

---

**REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ‘OTHER’: A COMPARISON BETWEEN  
ROMAN DESCRIPTIONS OF BRITONS, GAULS AND GERMANS  
PRE-AD 300 AND SIR HARRY SMITH’S PORTRAYAL OF THE  
XHOSA 1830s – 1850s.**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS**  
of  
**RHODES UNIVERSITY**

By

**AMY HESTER VAN WEZEL**

January 2016

---

## *ABSTRACT*

---

Stereotypical representations of an ‘ethnically’ or ‘racially’ different ‘other’ in ancient texts would seem to reappear throughout history. By comparing Roman views of Britons, Gauls and Germans, with Sir Harry Smith’s views of the Xhosa, this study seeks to explore the extent to which these stereotypical images were employed and for what reasons. Through close textual analyses, the descriptions of these peoples are examined and compared, taking into consideration the different authors’ context and agendas. By highlighting Caesar’s views of the abilities of the ‘other’ and Tacitus’ judgements of the moral character of the ‘other’, compared with Smith’s view of the same, the study aims to draw out the role of the author’s ‘self’ in complex and contradictory representations of the ‘other’, while arguing that various overwhelmingly negative images served to justify imperial conquest and rule. The extent to which the ‘other’ was perceived as remote and different from themselves, epitomised in the dichotomy between the ‘barbarism’ and ‘civilisation’, is examined, comparing a variety of Roman authors with Smith. The similar idea of ‘civilising missions’ are discussed, while acknowledging the differences between the policies of the Roman and British Empires toward the ‘other’. The connections between how the ‘other’ was portrayed in relation to ‘Empire’ and the ways in which they were treated is also explored stressing even further the different approaches taken by Roman and British authorities to include these peoples within their Empires. While certain stereotypes are shown to have persisted from Roman times, reappearing in the writing of Sir Harry Smith, summed up in the archetypal ‘barbarian’, I argue that the use of these images was varied, inconsistent and reflected more the motives and personalities of the writers themselves, who for the most part ascribed to imperial ideologies.

---

## Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	2
Preface .....	6
INTRODUCTION .....	7
<i>Literature on the ‘Other’</i> .....	7
<i>Parameters of the Study</i> .....	9
<i>Clarification of terms</i> .....	12
<i>Layout of Thesis</i> .....	14
CHAPTER 1 .....	15
<i>JULIUS CAESAR AND HARRY SMITH’S VIEWS ON THE CAPABILITY OF THE ‘OTHER’</i> .....	15
1.1 Introduction.....	15
1.2 Caesar and Smith: Comparison of Backgrounds and Genres .....	15
1.3 The Intellectual Ability of the ‘Other’ .....	21
1.4 The Political Capability of the ‘Enemy’ .....	28
1.4.1 Oratorical Ability.....	31
1.4.2 Disunity .....	32
1.5 The Military Capability of the ‘Enemy’ .....	36
1.5.1 Physical Abilities.....	42
1.5.2 Great Numbers.....	44
1.5.3. Practical Skills.....	46
1.5.4 Disorder and Lack of Discipline.....	49
1.6 The ‘Other’ Incapable of Defeating the Empire .....	50
1.6.1 Pathetic Repentance.....	55
1.7 Child-likeness.....	57
1.8 Conclusion .....	59
CHAPTER 2 .....	62
<i>CORNELIUS TACITUS AND HARRY SMITH’S MORAL JUDGEMENTS ON THE CHARACTER OF THE ‘OTHER’</i> .....	62

---

2.1 Introduction.....	62
2.2 Tacitus and Smith: Comparison of Backgrounds and Genres .....	63
2.3 The ‘Other’ as Reckless or Cautious .....	67
2.3.1 Passion and Emotion .....	68
2.4 The ‘Other’ as Cowardly or Courageous .....	72
2.5 The ‘Other’ as Lazy or Industrious.....	77
2.6 The ‘Other’ as Greedy .....	80
2.7 The ‘Other’ as Treacherous or Loyal .....	82
2.7.1 Deceit and Dishonesty .....	87
2.7.2 Inconstancy .....	89
2.8 The ‘Other’ as Violent or Cruel.....	91
2.8.1 The ‘Other’ as Criminal or Lawless .....	93
2.9 The ‘Other’ as Virtuous or Immoral .....	95
2.10 Religion: Superstition and Cruelty .....	98
2.10.1 Evil and Wickedness.....	100
2.11 Conclusion .....	104
CHAPTER 3 .....	106
ROMAN AND HARRY SMITH’S PERCEPTIONS OF THE ‘OTHER’ AS DIFFERENT FROM OR LIKE THEMSELVES .....	106
3.1 Introduction.....	106
3.2 The ‘Other’ as Distant and Unknown .....	106
3.3 The ‘Other’ as Different.....	110
3.4 Sounds and Cries .....	114
3.5 The ‘Other’ as Animal-like .....	116
3.5.1 Monstrousness.....	120
3.5.2 Wildness .....	121
3.6 The ‘Other’ as Barbaric, Savage or Uncivilised .....	124
3.6.1 Concepts of ‘Barbarism’ and ‘Civilisation’ .....	126

---

3.6.2 <i>Implications for a ‘Civilising Mission’</i> .....	133
3.7 <i>The ‘Other’ in Familiar Terms</i> .....	140
3.8 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	142
CHAPTER 4 .....	144
<i>ROMAN AND HARRY SMITH’S DESCRIPTIONS OF THE ‘OTHER’ AS SUFFERING OR     BENEFITTING FROM ‘EMPIRE’</i> .....	144
4.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	144
4.2 <i>Sympathetic Portrayals</i> .....	144
4.2.1 <i>Severity or Cruelty of the Conqueror</i> .....	153
4.3 <i>The ‘Benefits’ of Empire</i> .....	156
4.3.1 <i>Equal Opportunities</i> .....	159
4.3.2. <i>The ‘Other’ as Grateful and Content</i> .....	162
4.4 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	164
CONCLUSION.....	165
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	168

---

## Preface

---

I would like to thank my supervisor, John Jackson, for the time and effort he put in to helping me with this thesis, particularly the last painful couple of months. His constant support, positive encouragement and understanding have been invaluable to me and kept me going despite my constant setbacks and doubts. I would also like to thank Daniel Malamis and Mike Lambert in the Classics Department for their help and input along the way.

I would like to thank the helpful staff at the Cory Library and Western Cape Archives and Records Service for their assistance and use of their resources, as well as the staff of the Albany Museum for allowing me the scope to pursue this research and the use of their resources.

I would like to thank my parents, for their encouragement and unfailing belief in what I can accomplish; my boyfriend, Bruce Mostert, for his help, support and empathy; and Percy for the company and comfort during the long hours of writing.

---

# INTRODUCTION

*'... there were other people on the island. We called them the 'Others'...' - Lost TV Series*

---

## Literature on the 'Other'

There is a wide range of scholarship on how individuals or groups of people view and represent the 'other' in relation to themselves and how they use these representations to construct their own identities, by means of what Fothergill termed 'projection', 'contradiction' and 'negation'.<sup>1</sup> This self-reflective topic has been studied under a variety of disciplines such as Anthropology and Ethnography,<sup>2</sup> Social Psychology<sup>3</sup> and Literary Studies and Cultural Criticism,<sup>4</sup> among others.<sup>5</sup>

As early as the eighteenth century a theory of social representation was posited by Vico, who noted the tendency of people, when faced with strange new cultures or worlds, to make sense of these new discoveries by relating them to the familiar, a strategy later termed by Moscovici as 'anchoring', by comparing the ways of 'others' to a system of preconceived categories of the familiar,<sup>6</sup> essentially labeling 'others' by comparing them to what they viewed as 'normal'. In 1906, William Graham Sumner introduced the term 'ethnocentrism' for the theory that a group will inevitably view its own as the centre of everything and relate and scale all others against itself, creating the idea of 'we' versus 'they', a means by which a

---

<sup>1</sup> Fothergill 1992: 38, 39, 45.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Berndt, and Berndt (1971), LeVine and Campbell (1972), Asad (1973), Clifford and Marcus (1986), and Mason (1990).

<sup>3</sup> For example, Tajfel (1981), and Jahoda (1999).

<sup>4</sup> For example, Said (1978), Gidley (1992) and Sardar (1993).

<sup>5</sup> For example, history, politics and philosophy and other social sciences mentioned in LeVine and Campbell (1972) and Clifford and Marcus (1986).

<sup>6</sup> Jahoda 1999: 9-10.

---

group exaggerates and intensifies the peculiar and different aspects of the ‘other’ in order to strengthen the idea of its own ways which, he argued, leads to justifications and hostility.<sup>7</sup>

These early theories have continued to evolve through ongoing discussions and studies. Debates have since arisen on the extent to which the values and assumptions of one’s own society’s cultural background are projected onto the conception and representation of other cultures, usually referred to as ‘ethnocentrism’,<sup>8</sup> the question of whether this is a natural condition of mankind,<sup>9</sup> and the impact of individual ideas, interests and values on the representation of the ‘other’.<sup>10</sup> Studies have been written on whether these representations are constructed and invented rather than perceived or represented,<sup>11</sup> and on the tendency of people to dichotomize between ‘us’ and ‘them’, rather than finding similarities.<sup>12</sup> There has been substantial study on the idea that social and personal identity is based on defining oneself against the ‘other’,<sup>13</sup> and that in representing the ‘other’, one is essentially representing oneself.<sup>14</sup> Much has been written on the use of one’s own values to judge the ‘other’ as incorrect, inferior or immoral,<sup>15</sup> and the degree of uniformity in characterizations of the ‘other’.<sup>16</sup>

A fair amount of comment in these studies has been made on the tradition of certain European stereotypes and perceptions of the ‘other’ as dating back to Greco-Roman ideas and

---

<sup>7</sup> LeVine and Campbell 1972: 1-2, 7-9.

<sup>8</sup> This is discussed as ‘phenomenal absolutism’ in Segall (1966). It is acknowledged and understood as ‘ethnocentrism’ in parallel with stages of ‘egocentrism’ in LeVine and Campbell (1972) and Jahoda (1999: xiv).

<sup>9</sup> Jahoda 1999: xiii.

<sup>10</sup> Jahoda 1999: 12.

<sup>11</sup> For example, Wagner (1980) and Jahoda (1999: 8-9).

<sup>12</sup> For example, Berndt and Berndt (1971) and LeVine and Campbell (1972).

<sup>13</sup> Gidley 1992: 2, Berndt and Berndt 1971: 15,16.

