] Barros, *Da Asia*, p 302.

[14] Reinhart Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History. Timing History, Spacing Concepts*, T S Presner (trans), Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002, p 76.

[15] Barros, *Da Asia*, p 306.

[16] Correa, *Legends*, pp 46–47.

[17] Bell, *Gaspar Correa*, pp 62–63.

[18] De Goís, *Chronicle*, p 139.

[19] For discussion of Camões's sources, see Rebecca Catz, 'Consequences and Repercussions of the Portuguese Expansion on Literature', in G D Winius (ed), *Portugal, The Pathfinder. Journeys from the Medieval toward the Modern World 1300–ca. 1600*, Madison, WI: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1995, pp 329–340.

[20] Luis Vaz de Camões, *The Lusiads*, L White (trans), Oxford: Oxford University Press, p 5. Of the many available translations of *The Lusiads*, I have used White's for its determination to 'err on the side of plainness' (p xxii).

[21] Camões, *The Lusiads*, p 107.

[22] Camões, *The Lusiads*, p 204.

[23] David Quint, 'Voices of Resistance: The Epic Curse and Camões's Adamastor', *Representations* 27, 1989, pp 118–141, p 134.

[24] For a survey of how the Old Man's speech has been interpreted over the centuries, see Gerald M Moser, 'What Did the Old Man of the Restelo Mean?' *Luso-Brazilian Review* 17, 1980, pp 139–151.

[25] Camões, *The Lusiads*, p 195.

[26] Camões, *The Lusiads*, p 227.

[27] Camões, *The Lusiads*, p 228.

[28] For this episode, see Aubrey Bell, *Luis de Camões*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923, pp 132–137; and more generally on Camões, Henry H Hart, *Luis de Camoens and the Epic of the 'Lusiads'*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962. For a good sample of more recent scholarship, see the Special Issue on Camões of *Portuguese Literary and Cultual Studies* 9, 2002.

[29] John de Oliveira e Silva, 'Moving the Monarch: The Rhetoric of Persuasion in Camões's *Lusíadas'*, *Renaissance Quarterly* 53(3), 2000, pp 735–768, p 739.

[30] Quoted in Fidelino Figueiredo, 'Camões as an Epic Poet', *Romantic Review* 17, 1926, pp 217–229, p 218.

[31] M M Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, C Emerson and M Holquist (trans), Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981, p 14.

[32] Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood. The Elizabethan Writing of England*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992, p 158.

[33] On the contending factions in Portugal's ruling class of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see Luis Felipe Thomaz, 'Factions, Interests and Messianism: The Politics of Portuguese Expansionism in the East, 1500–1521', *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 28(1), 1991, pp 97–109;

Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *The Career and Legend of Vasco da Gama*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp 38–57; and Shankar Raman, *Framing 'India'. The Colonial Imaginary in Early Modern Culture*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 2002, pp 55–60.

[34] Malyn Newitt, *A History of Mozambique*, London: Hurst and Company, 1995, p 14. On Portugal's ostensible motives for their 'voyages of discovery', see C R Boxer, *The Portuguese Seaborne Empire 1415–1825*, London: Hutchinson, 1969, pp 17–18; and G V Scammell, *The First Imperial Age. European Overseas Expansion, c. 1400–1715*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1989, pp 51–70.

[35] Malyn Newitt, *A History of Portuguese Overseas Expansion, 1400–1668*, London: Routledge, 2005, p 15.

[36] Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery. From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492–1800*, London: Verso, 1997, p 119.

[37] Gil Vicente, *Three Discovery Plays*, A Lappin (ed and trans), Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1997, pp 203, 209.

[38] Camões, *The Lusiads*, p 97.

[39] Neil Larsen and Robert Krueger, 'Camões' *Os Lusiadas* and the Break-up of Epic Discourse', *Revista Camoniana* 5, 1984, pp 69–85, p 70.

[40] Thomas Herbert, *Some Years Travels into Divers Parts of Africa, and Asia the Great*, London: R Everingham, R Scot, T Basset, J Wright and R Chiswell, 1677, p 19.

[41] Translated and reprinted in R Raven-Hart (ed), *Cape of Good Hope 1652–1702. The First Fifty Years of Dutch Colonisation as Seen by Callers: Vol 2*, Cape Town: A A Balkema, 1971, pp 490–491.

[42] See for example Lord Viscount Strangford's *Poems from the Portuguese of Luis de Camoens: With Remarks on his Life and Writings* (1804) and John Adamson's *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Luis de Camoens* (1820).

[43] See for example Arthur Costigan's *Sketches of Society and Manners in Portugal* (1778),

[44] See for example Richard Cumberland's *Memoirs* (1806) and William Beckford's *Italy, with Sketches of Spain and Portugal* (1834).