<sup>14</sup> Gidley 1992: 3.

<sup>15</sup> For example, Hertz (1928) and Asad (1973). The link between ethnocentrism and hostile or antagonistic behavior between different groups is discussed in LeVine and Campbell (1972) and Jahoda (1999: 11).

<sup>16</sup> For example, in LeVine and Campbell (1972), and as alluded to in Clifford and Marcus (1986: 23).

---

Judeo-Christian traditions, which persisted and evolved through the Middle Ages, Renaissance and Enlightenment Era of Exploration.<sup>17</sup>

### Parameters of the Study

This thesis will look at Roman portrayals of Britons, Gauls and Germans before the Third Century AD, compared with Sir Harry Smith's representation of the Xhosa people in the Eastern parts of the Cape Colony during the early to middle Nineteenth Century. I will be attempting to discuss these depictions against the context of the times in which they were written and the authors' genres, prejudices and influences; and I will attempt to pose possible reasons for these views and the implications these ideas would have had for policies adopted by these imperial powers towards the 'other'. I hope to use this comparison to highlight significant points of similarity and difference between Roman and British views and policies towards the 'other'.

It is important to note that this thesis will focus on only the *perceptions* and *representations* of Roman writers and Smith, which may or may not be reflective of reality. For example, whether or not the 'other' was *viewed* or *portrayed* as violent, is more important to this study, than whether or not they actually were violent. A work such as this will inevitably be one-sided (as the sources it uses are).<sup>18</sup> For example, to say that the 'other' is treacherous, does not necessarily mean to say that the Romans or British were not as treacherous or more so, or were not thought to be so by the 'other'.

---

<sup>17</sup> For example, Hertz (1928), Fothergill (1992: 38, 39, 45), Davies et al. (1993: 25-40), Hannaford (1996), Coleman and Walz (1997), Jahoda 1999), Isaac (2004).

<sup>18</sup> As Burns notes, it is 'through classic literature... that we view the barbarian' (Burns 2003: 88).

---

A fair amount has been written about how the ‘other’ was viewed in Greco-Roman literature.<sup>19</sup> My reasons for focusing on Roman views of North-West European peoples is that much scholarship focuses on Orientalism,<sup>20</sup> and Greco-Roman views and ideas of the Eastern ‘other’,<sup>21</sup> and less so on Britons, Gauls and Germans,<sup>22</sup> so I chose to focus on these groups on the other side of the empire, also hoping to highlight the irony behind British views of the ‘barbaric other’, since they were once, as a people, viewed as exactly that by the Romans whom they academically revered. I have also chosen to halt my research before the introduction of Christian doctrine into Roman government, as it would have added another dimension to the study of Roman conceptions and ideas, the scope of which cannot be justly dealt with in a thesis of this size, although the implications are worth further investigation.

I have also chosen to focus on particular Roman authors, namely Caesar and Tacitus, in my first two chapters. The reasons for this choice are the amount they wrote on Germans, Gauls and Britons and that the focus of their particular writings is relevant to the theme of specific chapters, such as Caesar’s military outlook and Tacitus’ moral agenda. These reasons will be dealt with in more detail in the relevant chapters. An inevitable focus falls on the writings of Cicero in the third chapter as Cicero wrote quite substantially on the topic of ‘barbarism’ and ‘civilisation’. Livy and other Roman authors who wrote on Germans, Gauls and Britons, and related themes have been included but serve largely to either confirm or cast doubt on any ‘stereotypical’ or common tropes on the ‘other’.

---

<sup>19</sup> For example, Sherwin-White (1967), Balsdon (1979), Long (1986), Hartog (1988), Hall (1991), Cartledge (1993), Hall (1997), Tuplin (1999: 47-75), Cohen (2000), Harrison (2002), Burns (2003), Isaac (2004), Gruen (2010).

<sup>20</sup> The best known work being that by Edward Said in Said (1978), noted so by Lester (1998: 2) and Gruen (2010: 1). More recent works on the topic include King (1999), Macfie (2002) and Varisco (2007).

<sup>21</sup> For example, Hirsch (1985).

<sup>22</sup> For example, Isaac’s work on proto-racist views of the ‘other’ in Greek and Roman texts provides a wealth of relevant information and sources on the topic, but only offers two chapters on views about Gauls and Germans (Isaac 2004).

There are also a number of reasons for choosing to draw solely on the sources written by Sir Harry Smith. Any educated British Government official or soldier would have been familiar with Latin literature as all British education from primary to university level in the 1800s was dominated by classical education.<sup>23</sup> Harry Smith in particular, mentions briefly in his autobiography that he was ‘taught natural philosophy, classics, algebra and music’<sup>24</sup> and it is known that he had knowledge of classical literature and history, some of which he may have learned from his education under Rev. George Burgess in a small schoolroom of St Mary’s Church in Whittlesea.<sup>25</sup> This is supported by his occasional use of Latin phrases,<sup>26</sup> quotations from classical literature<sup>27</sup> and the sporadic references to ‘Trojans’,<sup>28</sup> ‘Myrmidons’,<sup>29</sup> ‘Sabines’,<sup>30</sup> and the ‘mythological Pallas’.<sup>31</sup> The knowledge of and esteem given to classical literature at this time gives a further dimension to this comparison in that educated British officers can be assumed to have had a knowledge of Roman ideas, especially Smith who often alludes to ancient history and examples in his arguments, as I will later illustrate. I have also chosen to concentrate on the opinions and views of Sir Harry Smith because of the amount of time he spent at the Cape Colony, from 1829 – 1840 and again from 1847 – 1852 and his involvement and investment in the policies and peoples on the Eastern boundaries of the Cape Colony from 1835.<sup>32</sup> It is also interesting to study his views and descriptions of the local people because, as I will show, these seem to have changed during his experience at the

<sup>23</sup> Archer 1921, Curtis and Boulton 1966: 84, 147, 338, Morrish 1970: 78, Stray 1998, Stray 2001.

<sup>24</sup> Smith, H., in Moore Smith 1901: 1. (Hereafter referred to as ‘Smith, *Autobiography*’)

<sup>25</sup> Moore Smith 1901: 1, Harington 1980: 4, Lehmann 1977: 2.

<sup>26</sup> For some examples see Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 1 Sept 1835, 3 Nov 1835, 17 Nov 1835, 10 Apr 1836, 17 Apr 1836 in Smith, Col. H.G.W., *Letterbook, Eastern frontier, 1835-1836* [GH 34/7-8] The Western Cape Archives and Records Services (This collection hereafter referred to as *Letterbook*). See also the comment in Harington 1980: 4.

<sup>27</sup> Some examples of his quotations include: ‘prohibenda [autem], maxima [est] ira in puniendo’ from Cic. *Off.* 1.89 (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 July 1835, in *Letterbook*), ‘[pax] vel iniusta utilior est quam iustissimum bellum’ from Cic. *Att.* 7.14.3 (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 23 Aug 1835, in *Letterbook*), ‘cavendum est etiam, [ne] major poena quam culpa sit’ from Cic. *Off.* 1.89 (Smith *Letter to D’Urban*, 19 December 1835, in *Letterbook*), ‘fama [...] mobilitate viget viresque acquirit eundo’, from Verg. *Aen.* 4.174-175. (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban*, 21 Feb 1836, in *Letterbook*), ‘voluntas est quae quid cum ratione desiderat’, from Cic. *Tusc.* 4.12 (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban*, 7 March 1836 in *Letterbook*), ‘nihil [esse] in vita magno opere expectandum nisi [laudem atque honestatem]’ from Cic. *Arch.* 14. (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 2 July 1836 in *Letterbook*). See also the comment in Harington, *Sir Harry Smith* p.4.

<sup>28</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana*, 23 April 1835 in Smith, *Autobiography* p. 359.

<sup>29</sup> Smith, *Letter to Alice*, 18 June 1851 in Smith, *Autobiography* p. 273.

<sup>30</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.77.

<sup>31</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library

<sup>32</sup> For biographies of his career see Harington (1980) and Lehmann (1977).

---

Cape and in a way reflect the unsettled ideas and changing policies of British Imperialists towards the indigenous people on the Eastern Cape frontier.<sup>33</sup>

There is a rich tradition of comparative historiography,<sup>34</sup> some of which deals specifically with comparisons between ancient and modern history and the Roman and British Empire.<sup>35</sup>

This thesis seeks to look at specific areas within those empires to provide a more focused and in depth comparison. Few similar comparisons on representations of the ‘other’ were found, but one notable example is Miller and Savage’s paper on the function of ethnic stereotypes of Germans by Romans and native Americans by early American colonists.<sup>36</sup> Interestingly, Miller and Savage refer to the frontier region of South Africa as another possible situation where their model of frontier stereotypes might be applied.<sup>37</sup>

### Clarification of terms

For the remainder of this thesis, the term ‘other’ will be exclusively referring to perceived distinctions of ethnicity, race or nationalities and will not deal with women, slaves, children, elderly, or other minorities, as identified by Isaac.<sup>38</sup>

Britons, Gauls and Germans, either labelled as such or referred to as ‘barbarians’ in the primary texts, regardless of their state of ‘romanisation’ or geographical state within or outside of Roman boundaries, are identified in this thesis as the ‘other’,<sup>39</sup> as are the Xhosa

---

<sup>33</sup> van Aswegen 1993: 214, 218. For an overview of the Cape Colonial government’s shifting frontier policies see Wilson (1969: 243-244), Davenport (1991: 113-123). Smith himself deplored the changeability of British policies (Smith *Letter to D’Urban* 4 June 1836, 28 July 1836, 1 Aug 1836 in *Letterbook*).

<sup>34</sup> For an idea of the scope and potential of these kinds of studies see Skocpol and Somers (1980), Rusen (1996) and Lorenz (1999).

<sup>35</sup> For example, Lucas (1912), Brunt (1965: 267-288), Strayer (1966:101-104), Freeman (1996: 19-34), Harrison (2008:1-22).

<sup>36</sup> Miller and Savage 1977.

<sup>37</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 131.

<sup>38</sup> A distinction acknowledged in Isaac (2004: 4).

<sup>39</sup> It is acknowledged that further study may be needed to distinguish between possible variations in representations of these peoples depending on their Roman status or perceived ‘romanness’. For example, Burns notes that the “Celts of southern Gaul were regarded much as Romans” (Burns 2003: 99).

---

people, regardless of their temporary identification as ‘British subjects’ or their geographical location within the Cape Colony.

The ‘Roman sources’ and ‘Roman writers’ alluded to at various stages of the thesis, refer to those written by authors, in Latin or Greek, from within the Roman Empire, as Roman citizens, whether ethnically Italian or not, who were writing from around 200 BC to AD 300.

‘British officials’ generally refer to those contemporaries of Sir Harry Smith, who worked for the British government at the Cape Colony at some time during the first half of the nineteenth Century. These observations are not exhaustive, but merely seek in some places to add perspective and context.

As I will be essentially looking at the Gauls, Britons and Germans as one ‘group’, it is worthwhile to note that the distinction between Germans, Gauls, Britons and Celts, the latter an ethnic rather than geographic term, was largely invented by the Romans.<sup>40</sup> The inclusion of descriptions of all of these peoples provides more material for comparison.

Conversely, with the huge amount of Smith’s writings available, I chose to focus on his comments and descriptions of only those he termed ‘kafir’ people. For the purpose of this thesis I have replaced the offensive term with the word ‘Xhosa’, although I do acknowledge that those referred to by the former were not necessarily correctly anthropologically ‘Xhosa’. I have also replaced all of Smith’s inaccurately and irregularly spelt names of African individuals with the correct spellings and names according to more recent sources.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Balsdon 1967: 73. Riggsby notes the hazy distinctions between these groups in ancient ethnography and that in Caesar’s time anthropological knowledge suggested that northerners were relatively homogenous (Riggsby 2006: 50-52). For possible reasons behind the invention of such distinctions see Riggsby (2006: 67-69).

<sup>41</sup> Owen 1994, Mostert 1992, Peires 1982, Peires 1989.

---

Where the meanings of English words are referred to, I have used Barclay's Dictionary published in 1811<sup>42</sup> to more accurately reflect the meanings during Smith's time.

### *Layout of Thesis*

In an attempt to pull together the primary extracts which I discuss and compare in this thesis, I have sorted different kinds of descriptions of the 'other' into four sections, thus forming the four chapters of the thesis. The first chapter will deal with the perceptions Romans and Harry Smith had of the capabilities of the 'other', as individuals and societies, primarily viewed as military opponents, here focusing mainly on a comparison between Julius Caesar and Smith. The second chapter will deal with the moral judgements Romans and Harry Smith made on the character of the 'other', here focusing on a comparison with Cornelius Tacitus and Smith. In these two chapters much attention will be paid to their genres, personalities and particular influences and agendas. The third chapter will deal more broadly with Roman and Smith's idea of the 'other' in relation to themselves and the conception of 'other' as inhuman, barbaric or uncivilised. The fourth chapter again deals more broadly with descriptions of the 'other' in relation to 'Empire' and whether it was portrayed as a burden or benefit to the 'other', discussing to what extent these descriptions accurately reflected the situations they sought to represent.

---

<sup>42</sup> Barclay 1811.

---

## CHAPTER 1

### *JULIUS CAESAR AND HARRY SMITH'S VIEWS ON THE CAPABILITY OF THE 'OTHER'*

*'his very affections were ty'd to me, like those of a child to a father' – Defoe 'Robinson Crusoe' 1719*

---

#### 1.1 Introduction

Many Roman sources describe the supposed mental and physical capability of Germans, Gauls and Britons, commenting on their various strengths and weaknesses both as individuals and as groups. Julius Caesar, in particular, remarks on these aspects a fair amount and it is his works, *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* and *Comentarii de Bello Civili*<sup>1</sup> that I will use as I make comparisons with the writings of Sir Harry Smith on the Xhosa. Before going into an in-depth textual analysis of relevant references found from these sources, the context and genre of these two writers will be examined and the possible shortfalls or values of this specific comparison outlined. Thereafter, this chapter will deal with the kinds of capabilities, or lack thereof, observed in the 'other', the various reasons and implications for such comments and the similarities and differences found between the sources of Caesar and Smith.

#### 1.2 Caesar and Smith: Comparison of Backgrounds and Genres

As military leaders and provincial administrators, Caesar and Smith share the fact that they both had, for the most part, experience and contact with the peoples whom they describe.<sup>2</sup> Gaius

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Adcock, these works combined were called *C. Juli Caesaris Commentarii rerum Gestarum* (Adcock 1956: 6), although the original title is uncertain (Kraus 2009: 160).

<sup>2</sup> Although, as noted by Richard Evans, Caesar may not have been an eye witness to all that he wrote about and much his ethnographic material may have come from other sources such as Posidonius (see Riggsby 2006: 1, 47-48, Burns 2003: 119).

---

Julius Caesar spent almost a decade, from 58 – 50 BC, as the governor of Illyricum and Gaul,<sup>3</sup> during which he visited all parts of the latter and came into contact with its peoples.<sup>4</sup> As a proconsul, Caesar had control over the province of Gaul<sup>5</sup> and the command of an army.<sup>6</sup> Sir Harry Smith spent almost two years, from 1835 – 1836, in the eastern districts of the Cape Colony, second in command to Governor D'Urban,<sup>7</sup> first campaigning against the Xhosa people, and then in charge of the newly acquired Province of Queen Adelaide.<sup>8</sup> On his return to the Cape Colony, Smith spent four and a half years as its governor 1847 - 1852, some of which time was spent at war with the Xhosa on the eastern 'frontier'.<sup>9</sup> Incidentally, both Caesar and Smith were initially given the command of large armies for the purpose of settling problems on their respective frontiers.<sup>10</sup> Both came into contact with groups of people, on whom they comment, within hostile and dominant contexts. Although there is debate over Caesar's initial intentions in Gaul,<sup>11</sup> Caesar's ultimate goal was its conquest and expansion of the rule of the Roman Empire over the Gallic peoples,<sup>12</sup> which included attempts to militarily defeat Germans and even Britons.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, Smith's goals as a military leader were to conquer the 'enemy' who opposed British rule, and to expand the reach of the British Empire by adding new territories to the Cape

---

<sup>3</sup> Holmes 1914: lxii, Gardner 1982: 7, Gruen 2006: 471, Rosenstein 2009: 98, Gruen 2010: 141.

<sup>4</sup> Isaac 2004: 413-414. According to Gruen, Caesar had direct and extensive experience of the Gauls he wrote on (Gruen 2010: 147).

<sup>5</sup> Balsdon 1967: 68.

<sup>6</sup> Balsdon 1967: 65.

<sup>7</sup> Smith was originally made Deputy Quarter Master General at the Cape in 1828 (Mostert 1992: 663), and later given full civil and military powers in 1835 by D'Urban when he was sent to the frontier (Mostert 1992: 664). Despite much hinting he was not made the Lieutenant Governor (Smith, *Letters to D'Urban*, 11 Oct 1835, 25 Oct 1835, 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*) and ruled the province largely as a military commander, the area consistently under martial law (Mostert 1992: 764, 786-7, Lester 1998: 227, 230). In his autobiography he gives himself the incorrect title of 'governor' of the province of Queen Adelaide (Smith, *Autobiography* p. 72).

<sup>8</sup> Lehmann 1977: 135 – 207, Harington 1980: 14 – 78.

<sup>9</sup> Lehmann 1977: 270 – 350, Harington 1980: 95 – 225.

<sup>10</sup> For Caesar, see Balsdon 1967: 65. For Smith, see Mostert 1992: 664.

<sup>11</sup> Holmes argues that although Caesar undoubtedly dreamed of adding a new province to the Empire it is nothing but idle conjecture to attempt to determine whether he had initially resolved to attempt a full-scale conquest of Gaul (Holmes 1914: lxxv-lxxvi.). Both Fuller and Gardner argue that it is improbable and unlikely that Caesar initially contemplated the idea of the whole conquest of Gaul (Fuller 1965: 102., Gardner 1982: 16). Balsdon merely reiterates Holmes' argument that it is simply impossible to know when Caesar first envisaged the conquest (Balsdon 1967: 74), whereas Meier argues that Caesar intended for the entire subjugation of Gaul from the beginning (Meier 1995: 235, 256). For an overview of different opinions see also, Thorne (2007). Thorne argues that although his intentions cannot be known for certain, there is evidence that Caesar acted early, positively and with force against Gaul (Thorne 2007: 36).

<sup>12</sup> Balsdon 1967: 81, Holmes 1914: lxxvi., Gardner 1982: 18-19, Meier 1995: 235.

<sup>13</sup> For campaigns against the Germans see Caes. *B.G.* 1.30 – 54, 4.1 – 19, 6.1 – 10, 6.29 – 44. For campaigns against the Britons see Caes. *B.G.* 4.20 – 38, 5.8 – 23.

---

Colony,<sup>14</sup> even when this went against the reluctance of the British government to expand for economic reasons.<sup>15</sup> Although in vastly different territories and times, their contact and experience with the ‘other’ in war as well as their shared ideologies of imperial conquest, yet to be demonstrated, are significant enough to warrant a comparison between the two.

In a careful textual analysis of their descriptions, however, it is important to also take into consideration their own individual motives and careers. Unquestionable differences are evident in their political ambitions and powers. While Caesar’s principal career was a political one, which culminated in his holding the title of *dictator perpetuus* in Rome in 44 BC,<sup>16</sup> Smith never had any political sway or power in the running of the British Empire,<sup>17</sup> and often went as far as to claim on several occasions that he held no party affiliations.<sup>18</sup> While Caesar was arguably preoccupied with political intrigue and his own rise to power,<sup>19</sup> Smith was concerned with his reputation among military circles and his advancement within the ranks of the British army.<sup>20</sup> It should also be stated though, that military achievement and victory were important to both Caesar and Smith for its own sake, for their reputations, promotion and social or political advancement.<sup>21</sup> These personal factors would have influenced what and how they wrote, although, despite their different reasons or motives, both Caesar and Smith were largely

---

<sup>14</sup> Wilson 1969: 243, Lehmann 1977: 167, 173, Harington 1980: 35, 99, 100, 102-103, 203, Mostert 1992: 693-695, 713, 731, 720, 731, 932, 933, 939, Lester 1998: 231, Crais 2001: 118, Arndt 2010: 722.

<sup>15</sup> Galbraith 1963: 3.

<sup>16</sup> Gardner 1982: 23.

<sup>17</sup> The highest position Smith held in his lifetime was as the Governor of the Cape Colony (See footnote 9), and as such he was still responsible to and under the control of the rulers of the British Empire. He never aspired to or held any position in the British Parliament.