[45] See for example Byron's *Childe Harold* (1809).

[46] For biographical details, see J J Caudle, 'Mickle, William Julius (1734/5–1788)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18661 (accessed 25 May 2007).

[47] William Julius Mickle, *The Lusiad; or The Discovery of India. An Epic Poem. Translated from the Original Portuguese of Luis de Camoëns*, Oxford: Jackson and Lister, 1776, p lxx.

[48] Mickle, *The Lusiad*, p 208.

[49] Barros, *Da Asia*, pp 304–305.

[50] Mickle, *The Lusiad*, p ii.

[51] Mickle, *The Lusiad*, p i.

[52] William Julius Mickle, *Almada Hill: An Epistle from Lisbon*, Oxford: W Jackson, 1781, p 30.

[53] William Julius Mickle, *A Candid Examination of the Reasons for Depriving the East-India Company of its Charter, contained in 'The History and Management of the East-India Company, from its Commencement to the Present Time' [1779, by James Macpherson]. Together with Strictures on some of the Self-contradictions and Historical Errors of Dr. Adam Smith, in his Reasons for the Abolition of Said Company*, London: J Bew and J Sewell, 1779, p 17.

[54] Mickle, *A Candid Examination*, p 20.

[55] For sympathetic accounts of Robertson, see Stewart J Brown (ed), *William Robertson and the Expansion of Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997; and Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment. Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp 163–170.

[56] William Robertson, *An Historical Disquisition concerning the Knowledge which the Ancients had of India*, London: A Strahan and T Cadell, 1791, p 133.

[57] Robertson, *An Historical Disquisition*, p 134.

[58] Robertson, *An Historical Disquisition*, pp 134, 145.

[59] Robertson, *An Historical Disquisition*, p 134.

[60] Richard Waswo, *The Founding Legend of Western Civilization. From Virgil to Vietnam*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1997, p 216.

[61] See W A Speck, *Robert Southey. Entire Man of Letters*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006, pp 62–65 and pp 83–87; and Mark Storey, *Robert Southey: A Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

[62] Robert Southey, *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey: Vol 1*, John Wood Warter (ed), London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1856, p 21.

[63] Tim Fulford, 'Heroic Voyagers and Superstitious Natives: Southey's Imperialist Ideology', *Studies in Travel Writing* 2, 1998, pp 46–65, p 49.
[64] Robert Southey, *New Letters of Robert Southey: Vol 1 1792–1810*, K Curry (ed), New York: Columbia University Press, 1965, p 337.
[65] See R A Humphreys, *Robert Southey and his 'History of Brazil'*, London: Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Council, 1978.
[66] Robert Southey, 'Review of John Barrow's *An Account of Travels into the Interior of Southern Africa*', *The Annual Review and History of Literature for 1804*, 3, 1805, pp 22–33, p 24.
[67] Southey, 'Review of Barrow', *Annual Review*, p 24.
[68] Southey, 'Review of Barrow', *Annual Review*, p 27.
[69] Southey, 'Review of Barrow', *Annual Review*, p 28.
[70] Southey, 'Review of Barrow', *Annual Review*, p 33.
[71] Although neither discusses Southey's writings on the Cape, there are useful accounts of Southey on empire in Carol Bolton, *Writing the Empire: Robert Southey and Romantic Colonialism*, London: Pickering and Chatto, 2007; and David M Craig, *Robert Southey and Romantic Apostasy*, Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 2007.
[72] William Tytler, *Principles of Translation*, London: T Cadell and W Davies, 1797, p 36.
[73] Lawrence Lipking, 'The View from Almada Hill: Myths of Nationhood in Camões and William Julius Mickle', *Portuguese Literary and Cultural Studies* 9, 2002, pp 165–176, p 166.
[74] Mickle, *The Lusiad*, pp 208–209.
[75] Rose Macaulay, *They Came to Portugal*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985 [1946], p 97.
[76] Lynn Festa, *Sentimental Figures of Empire in Eighteenth-Century Britain and France*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006, pp 57–58. See also Simon Dentith, *Epic and Empire in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
[77] On Britain's many colonial wars throughout this period, see Byron Farwell's *Queen Victoria's Little Wars*, New York: Harper and Row, 1972; and Alan Thomas and Ben Crow, *Third World Atlas*, 2nd edn, Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997.
[78] Robert Southey, 'Observations on Mr. Mickle's *Lusiad*, with the Portuguese criticism on that translation', *The Monthly Magazine and British Register* 2, November 1796, pp 787–789, p 787.
[79] Robert Southey, 'Review of Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Luis de Camoens by John Adamson', *The Quarterly Review*, 27 (April 1822), pp 1–39, p 25.
[80] Robert Southey, 'Review of *Poems from the Portuguese of Luis de Camoens* by Lord Viscount Strangford', *Annual Review* 2, 1803, pp 569–577, p 577. Southey was not alone in rating Mickle above Camões. See R A Davenport, 'Life of Mickle', in *The British Poets. Including Translations. In One Hundred Volumes: Vol LXVI Mickle and Smollett*, Chiswick: C Whittingham, 1822, p 21.
[81] Southey, 'Review of *Memoirs*', p 21.
[82] Southey, 'Review of *Memoirs*', p 20.
[83] Quoted in Javed Majeed, *Ungoverned Imaginings. James Mill's 'The History of British India' and Orientalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, p 61.
[84] For more on this point, see Nigel Leask, 'Southey's *Madoc*: Reimagining the Conquest of America', in L Pratt (ed), *Robert Southey and the Contexts of English Romanticism*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, p 135.
[85] Rupert Hart-Davis (ed), *Thomas Love Peacock: Memoirs of Shelley and Other Reviews*, London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1970, p 128.
[86] Lord Byron, *The Major Works*, J McGann (ed), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986, p 428.
[87] Jacques Derrida, 'La loire du genre/The Law of Genre', *Glyph Textual Studies* 7, 1980, pp 176–232, p 207.
[88] Hayden White, *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973, p 54.
[89] Robert C-H Shell, Edward Hudson and Raymond Hudson (eds), *Out of Livery. The Papers of Samuel Eusebius Hudson 1764–1828*, Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society, forthcoming, p 221.
[90] John Philip, *Researches in South Africa; Illustrating the Civil, Moral, and Religious Condition of The Native Tribes: Vol 1*, London: James Duncan, 1828, p 3.
[91] See Malvern Van Wyk Smith (ed), *Shades of Adamastor: Africa and the Portuguese Connection. An Anthology of Poetry*, Grahamstown: NELM, 1988, pp 73–77.
[92] 'Adamastor: The Titan of Table Mountain', *Cape Monthly Magazine* 5(29), May 1859, pp 310–317.
[93] G M Theal, *The Portuguese in South Africa*, Cape Town: Juta, 1896, p 113. Theal's views were shared by the major English historian of Portugal, R S Whiteway, *The Rise of Portuguese Power in India 1497–1550*, Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co, 1899, p 25.