<sup>18</sup> Harington 1980: 76-77. See also Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4 Aug 1835, 23 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>19</sup> For example, Caesar’s retention of military command outside of Rome in order to avoid being charged in Rome (Gardner 1982: 10)

<sup>20</sup> Lehmann 1977: 194, 202, 205, Harington 1980: 35, 41, 52, 62, 66-67, 72, 78, Mostert 1992: 685, 785, 1098. See also Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 13 Dec 1835, 17 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>21</sup> According to Sallust, Caesar longed for an army and war to prove his ‘*virtus*’ (Sall. *Cat.* 54.4, in Rosenstein 2009: 88). Rosenstein argues that the validation of claims to elite honors and offices by Caesar’s time was still connected to military glory (Rosenstein 2009: 86). Meier argues that Caesar was among other things concerned with achievement for its own sake (Meier 1995: 224-225).

---

concerned with justifying their actions in the provinces.<sup>22</sup> Whatever the grander and personal motives, their intention in battle was identical: to defeat the enemy.

It is also important to consider the different genres in which they were writing.<sup>23</sup> Although it could be argued that Caesar's literary renown<sup>24</sup> far outweighed Smith's literary ambitions, both were prolific writers on the battlefield and during their time in far flung territories.<sup>25</sup> The sources that survive from Caesar are the *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* and *Commentarii de Bello Civili*, written in the genre of 'commentaries',<sup>26</sup> the former probably written every year after the events described and published in 51 BC, and the latter later.<sup>27</sup> Traditionally commentaries were intended as an *aide-memoire*, as material for the writing of the more literary 'historia'.<sup>28</sup> Caesar adheres to the genre<sup>29</sup> to an extent, describing what happened as statements of facts and events, in a simple and straightforward manner, without undue elaboration or comment<sup>30</sup> but inevitably reveals events as he saw them, emphasizing and interpreting events from his point of view.<sup>31</sup> The works give an impression of objectivity<sup>32</sup> and are mostly written in the third person.<sup>33</sup> However, the works, particularly the *Bellum Gallicum*, emerge as more than a simple *aide-memoire* to future historians, but as literary works in their own right, written with skill and literary touches.<sup>34</sup>

As works intended for a relative degree of 'publication', Caesar's 'commentaries' were written

---

<sup>22</sup> For Caesar, see Adcock 1956: 51. For Smith, see Mostert 1992: 784.

<sup>23</sup> According to Syed, the representation of 'others' is informed by genre, target audiences and the aims of the author, as much as knowledge of the people themselves (Syed 2005: 360).

<sup>24</sup> Adcock 1956: 18, 50, Ogilvie 1982: 281.

<sup>25</sup> For Caesar see Osgood (2009: 329). The evidence for Smith's prolific writing lies in the records of exhaustingly long letters written often more than once a day to his wife, relatives, friends, peers and superior officers, many of which are referenced throughout this thesis.

<sup>26</sup> Adcock 1956: 7.

<sup>27</sup> Although Ogilvie notes that the time of writing of the commentaries is uncertain and disputed (Ogilvie 1982: 282-4), it would seem more probably that the commentaries were written each year (Adcock 1956: 3, Ogilvie 1982: 281). Meier, on the other hand insists that they were all written in 51BC (Meier 1995: 253). See also Radin (1918), Kraus (2009: 159-16) and Osgood 2009: 349-350.

<sup>28</sup> Adcock 1956: 7-10.

<sup>29</sup> According to Murphey, Hirtius confirms this as he relates Caesar collecting raw material so that historians would know of his achievements (Murphey 1949:121).

<sup>30</sup> Adcock 1956: 9, 16, 63, Wilkinson 1982: 240.

<sup>31</sup> Adcock 1956: 23-4.

<sup>32</sup> Rosenstein argues that the commentaries are scarcely objective accounts as Caesar's political concerns affected the way he told the story of his military achievements and how he presented himself (Rosenstein 2009: 85).

<sup>33</sup> Meier 1995: 225, Osgood 2009: 351. For a rare example where he does write in the first person see Caes. *B.G.* 5.54.5.

<sup>34</sup> Adcock 1956: 68, 71, Kraus 2009: 164; Murphey 1949: 121, Ogilvie 1982: 283-5, Meier 1995: 254. See also Suet. *Jul.* 55-56.

---

for a wide audience, primarily those of his own aristocratic senatorial class,<sup>35</sup> with the purpose of documenting events,<sup>36</sup> satisfying intellectual curiosity and interest in what happened, his and others' role in events, and military techniques, as well as serving to promote his own claim to *dignitas*, greatness, high office, public consideration and honours,<sup>37</sup> for both his current public reputation and for posterity.<sup>38</sup> Some scholars also argue that Caesar's intention in writing the commentaries was to justify and explain his campaigns and actions<sup>39</sup> which if the case, would ring very similar to Smith's agenda. Some of Caesar's digressions should also be discussed in the light of their separate genre as 'ethnography',<sup>40</sup> for example the excursuses on the Gauls,<sup>41</sup> Germans<sup>42</sup> and Suebi,<sup>43</sup> although Schadee argues that he uses these to serve his agenda and grander narrative, rather than simply for curiosity's sake.<sup>44</sup>

Smith's writings consist largely of correspondence addressed to public officials, such as Sir Benjamin D'Urban, Earl Grey and others, including letters marked 'private' or 'confidential', as well as more personal letters addressed to his wife and sister. These letters had the intention of relaying events and situations as they happened and also included a great deal of comment, interpretation and bias. Depending on who the letter was intended for, Smith's descriptions reveal discrepancies in facts and opinions.<sup>45</sup> Unlike Caesar's writings, Smith's letters were personal, often emotional, elaborate to the extreme and intended only for those individuals to whom they were addressed. Smith's autobiography, called by the author *Various Anecdotes and*

---

<sup>35</sup> Adcock 1956: 21-22.

<sup>36</sup> Ogilvie 1982: 281, Meier 1995: 255.

<sup>37</sup> Adcock 1956: 22-23, Ogilvie 1982: 282. cf. Burns 2003: 122.

<sup>38</sup> Ogilvie 1982: 281, Meier 1995: 255.

<sup>39</sup> Ramsey 2009: 56, Adcock 1956: 9, Meier 1995: 255. De Witt, however, argues against this idea (De Witt 1942).

<sup>40</sup> Adcock 1956: 97-100, Isaac 2004: 413, Syed 2005: 362, Riggsby 2006: 59.

<sup>41</sup> Caes. *BG.* 1.1, 6.11-20.

<sup>42</sup> Caes. *BG.* 6.21-28.

<sup>43</sup> Caes. *BG.* 4.1-3.

<sup>44</sup> Schadee 2008:158-180.

<sup>45</sup> Harington 1980: 42, 52, 181, 188, Mostert 1992: 1058, 1074, 1133.

---

*Events of my Life*, was written in 1844 while he was in India between his episodes spent at the Cape.<sup>46</sup> Smith himself admitted that he had ‘never read a page of it since [his] scrawling it over at full gallop’, and Moore states that Smith did not contemplate the publication of his story in the rough form in which he had written it, but imagined that some literary man might take it in hand to rewrite as a military romance.<sup>47</sup> Although published in 1901,<sup>48</sup> and available to a wider audience, this was not its intention. The differences with Caesar’s commentaries are quite apparent and must be borne in mind.

Although Caesar and Smith had vastly different careers and achievements, whether political or literary, I believe it is important not to dismiss the idea of comparing them due to any exaggerated myth of Caesar’s ‘greatness’.<sup>49</sup> Both were fighting against and ruling the ‘other’, whom they wrote a great deal about, from the bias of an imperial conquering party. Smith, I would venture to conjecture, appreciated these parallels. The impression of Caesar as a man of industriousness, confidence, resolution, sharp decision, action and imperturbability in a crisis,<sup>50</sup> would have appealed to Smith’s personality, although the apparently rational temperament of Caesar<sup>51</sup> was far removed from Smith’s fiery temper. As Smith’s actions and conduct on the eastern ‘frontier’ of the Cape Colony were criticised by British authority,<sup>52</sup> the charges of illegality of Caesar’s actions in Gaul by Roman leadership<sup>53</sup> could likely have presented a welcome similarity in Smith’s mind, if he had noted it, since Caesar was lauded for his actions in the end, while Smith fought mostly in vain to defend his reputation. While these are merely my

---

<sup>46</sup> Moore Smith 1901: v-vi.

<sup>47</sup> Moore Smith 1901: vii.

<sup>48</sup> Moore Smith 1901.

<sup>49</sup> Fuller 1965: 11-12.

<sup>50</sup> Balsdon 1967: 31, 57, 96, 107-8, 110, Ogilvie 1982: 284.

<sup>51</sup> Wilkinson 1982: 240.

<sup>52</sup> Harington 1980: 41, 62-63, 69-71, Lehmann 1977: 195-196, 341, Mostert 1992: 759, 784-785, 789, Strobel 2008: 78-79.

<sup>53</sup> Gardner 1982: 10, Meier 1995: 237. According to Murphey, Caesar’s actions in Germany were criticized in Rome (Murphey 1977: 238). Cato is noted to have commented on this very conduct as a crime (Balsdon 1967: 87, Meier 1995: 282-3) and there is evidence a commission was despatched to investigate Caesar’s conduct (Balsdon 1967: 87). See also Osgood 2009: 331-339.

---

own musings, that Smith was well acquainted with and influenced by Caesar's commentaries is more than plausible. Since the Renaissance the Caesarian corpus found wide and scholarly readership in Europe and by the sixteenth and seventeenth century was studied for its military value.<sup>54</sup> Napoleon had commended the commentaries of Caesar to the constant study of anyone who sought to make himself a master of the art of war,<sup>55</sup> and Smith most certainly considered himself a student of the 'usages' of war to which he refers numerous times,<sup>56</sup> also frequently using the right of conquest accepted in Roman times<sup>57</sup> and since as a defence of his conduct.<sup>58</sup>

### 1.3 The Intellectual Ability of the 'Other'

The first representation of the 'other' that will be discussed is the attention paid to their perceived intellectual ability. In his commentaries, Caesar makes a fair amount of comment on the mental capability of some Gauls. He refers in particular to the Gallic chief Vercingetorix, as conducting a military campaign that could not have been conducted with greater reason or judgement<sup>59</sup> (*maiore ratione*),<sup>60</sup> a trait Caesar admired and possessed himself, according to Adcock.<sup>61</sup> However Caesar, by making it clear that it is other Gauls (*omnis multitudo*) who present Vercingetorix in this way, distances himself from the comment. Just one chapter later, Caesar describes the Gauls in the words *summae genus sollertiae*,<sup>62</sup> which would also indicate that he acknowledged their ingenuity, shrewdness and skill,<sup>63</sup> but he goes on to qualify this by

---

<sup>54</sup> Adcock 1956: 107. See also McLaughlin (2009), Biskup (2009).

<sup>55</sup> Adcock 1956: 62.

<sup>56</sup> Lehmann 1977: 151, 200, Harington 1980: 66, Mostert 1992: 711. See also Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 13 Feb 1836, 17 Apr 1836, 25 Apr 1836: *Letterbook*.

<sup>57</sup> According to Fuller, Caesar has Ariovistus allude to this right of conquest in Caes. *B.G.* 1.36 (Fuller 1965: 107). See also Balsdon (1979: 198)

<sup>58</sup> Harington 1980: 64, Lehmann 1977: 199, Mostert 1992: 784, Crais 2001: 118. See also Smith, *Letter to Juana*, 7 May 1835, in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D'Urban*, 3 Jan 1836, 17 April 1836, in *Letterbook*.

<sup>59</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 1526.

<sup>60</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.21.1. The word '*ratio*' is used by other authors in reference to the Gauls. Cicero uses it to describe the knowledge of divination possessed by Gallic Druids (Cic. *Div.* 1.90). Livy refers to the Gauls as possessing *ratio* in the chieftain's decision to attack the Roman troops before using bigger numbers to overwhelm the Romans, therefore alluding to forethought and planning (Liv. 5.38.5).

<sup>61</sup> Adcock 1956: 52.

<sup>62</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.22.1. cf. Tacitus' description of Civilis as being more shrewd than the average barbarian (*ultra quam barbaris solitum ingenio sollers*) (Tac. *Hist.* 4.13).

<sup>63</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 1721.

---

commenting on their particular skill to imitate<sup>64</sup> and carry out anything suggested to them. This would appear to undermine their own capability to think for themselves, as do his comments on their naivety.<sup>65</sup> Caesar does however suggest their ability to strategise<sup>66</sup> in referring to them as forming plans or devices of war (*consilia*)<sup>67</sup> attributing to them the ability to judge and understand<sup>68</sup> (*consilia* having been used to describe what the Romans used to defeat the Treveri).<sup>69</sup> Adcock notes how Caesar does at times attribute tactical strategies to enemy leaders, for example Ariovistus, Boduognatus, and Vercingetorix.<sup>70</sup> But since the reader is later told that these stratagems failed as they were defeated, one is led to conclude that they were ultimately inferior to the Roman plans.

The choice of words Caesar uses at times to describe the ‘other’, not only refers to their intelligence, but more often than not to the presence of deviousness on the part of the ‘other’. Caesar referred to one of his own Gallic auxiliaries as *callidus*,<sup>71</sup> one who possesses taught wisdom by experience and practice, who is shrewd, or skilful, but could also be crafty, sly or cunning.<sup>72</sup> Since the Gaul identified in this way is ordered to act falsely and to deceive the enemy albeit on behalf of the Romans, it would be assumed that it is the latter meaning being alluded

---

<sup>64</sup> Interestingly, according to Jahoda, ‘imitation’, as an indication of a lack of understanding and reason, had been ascribed to images of fools or children since Greco-Roman antiquity, later attributed to primates who were compared to ‘savages’ and into the twentieth Century African people were labeled as prone to ‘imitation’ (Jahoda 1999: 8, 9, 34, 41, 89, 149).

<sup>65</sup> Caesar remarks on the Gauls as slaves to ‘rumour’ (Caes. *B.G.* 4.5.3), induced to make plans from what they have heard (*auditionibus*) (Caes. *B.G.* 4.5.3). Riggsby notes this representation of the Gauls as susceptible to rumour and how Caesar suggests that even the Gauls themselves were aware of this and went as far as taking legal steps to channel all information through the magistrates (Riggsby 2006: 62. See Caes. *B.G.* 6.20). Further on Caesar again describes the Gauls as treating something unsubstantial which they have heard as fact (*levem auditionem*) (Caes. *B.G.* 7.42.2). Tacitus also alludes to the Gauls believing a rumour (Tac. *Hist.* 4.54), which prompted them into a second war, but he does not explicitly say that they were liable to blindly believe in hearsay. Along similar lines a couple of Roman writers portray the ‘other’ as lacking, in a sense, critical and rational thought when describing the ‘other’ as possibly moved by religious feeling (*religione*) (Liv. 5.46.3) and taken in by fame (Cic. *Sull.* 37).

<sup>66</sup> Rawlings notes Caesar’s concern with stratagems or the lack thereof as a reason for victories or defeats (Rawlings 1998: 176, 178).

<sup>67</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.33.2, 4.5.1, 5.34.1, 7.22.1. Similarly, Tacitus refers to Arminius as planning an entrapment (Tac. *Ann.* 1.68) and the Germans as having *consilia* (Tac. *Ann.* 2.20). Tacitus also comments on the Britons planning tactical positions (Tac. *Ann.* 12.31) although not much further on will narrate their defeat in spite of this. He also mentions the Germans deliberating and discussing (Tac. *Germ.* 11.1). He also describes the Britons as forming *consilia* (Tac. *Agr.* 15.6).

<sup>68</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 432.

<sup>69</sup> Murphey 1977: 240.

<sup>70</sup> Adcock 1956: 54.

<sup>71</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.18.1. cf. Tac. *Hist.* 4.32.

<sup>72</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 270.

---

to<sup>73</sup>. Hirtius<sup>74</sup> repeats the use of this specific word later on to describe the fleeing Bellovaci as doing so with *calliditas*,<sup>75</sup> in that even though afraid, their choice to flee was cunning or wise in that it saved lives and they were able to set up camp in a strong position and go on to inflict losses on the Romans. One can also assume that in such a circumstance, in military conduct, that would have been viewed as a positive decision, although it was coupled by the idea of timidity and fear on the part of the Gauls. Caesar also, however, seems to exhibit *calliditas*,<sup>76</sup> an indication that it is not always a negative, but admirable, trait.

In his early campaign on the frontier, Smith describes the Xhosa as incapable of judgement.<sup>77</sup> He also describes Tyali as having ‘more brandy than brains in his head’.<sup>78</sup> However, he much more frequently refers to individual Xhosa chiefs, women and men as ‘clever’<sup>79</sup> and ‘intelligent’<sup>80</sup> He describes Maqoma as ‘clever’,<sup>81</sup> capable of more understanding<sup>82</sup> than expected from a ‘savage’.<sup>83</sup> He also describes individual Xhosa men as ‘sharp’.<sup>84</sup> Smith comments at one point that ‘no race of man possesses a more acute or observant intellect’ than the Xhosa.<sup>85</sup> He

---

<sup>73</sup> cf. the description by Velleius Paterculus of the Germans as being ‘very shrewd’ (*versutissimi*) (Vell. 2.118.1), There is emphasis here not only on their cleverness, but also on their slyness as Velleius immediately afterwards describes them as lying and fabricating lawsuits. Tacitus refers to the Germans as using cunning in decisions to retreat (*astu*) (Tac. *Ann.* 1.56), which also acknowledges the ‘other’s’ ability to strategise and plan as well as slyness. He uses the same word later to refer to the actions of Caratacus (Tac. *Ann.* 12.33).

<sup>74</sup> Hirtius served as an officer in Gaul under Caesar and completed Caesar’s Gallic Commentaries (Bowder 1980: 109).

<sup>75</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 8.16.3.

<sup>76</sup> Murphey 1977: 234-5, Fuller 1965: 120.

<sup>77</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 11 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>78</sup> Quoted in Lehmann (1977: 189).

<sup>79</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 15 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 26 Jan 1836, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>80</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 25 July 1835, 9 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Instructions to Lieut.-Col Perceval* 20 March 1852 in *Correspondence: Government of the Cape of Good Hope Relative to the State of the Kafir Tribes and the Recent Outbreak on the Eastern Frontier of the Colony, Cape of Good Hope, Presented to both houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty May 31 1853* (London: George Edward Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1853). This Collection will hereafter be referred to as ‘*Correspondence* (1853)’.

<sup>81</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 18 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>82</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 23 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>83</sup> Lehmann 1977: 186.

<sup>84</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 12 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 33.

<sup>85</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

describes the Xhosa as an ‘acute and intelligent race’,<sup>86</sup> possessing acute minds.<sup>87</sup> Like Caesar he also alludes to the Xhosa as being capable of making plans.<sup>88</sup>

He also describes the Xhosa as possessing common sense,<sup>89</sup> which ‘figuratively’ implies ‘apprehension’, ‘understanding’ and ‘reason’.<sup>90</sup> He refers to the Xhosa as ‘sensible’.<sup>91</sup> Harrington comments on Smith’s surprise at the Xhosa’s grasp of logic.<sup>92</sup> Smith acknowledges the Xhosa generally as possessing ‘strong powers of reasoning’.<sup>93</sup> However, he refers to Xhosa chiefs as being ‘endowed by nature with excellent understanding and powers of reasoning as regards the *present*; ...only one man among them – Umhala... who had an idea of the result of measures, or futurity’.<sup>94</sup> He later describes the same Mhala as a ‘man of superior intellect, and the only one who could judge cause and effect, and future results’.<sup>95</sup> He also makes a more general assertion that the ‘savage’ as ‘always buries the past in oblivion, and regards the present only’, with a disregard for the ‘future’.<sup>96</sup> The acceptance of the ‘other’ as possessing reason is important. Early on during his campaign against the Xhosa Smith writes that ‘if these savages are to be treated as men and rational beings there exists much matter for discussion’.<sup>97</sup> He later asserts the importance of treating them as ‘endowed with intellectual powers’ and ‘the power of reason’ and

---

<sup>86</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>87</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 74, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library

<sup>88</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 67.

<sup>89</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.77, Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 March 1849: *Correspondence with the Governor of the Cape Of Good Hope Relative to the State of the Kafir Tribes on the Eastern Frontier of the Colony, Cape of Good Hope, Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty 14 Aug 1850* (London: William Clowes and Sons, 1850). This collection will hereafter be referred to as ‘*Correspondence* (1850)’.

<sup>90</sup> Barclay 1811: 845.

<sup>91</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835, 15 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 41.

<sup>92</sup> Harrington 1980: 55.

<sup>93</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*, reiterated in Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 74.

<sup>94</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 73.

<sup>95</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.83, reiterated in Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 5 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>96</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 35, reiterated in Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 24 July, 16 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library. Seneca also labels the Gauls as incapable of intelligent long-term planning (Balsdon 1979: 166).