[94] G M Theal (ed and trans), *Records of South-Eastern Africa: Vol 8*, Cape Town: Struik, 1964 [1902], p 387.
[95] Theal, *Records: Vol 8*, p 408.
[96] John Buchan, *Prester John*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956 [1910], pp 27–29.
[97] Buchan, *Prester John*, p 95.
[98] On the context of Theal and Buchan, see Philip Henshaw, 'The "Key to South Africa" in the 1890s: Delagoa Bay and the Origins of the South African War', *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24(3), 1998, pp 527–544.
[99] John Purves, 'Camoens and the Epic of Africa, Part 1', *The State* 2(11), November 1909, pp 542–555, p 544.
[100] John Purves, 'Camoens, Part 1', p 550.
[101] John Purves, 'Camoens and the Epic of Africa, Part 2', *The State* 2(12), December 1909, pp 734–745, p 744.
[102] Purves, 'Camoens, Part 2', p 745.
[103] Luis C Lupi, *Portugal in Africa. The Significance of the Visit of the President of the Republic to the Overseas Provinces*, Lisbon: Agencia Geral do Ultramar, 1957, p 13.
[104] Lupi, *Portugal*, p 36.
[105] Sidney R Welch, *South Africa under King Manuel, 1495–1521*, Cape Town: Juta, 1946, p 153.
[106] Welch, *South Africa*, p 479.
[107] Van Wyk Smith, *Shades*, p 112. A number of South African scholars have reflected on Campbell's poetry, with most praising his poetry while regretting his politics. See Stephen Gray, *Camoens and the Poetry of South Africa*, Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University, 1980; Jeremy Cronin, 'Turning Around: Roy Campbell's "Rounding the Cape"', *English in Africa* 11, 1984, pp 65–78; Michael Chapman, 'Roy Campbell, Poet: A Defence in Sociological Times', *Theoria* 68, 1986, pp 79–93; and Jonathan Crewe, 'The Spectre of Adamastor: Heroic Desire and Displacement in "White" South Africa', *Modern Fiction Studies* 43(1), 1997, pp 27–52. Cronin is the most hostile critic of Campbell and (to me) the most persuasive; Crewe the most typical in his bifurcated discussion of Campbell's poetry in the text and Campbell's politics in the footnotes. Also of interest is the chapter 'The Adamastor Story' in George Monteiro, *The Presence of Camões: Influences on the Literature of England, America, and Southern Africa*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1996, pp 120–131; and Nicholas Mezhuzen's comparative study, *Ordering Empire. The Poetry of Camões, Pringle and Campbell*, Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.
[108] See Lesley Witz, 'Eventless History at the End of Apartheid: The Making of the 1988 Dias Festival', *Kronos. Journal of Cape History* 32, 2005, pp 162–191. The main historian of the Portuguese in Southern Africa after Welch was Eric Axelson, who provides a neutral description of Almeida's death in *Portuguese in South-East Africa 1488–1600*, Cape Town: Struik, 1973, pp 111–113.
[109] This artwork is discussed in sympathetic detail in Ivan Vladislavic (ed), *T'kama-Adamastor. Inventions of Africa in a South African Painting*, Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand Press, 2000.
[110] Van Wyk Smith, *Shades*, p 35.
[111] Brink mentions Almeida's death briefly in his essay 'A Myth of Origin', in Vladislavic, *T'kama-Adamastor*, p 41, but moves swiftly to a lengthy discussion of Adamastor. For Brink on the relation between History and Literature, see André Brink, *Reinventing a Continent. Writing and Politics in South Africa, 1982–1995*, London: Secker and Warburg, 1996, p 191.
[112] Brink with R Nethersole, 'Reimagining the Past', in Vladislavic, *T'kama-Adamastor*, p 57.
[113] André Brink, 'A Myth of Origin' in Vladislavic, *T'kama-Adamastor*, p 46.
[114] André Brink, *The First Life of Adamastor*, London: Vintage, 2000 [1993], p 102. Brink was a finalist in the 2004 *Literary Review* Bad Sex Award. For details, see 'The Bad Sex Award Winner and Longlist', *Guardian*, 14 December 2004, www.guardian.co.uk/books/2004/dec/14/awardsandprizes.badsexaward
[115] Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious. Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*, London: Methuen, 1981, p 107.
[116] Van Wyk Smith, *Shades*, p 162.
[117] James Greene, 'Camões' Birthday', in Van Wyk Smith, *Shades*, p 199.
[118] See Jared Banks, 'Adamastorying Mozambique: *Ualalapi* and *Os Lusiadas*', *Luso-Brazilian Review* 37, 2000, pp 1–16.
[119] Kelwyn Sole, *Projections in the Past Tense*, Johannesburg: Ravan, 1992, p 41.
[120] Kelwyn Sole, *Land Dreaming*, Scottsville: University of Natal Press, 2006, p 75.
[121] O J O Ferreira, 'Adamastor, Gees van die Stormkaap', *Tydskrif vir Volkskunde en Volkstaal* 49(1), 1993, pp 20–47, p 40.