<sup>97</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 16 August 1835 in *Letterbook*.

---

that he views himself as doing so.<sup>98</sup> It is evident therefore that how the ‘other’ was treated depended substantially on whether or not they were viewed as rational beings.

He also dwelt much on whether or not the Xhosa mind was susceptible to ‘cultivation’ and the acquisition of ‘new perceptions and ideas’,<sup>99</sup> in other words, whether or not he could mould the Xhosa mind to adopt English ways of thinking. Smith asserts a little later that the only difference between the European and Xhosa man is education,<sup>100</sup> rather than intellectual capability. He frequently refers to the Xhosa as ‘uneducated’ or ‘untutored’,<sup>101</sup> with the exception of a councillor Ganya,<sup>102</sup> whom he used in his service.<sup>103</sup> Although he comments on the illiteracy of the Xhosa<sup>104</sup>, he also makes note of their skill at retaining information and their ‘power of memory’.<sup>105</sup> But he describes Tyali, as ‘an ignorant fellow’,<sup>106</sup> along with the Xhosa generally,<sup>107</sup> often portraying the Xhosa as referring to themselves as ‘ignorant’, in need of schools and instruction.<sup>108</sup> He also refers to their practice of witchcraft as ‘ignorance’,<sup>109</sup> a comment loaded with religious stigma that I will be commenting on in the next chapter, but the value of the reference here is in the idea of ignorance being associated with a lack of knowledge rather than of innate intelligence.<sup>102</sup> Smith also describes the Xhosa people as ‘deluded’ in their support of their chiefs and in other matters.<sup>110</sup> Smith describes Maqoma as having more theological knowledge ‘than many Christians’.<sup>111</sup> Regardless of whether he was a convert or not, this

---

<sup>98</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 6 Oct 1835, 12 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>99</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>100</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>101</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 3 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 19 Dec 1835, 10 Apr 1836, 12 May 1836, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>102</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 101.

<sup>103</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 5 Dec 1835, 23 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>104</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 20 Jan, 26 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>105</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 101-2.

<sup>106</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 70.

<sup>107</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 23 Nov 1835, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>108</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 Sept 1835, 6 Oct 1835, 26 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>109</sup> Smith, *Address to the Kafir Chiefs* 7 January 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>110</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 4, 23, 30 Aug 1835, 22 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>111</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90.

---

comment implies that Smith believed that a Xhosa person had the capacity to gain and interpret knowledge. Interestingly, on the prospect of the abandonment of the province of Queen Adelaide and of any attempt to educate and ‘civilise’ the Xhosa under British rule, Smith comments on the danger of educating and then leaving the Xhosa to their own devices, as they would now judge the British more severely for their vacillating policies towards the Xhosa and therefore revert to hostility towards the government.<sup>112</sup> He later reiterates this as he writes of the Xhosa having ‘learnt just enough by our late intercourse and connection to make him dangerous to us’.<sup>113</sup> Despite Smith’s agenda and preoccupation with the abandonment of his measures, this comment alludes to the possibility of the ‘other’, educated in the ways of the conqueror, using that knowledge to resist imperial rule, something we also find alluded to in Tacitus’ writing.<sup>114</sup>

Smith also refers to the deviousness of the ‘other’ in much less ambiguous terms than Caesar. He describes one of Hintsas’s councillors as ‘shrewd-looking’<sup>115</sup> and later describes ‘Umtini’ and Nqeno as ‘shrewd’.<sup>116</sup> The word, implying maliciousness, mischievousness, and cunning,<sup>117</sup> is also used to describe the Xhosa generally.<sup>118</sup> He uses the word ‘cunning’ to describe most Xhosa chiefs such as Hintsas, Maqoma and Mhala,<sup>119</sup> the word meaning ‘learned, knowing, or of an extensive knowledge performed with art or skill’ with figurative connotations of slyness and deceit.<sup>120</sup> Although these moralistic descriptions will be dealt with more fully in the next chapter, they are relevant here in that they illustrate the acknowledgement of intelligence on the part of

---

<sup>112</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 April 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>113</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library. Smith much later mentions the son of Moshesh as educated in Cape Town and turned ‘rebellious’ against the Colony (Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 17 June 1851, in Smith, Sir H., *The Godlonton Correspondence: Letters to the Hon. R. Godlonton, 10.2.1837 – 19.1.1859* [A 47] The Western Cape Archives and Records Services). Hereafter this collection will be referred to as ‘*Godlonton Corresp.*’

<sup>114</sup> Tac. *Hist* 4.32, 4.50-60, *Ann.* 2.10, 11.1, 11.16.

<sup>115</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 18 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>116</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.36, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>117</sup> Barclay 1811: 854.

<sup>118</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 18 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>119</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 9 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 22 Sept, 28 Dec 1835, 17 Apr, 1, 5 May, 8 June, 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 33.

<sup>120</sup> Barclay 1811: 249.

---

the ‘other’, since to be sly and cunning requires considerable mental capability. However, no matter how cunning or clever he portrayed the ‘other’ to be, and although he seems to have admired their intellect,<sup>121</sup> Smith frequently claimed he alone understood them better than anyone else and could see through all their stratagems, and supposedly took pleasure in pretending to be taken in by them.<sup>122</sup>

As the above analysis suggests, both Caesar and Smith acknowledge, either overtly or implicitly, the ‘other’ as having intelligence and the ability to think and reason.<sup>123</sup> However, these abilities are often given sinister connotations or qualified by different means, which is not altogether surprising considering the relatively common Roman stereotypes,<sup>124</sup> and even stronger racial ideas prevalent in the nineteenth century.<sup>125</sup> Caesar uses subtle ways to undermine seemingly positive statements, and while he allows for the admiration of his enemy leader opponents, crediting them as similar to himself in terms of reason and intelligence,<sup>126</sup> this was something reserved only for an enemy leader, not necessarily for the people as a whole.<sup>127</sup> Smith overtly

---

<sup>121</sup> Mostert 1992: 770.

<sup>122</sup> Harington 1980: 41, Mostert 1992: 719.

<sup>123</sup> Other Roman authors were known to acknowledge the ‘other’ as possessing intelligence. A Gallic woman is described as admired for her ‘intelligence’ by Polybius (Plb. 21.38.7), who later also describes another Gaul as holding ‘intelligent’ conversation (Plb. 22.21.4) and also refers to a strategic delay of negotiations to gain time (Plb. 21.39.9) – the latter a particular description used quite often by British writers. Tacitus refers to the Germans as possessing ‘considerable mental strength’ (*maior animi vigor*) (Tac. *Germ.* 30.2). Livy describes Brennus as apprehensive, strategic and cautious in his assault (Liv. 5.38.3).

<sup>124</sup> Roman authors describe Gauls, Germans and Britons as stupid, possessing slow simple minds. Livy makes one reference to a Gaul as being ‘stupidly happy’ (*stolide laetum*) (Liv. 7.10.5), which he also mentions as commented on by previous writers on the same incident. Vitruvius refers to the northern peoples as having dull, slow minds (Vitr. 6.1.9, 6.1.10). Strabo refers twice to the Gauls as being simple (Strab. 4.4.2, 4.4.5). In some cases Roman authors acknowledge the few individual exceptions to a general assumption that all ‘barbarians’ are stupid. Velleius refers to a particular German as ‘quick witted, with more than a barbarian’s intelligence (*sensu celer, ultra barbarum promptus ingenio*)’ (Vell. 2.118.2). This is similar to his comment on Maroboduus, as not being a barbarian in terms of intelligence (Vell. 2.108.2). To Velleius it is expected that the ‘other’ is lacking in intelligence but he is willing to comment on the supposedly extraordinary intelligence of particular individuals.

<sup>125</sup> According to Jahoda, the Middle Ages saw the criteria of the faculty of ‘reason’ used to determine humanity in the ‘Great Chain of Being’ (Jahoda 1999: 33). Various groups of ‘other’ were attributed with a lack of reason: the mythical wild man of the Middle Ages, ‘negroes’ in the works of Leo Africanus in the 1500s, and the American ‘Indians’ after the ‘discovery’ of the Americas (Jahoda 1999: 5, 19, 21, 30). By the nineteenth century black people were being labelled with attributes of heightened sensibility, governed only by the senses which they linked to apish animality and child-likeness (Jahoda 1999: 55 – 57, 59, 62, 70, 77, 78, 89). These stereotypes were propped up by pseudo-scientific claims that the black man’s lack of intelligence was linked to the narrowness of cerebral organs, projection of the skull and smaller cranial areas (Jahoda 1999: 69, 78). Bank points out that ‘phrenology’ and early ideas of scientific racism were filtering into the Cape Colony in the early nineteenth century already and proponents of these ideas were spreading their ideas among the settlers of the frontier districts such as Grahamstown (Bank, 1996) so that the fact that Smith was aware of such ideas is almost indisputable, although I would argue that this does not mean he adhered to them.

<sup>126</sup> Meier 1995: 261.

<sup>127</sup> Isaac 2004: 414.

---

writes of a specific limited nature of the level of intelligence he acknowledges, that restricted to the present, which is particularly reminiscent of some racial stigmatisms.<sup>128</sup> There is also a marked emphasis in Smith's writing, unlike in Caesar's, on the 'other' as uneducated and susceptible to new ideas, which is possibly reflective of Smith's active role as civiliser of the 'other', although Caesar does use different ways to identify the 'other' as susceptible to Roman incorporation, to be discussed in depth in chapter 3. Here, it is important to note the acknowledgement of the 'other' as having intellectual ability. Miller and Savage note the tendency of Roman writers to attribute both stupidity and fiendish cleverness to the 'other' simultaneously,<sup>129</sup> something that Smith also did often. As military leaders, both Caesar and Smith would not have benefited from portraying themselves as defeating an entirely 'stupid' enemy, an agenda that would have been at odds with any prevalent stereotype.

#### 1.4 The Political Capability of the 'Enemy'

Some degree of intelligence would also be required in order for the 'other' to influence, persuade and lead. Caesar describes Gallic chiefs, men and tribes as possessing *auctoritas*,<sup>130</sup> power, authority by influence and persuasion.<sup>131</sup> Hirtius also uses the word *auctoritas* to describe the power of the Aedui.<sup>132</sup> He describes Orgetorix as having the power to persuade his community to march out in full force,<sup>133</sup> Vercingetorix as being able to coerce others to follow him in

---

<sup>128</sup> According to Jahoda, comments were made as early as the eighteenth Century on South American 'Indians' and Africans as not reflecting on causes connections or not caring or imagining about the future (Jahoda 1999: 22, 50). In the nineteenth Century Schultz considered primitive humans as not yet reflective beings and incapable of abstraction (Jahoda 1999: 89). Into the twentieth Century, some regarded Africans as lacking foresight, concentrated on the moment, not thinking about the future or the past (Jahoda 1999: 149).

<sup>129</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 116.

<sup>130</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.3.1, 1.17.1, 2.4.5, 2.15.1, 4.21.7, 5.6.2, 5.54.2, 7.63.2, 7.77.3. Tacitus also uses this word in reference to the 'other' (Tac. *Hist.* 4.61, *Ann.* 12.31).

<sup>131</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 199. Lacey points out the complexity of the concept of 'auctoritas', describing its meaning in the sense of moral authority, as the power to express an opinion or wish and for that to carry considerable weight without necessarily having the power to demand its execution (Lacey 1998). The word is attributed by Augustus to himself (August. *R.G.* 34).

<sup>132</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 8.54.5

<sup>133</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.3.1

---

rebellion<sup>134</sup> and other deputations as having the influence (*gratia*), to join others to their cause.<sup>135</sup> Caesar uses the adjective *potens* to describe Gallic tribes and men,<sup>136</sup> the more or most powerful among their kind<sup>137</sup> and the word *imperium* to describe the sovereignty Diviciacus held over a great part of Gaul. Linked to the idea of power was that of wealth,<sup>138</sup> and Caesar describes Orgetorix as one of the most wealthy among the Helvetii.<sup>139</sup> He also describes Dumnorix as powerfully wealthy, in possession of great resources to use for political power.<sup>140</sup> He later describes deputations of Gauls as having power of money (*pecunia*) as well as authority.<sup>141</sup> The power attributed to the ‘other’ is usually that which they held over others of their kind and never hints at a greater power than that of Rome. Barlow makes an interesting argument that although Caesar portrays the ‘rebel’ leaders of the ‘other’ as having power and a following, this influence is undermined by representing their power as ‘populist’, relying largely on a following of degenerates and undesirables, and operating outside of legal political structures.<sup>142</sup>

Smith describes a deputation of two Xhosa men who sued for peace as ‘influential’<sup>143</sup> and remarks on Pato’s influence as an ally in the war,<sup>144</sup> which serves to imply that, as he supposedly has power over them, his influence stretches that much wider. Likewise, he also writes of Ganya, a councillor he portrays as aiding and obeying him, as a ‘man of great influence’.<sup>145</sup> In a letter to his wife, Smith acknowledges Hintsas as a ‘very powerful chief’ and<sup>146</sup> describes him as being

---

<sup>134</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.31

<sup>135</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.63.2.

<sup>136</sup> Tacitus also uses this word to describe the ‘other’ (Tac. *Hist.* 3.45). Tacitus also uses the word *praepotens* to describe the influence Civilis has over the Batavians (Tac. *Hist.* 1.59).

<sup>137</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.3.8, 1.18.7, 2.1.4, 2.4.7, 7.32.4, 7.39.1.

<sup>138</sup> Livy describes the Gauls as ‘abounding in corn and people’ (*frugum hominumque fertilis*) (Liv. 5.34.2).

<sup>139</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.2.1.

<sup>140</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.18.5.

<sup>141</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.63.2.

<sup>142</sup> Barlow 1998: 142-3, 148, 152-153, 158. I find this argument difficult to accept considering the hypocrisy of Caesar’s own rise to power.

<sup>143</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>144</sup> Smith, *Letter to Maclean* 27 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>145</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 101, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>146</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 26 Feb 1835 in *Autobiography*, reiterated in Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

obeyed by his people with rapidity.<sup>147</sup> He describes Maqoma as ‘influential’.<sup>148</sup> When writing of the chiefs, he occasionally refers to the ‘great’ chief,<sup>149</sup> an acknowledgement of one chief’s authority over other minor chiefs. Smith speaks of Mhala as one who is respected by his people as he is ‘looked up to.’<sup>150</sup> However, he describes Keili’s government as ‘very weak’<sup>151</sup> and despite earlier commenting on Mhala’s influence, he refers to him, in an address, as ‘insignificant’ in relation to his own perceived power over the chiefs.<sup>152</sup> Again, in addressing the chiefs, he tells them how ‘insignificant’ they are.<sup>153</sup> This is a contradiction in that it is evident that Smith acknowledges the power that the chiefs held over their people but portrays their losing of that power<sup>154</sup> as evidence of the success of his efforts to strip them of it,<sup>155</sup> and to project his own delusions of power and influence over them,<sup>156</sup> which at times borders on something reminiscent of a kind of *auctoritas* on his part.<sup>157</sup> He also often refers to the chiefs having little control over their people with regard to stopping thievery or restraining criminal activity,<sup>158</sup> in an

---

<sup>147</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>148</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>149</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 32, 37.

<sup>150</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 86, 87.

<sup>151</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 19 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>152</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 86.

<sup>153</sup> Smith, *Address to Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>154</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17, 19 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*. See also Lehmann (1977: 321), Lester (1998: 236). Mostert argues that the chiefs retained their power of their people the entire time (Mostert 1992: 1009). Likewise, Crais states that Smith was never able to destroy the political structure of the Xhosa (Crais 2001: 144). Lester particularly states that in the province of Queen Adelaide 1835-6, the balance of power was in reality an unsteady balance between government and chiefs, much accommodation having to be made for the chiefs’ still extensive power (Lester 1998: 237 - 245).

<sup>155</sup> Harington 1980: 56-58, 60, 169, Mostert 1992: 763, 772, 1010, Lester 1998: 227, Strobel 2008: 85, Peires 1989: 51, Crais 2001: 118, 144. See also Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 1 Sept 8 Dec 1835. These attempts were part of an attempt to exert direct control over the Xhosa (Lester 1998: 221, Strobel 2008: 78, van Aswegen 1993: 218, Crais 2001: 117). Smith began to consider abandoning the idea of direct control late in his career when it became evident that it was not working (Mostert 1992: 1072, Crais 2001: 145, Lester 1998: 243). It is also important to note that he was given orders on his governorship to rule indirectly through the chiefs (Mostert 1992: 943-952), something which he disregarded (Mostert 1992: 1074).

<sup>156</sup> Lehmann 1977: 187-188, Harington 1980: 39, 59, 104, Mostert 1992: 765, 1046. See also Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 27 Sept, 12 Oct, 23 Nov 1835, 14 Feb, 21 Feb, 29 Mar, 17 April, 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 11 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Corresp.* Despite his initial belief in his own power and influence, scholars argue that it was only through the imposition of martial law and military control that he was able to exert any power of the Xhosa during the occupation of the province of Queen Adelaide (Mostert 1992: 764, 786-7, Lester 1998: 227, 230).

<sup>157</sup> Smith claims a kind of omnipotent ‘ascendency’ over the Xhosa (Harington 1980: 57, Mostert 1992: 764, 767) which is portrayed as stemming from his supposed charismatic authority and their love and admiration for him personally (Harington 1980: 65, see also chapter 4. Footnote 194). Smith even went as far as portraying the chiefs as voluntarily kissing his hand, which according to him was a sign of their admittance of their inferiority to his power (Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 1 Mar, 26 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*), and claimed in one letter that the chiefs were ‘at [his] feet’ (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*, see also Harington 1980: 106, Mostert 1992: 774). In reality any power he had rested solely on martial law and military presence (Harington 1980: 62, Mostert 1992: 952) and it is argued his claims to influence and power were unfounded (Harington 1980: 74) something he refused to accept no matter the resistance he faced (Harington 1980: 77).

<sup>158</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 3 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 71.

---

attempt to explain his inability to curb such activity through the chiefs, whom he is supposed to have power over.

Caesar and Smith both seem to acknowledge the political power and influence the leaders of the ‘other’ had over their own people. However, while Caesar would seem to undermine the ‘other’s’ influence as the wrong kind, Smith makes much more of their overall insignificance under his rule as both evidence of the success of his policies and excuses for his failures. In acknowledging the power of the ‘other’ to influence large groups of people, it is not surprising that the oratorical ability of the ‘other’ is called to our attention.

#### 1.4.1 Oratorical Ability

Although Caesar does not comment overtly on the ‘other’ as being particularly adept at oratory, as other Roman writers do,<sup>159</sup> he does portray Gallic and Germanic leaders as speaking with clarity and political savvy, by the way in which he writes.<sup>160</sup>

Smith, on the other hand, goes to great lengths to comment on the ‘other’s’ oratorical ability and influence. He comments on Mhala’s ability to speak ‘powerfully’.<sup>161</sup> In an address to the chiefs he tells them that they have ‘spoken well’<sup>162</sup> and he writes that some of the Xhosa ‘speak beautifully’.<sup>163</sup> Smith describes Sarili, Boku and Ganya as ‘eloquent’ speakers,<sup>164</sup> the word ‘eloquence’ meaning having the ‘power of speaking with elegance, fluency’ and in such a

---

<sup>159</sup> Cato comments on the ‘wit’ of the Gauls (Gruen 2006: 471). Balsdon notes the generalization of the Gauls as eloquent and keen speakers (Balsdon 1979: 65, 122, 128) According to Isaac, Strabo and Juvenal portray Gaul as a place of learning and rhetoric (Isaac 2004: 420).

<sup>160</sup> Kraus 2009: 166.

<sup>161</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 86, 87.

<sup>162</sup> Smith, *Address to the Kafir Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>163</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p 86. He also acknowledges their singing as ‘exceedingly fine’ and their ‘remarkably good ears’ for music (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p 93.

<sup>164</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4 Aug 1835, 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

manner as to ‘move the passions’.<sup>165</sup> On one occasion he refers to one of Hints’s councillors in particular as a ‘great orator’, and although he then dismisses his words as those of a ‘great humbug’, he acknowledges that the British can ‘humbug too’,<sup>166</sup> and I would argue that in this instance he is acknowledging the skill of the man and, rather than undermining him, is commenting on his disregard for verbose oratory in general. He describes the Xhosa as ‘great lawyers’.<sup>167</sup> He comments on Hints’s ability to ‘argue[d] every point’,<sup>168</sup> intimating he possessed a skill at debating, although he previously mentions that this ability of Hints ‘astonished’ him. He describes one councillor in particular as a man ‘of great ability’ as a lawyer that he would even equate with British examples like Bacon, Thurlow and Eldon.<sup>169</sup> He evidently credits them with knowledge and oratorical ability, despite mentioning that he found this fact ‘surprising’,<sup>170</sup> which gives away his initial assumption that he would not have expected them to be so adept. Smith’s preconceived stereotypes often falter when writing of individuals, and it has been commented on that he was prejudiced, prone to generalize, noting only exceptions as precisely that.<sup>171</sup> He also comments on the chiefs’ knowledge of events and their ability to talk to him of policies, describing them as ‘perfect politicians’.<sup>172</sup>

#### 1.4.2 Disunity

Despite their political ability, the ‘other’ on a large scale is often portrayed as politically divided. Caesar’s picture of the Gauls in the beginning and throughout his commentaries is of division.<sup>173</sup> If Smith had recalled any specific words of Caesar it would have been the famous opening lines

---

<sup>165</sup> Barclay 1811: 332.