[122] Mbeki's ideas on the African Renaissance are set out in two collections of his speeches: *Africa: The Time Has Come*, Cape Town: Tafelberg/Mafube, 1998; and *Africa: Define Yourself*, Cape Town: Tafelberg/Mafube, 2002.

[123] For a longer-term perspective on Mbeki's African Renaissance, see Mark Gevisser, *The Dream Deferred. Thabo Mbeki*, Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 2007, pp 322–326; and for the immediate political context of its launch, see William Gumede, *Thabo Mbeki and the Soul of the ANC*, Cape Town: Zebra Press, 2005, pp 202–204.

[124] For sympathetic commentaries on Mbeki's project of the African Renaissance, see W M Makgoba (ed), *African Renaissance: The New Struggle*, Cape Town: Mafube/Tafelberg, 1999; and M M Mulemfo, *Thabo Mbeki and the African Renaissance: The Emergence of a New African Leadership*, Pretoria: Actua Press, 2000. For critical accounts, see E Moloka and E Le Roux (eds), *Problematising the African Renaissance*, Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2000; and P Vale and S Maseko, 'Thabo Mbeki, South Africa and the Idea of an African Renaissance', in S Jacobs and J Calland (eds), *Thabo Mbeki's World*, London: Zed Press, 2002, pp 121–142. My own arguments are set out in detail in D W Johnson, 'Migrancy and Thabo Mbeki's African Renaissance', in S Gupta and T Omoniyi (eds), *The Cultures of Economic Migration*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007, pp 127–140.

[125] Mbeki, *Africa: The Time*, p 242.

[126] Mbeki, *Africa: The Time*, p 243. Mbeki's rhetorical references and the consensus of historical scholarship are not always in agreement. Most historians believe that the Battle of Omdurman (1898) ended in a victory for Kitchener's British Army.

[127] Mbeki, *Africa: The Time*, p 287.

[128] For a detailed elaboration of this argument, see Martin Legassick, *Towards Socialist Democracy*, Scottsville: University of Natal Press, 2007.

[129] Gumede, *Thabo Mbeki*, p 204.

[130] Quoted in Vale and Maseko, 'Thabo Mbeki', p 129.