<sup>166</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 18 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>167</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 16 June 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>168</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 36.

<sup>169</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 74.

<sup>170</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 15 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>171</sup> Harington 1980: 37.

<sup>172</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 15 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>173</sup> Balsdon 1967: 95. Gruen writes of Caesar’s account as filled with Gallic rivalries and divided loyalties that he could use to his advantage (Gruen 2010: 154).

---

of *de Bello Gallico*, ‘*Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres*’,<sup>174</sup> even if this speaks to ethnic divisions rather than political disunity. Caesar does refer to the discovery of groups within the Aedui who are described as voicing seditious opinions (*seditiosa... oratione*)<sup>175</sup> and remarks on the divided sentiments of Dumnorix and his brother Diviciacus – the former against and the latter in support of Rome.<sup>176</sup> Diviacus is portrayed as describing two parties of Gauls, the Aedui and Arverni between whom there had been a struggle for dominion for many years.<sup>177</sup> He describes intertribal quarrels between the Gauls during his campaign against the Belgae.<sup>178</sup> Divisions between and among tribes are commented on,<sup>179</sup> factions evident at every level.<sup>180</sup> This representation of disunity gives way to unity later in the commentaries from book seven<sup>181</sup> as Caesar mentions the shared fate (*communem... fortunae*)<sup>182</sup> and unanimity (*universae*) of Gaul<sup>183</sup> in his narration of the battles against the Gauls under Vercingetorix. Caesar also notes the intense hatred the Gauls had for the Germans.<sup>184</sup>

Smith early on comments that he regards there not being much union amongst the Xhosa,<sup>185</sup> and refers to ‘contending factions and parties’.<sup>186</sup> He describes Faku and Vadana as harbouring hostile feelings towards each other.<sup>187</sup> He also writes of the ‘division of interests and feelings’ among the confederation of the Galeka tribe.<sup>188</sup> He describes the chieftainship of distant allies as

---

<sup>174</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.1.

<sup>175</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.17.2.

<sup>176</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.18

<sup>177</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.3.

<sup>178</sup> Fuller 1965: 110.

<sup>179</sup> Balsdon 1967: 73, Adcock 1956: 33, Riggsby 2006: 63.

<sup>180</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.3, 2.3.2, 6.11.2-5

<sup>181</sup> Balsdon 1965: 95, Adcock 1956: 45.

<sup>182</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.1.5.

<sup>183</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.76.2. cf. *totius Galliae* (Caes. *B.G.* 7.29.6, 7.63.5).

<sup>184</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.9.7.

<sup>185</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 16 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>186</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 23 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>187</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>188</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

---

‘divided’, hence making a united attack against the Colony ‘out of the question’.<sup>189</sup> He describes the Xhosa as ‘divided in their general combination, under [the British Government] by a variety of conflicting interests’.<sup>190</sup> He describes having caused the cessation of ‘intestine strifes between the chiefs’, alluding to inherent conflict among them.<sup>191</sup> On his second appointment in the Cape Colony he relates a ‘great division among the Gaikas’ on whether or not they were planning or wanted to go to war with the Colony.<sup>192</sup> He later recounts that ‘disunion prevails’ among the Xhosa.<sup>193</sup> Smith refers to an imagined ‘united’ enemy, commenting on the idea or possibility of such an occurrence as ‘contemptible’.<sup>194</sup> It seems as though in this instance he is not referring to the ‘other’ as united but rather acknowledging the danger of them as an enemy should they come together against the Colony. Smith also makes reference to the animosity, hatred and enmity the Mfengu and Xhosa have for each other,<sup>195</sup> quite similar to Caesar’s comment on the Gaul’s hatred of the Germans. Smith also makes much mention of a supposed division between the chiefs and their people, in writing of his intention to rid the chiefs of their power and link with the people.<sup>196</sup>

Many Roman writers, whether explicitly or (in the case of Caesar) implicitly, portray the ‘other’ as divided,<sup>197</sup> according to Balsdon adhering to an image of the northerner prone to rivalries,

---

<sup>189</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 7 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>190</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>191</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>192</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 11 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>193</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 1 May 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>194</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 67.

<sup>195</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 23 Nov, 17 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 66.

<sup>196</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 23, 28 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>197</sup> Livy comments on the division in the Gallic army (Liv. 32.30.3-4, 38.16.2). Strabo describes disunity between the tribes (Strab. 4.3.2). Suetonius mentions discord and unrest (*discordia inquietam*) among the ‘other’ (Suet. *Tib.* 9.1). Tacitus makes the most comment on this aspect, describing the ‘other’ as divided (*dissidere*) (Tac. *Ann.* 1.55) and as suffering from discord (*internis discordiis*) (Tac. *Ann.* 2.26. cf. *Hist.* 4.37, 4.69), which is even ‘admitted’ by the ‘other’ themselves (Tac. *Agr.* 32.1, *Hist.* 4.73). Tacitus describes brothers divided over their political allegiance to Rome (Tac. *Ann.* 2.9-11). cf. *diversis sententiis* (Tac. *Ann.* 1.68), *factionibus* (Tac. *Ann.* 11.16, *Agr.* 12.1), *interna bella* (Tac. *Ann.* 11.16, *Hist.* 4.75) and *seditione domestica* (Tac. *Germ.* 29.1, *Agr.* 24.3). Tacitus represents the ‘other’ as more often than not troubled by dissent (*dissensione*) (Tac. *Agr.* 32.1) and hatred (*odio*) for their own kind (Tac. *Germ.* 33.1). Webster comments on a prevalent image of Celtic internecine conflict and warfare which is commonly portrayed in ancient writings as innate and stemming from a love of warfare (Webster 1996: 111, 118). Gruen also comments on this stereotype (Gruen 2010: 141).

---

quarrelling, division and internecine conflict.<sup>198</sup> It was common Roman practice to exploit divisions and ‘divide and conquer’,<sup>199</sup> as Caesar does at all levels.<sup>200</sup> Likewise, Smith makes reference to the ‘other’ as politically divided. Like Caesar, Smith, particularly among British officials, sought to interfere,<sup>201</sup> exacerbate<sup>202</sup> and cause division among the Xhosa.<sup>203</sup> Portraying the ‘other’ as divided gave the conqueror justification for intervention as they could argue that they brought ‘peace’ to a people in conflict.<sup>204</sup> Interestingly Caesar, almost alone among Roman authors,<sup>205</sup> makes mention of an ‘other’ that was at least partly unified under Vercingetorix, which inevitably served to bolster his victory in defeating such a vast and powerful enemy. But it must be acknowledged that, although various representations served various purposes, it is also possible that he was merely recording situations as they truly were. The Gauls he first encountered were divided and only after many campaigns did they unite in their fight against Rome, when they realised the Romans were there to stay.<sup>206</sup> A link between the unity, or lack thereof, of the ‘other’ and their relationship to the conquering empire emerges. As discussed, disunity often arose as a result of whether or not to collude with or resist the conquerors, and in Caesar’s case, it was evidently his actions and presence that caused the unity of the Gauls which is commented on.

---

<sup>198</sup> Balsdon 1979: 166, 169.

<sup>199</sup> Balsdon 1967: 95

<sup>200</sup> Balsdon 1967: 73, Meier 1995: 316-7, Osgood 2009: 334. Tacitus notes that the Romans greatest advantage in coping with the British tribes was their internal division (Tac. Agr. 12.2).

<sup>201</sup> Smith, *Letters to Durban* 17 Nov, 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>202</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 16 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>203</sup> Harington 1980: 33, 179, Peires 1982: 114, Mostert 1992: 763. See also Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 27 Sept, 1 Nov 1835, 10 April 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 15 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>204</sup> Fuller 1965: 115.

<sup>205</sup> Tacitus does emphasise a confederacy among the ‘other’, particularly the Britons (Tac. Ann. 1.60, Agr. 29-30).

<sup>206</sup> Rosenstein 2009: 91.

---

### 1.5 The Military Capability of the 'Enemy'

Whether or not the 'other' was presented as a political threat, the contest ultimately came down to military strength. As the narrative develops, Caesar describes the 'other' as warlike, aggressive and helpless. He describes the Belgae as the most strong, powerful and brave (*fortissimi*) of the Gauls,<sup>207</sup> however not necessarily of the rest of the known world including the Romans. He also acknowledges the Belgae as the only nation to have prevented the German tribes from entering their borders. But credit for this achievement seems to be reduced by the emphasis which he places on the great airs they put on in memory of those events.<sup>208</sup> In other words those deeds were in the past: the tribe is not necessarily as strong any more.<sup>209</sup> The idea of the Gauls as once powerful but no longer so is reiterated by Caesar's mention of the Gauls' longstanding reputation in war (*veterem belli gloriam*)<sup>210</sup> and his point that wars won by Gauls over Germans belong to the past.<sup>211</sup> It is important to note that he also describes the Belgae as having German origins.<sup>212</sup> Schadee argues that Caesar creates an overall view of distant, strong, warlike and hence threatening peoples, epistomised by the Belgae and Nervii,<sup>213</sup> adhering to a fairly common stereotype of northerners<sup>214</sup> as well as the idea that the more isolated or removed the 'other' was from Roman ways the less weak and corrupt they would be.<sup>215</sup> Contrasting nearer, weaker Gauls with distant hardy Germans,<sup>216</sup> it is not surprising then that Caesar describes the Helvetii as made strong by constant warfare in German territory,<sup>217</sup> with a

---

<sup>207</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.3.

<sup>208</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.4.3.

<sup>209</sup> Tacitus describes the Helvetii in a similar way (Tac. *Hist.* 1.67).

<sup>210</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.1.8. cf. *pristinæ belli laudis* (Caes. *B.G.* 7.76.2).

<sup>211</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.24.6.

<sup>212</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.4.2.

<sup>213</sup> Schadee 2008: 163-165, 175.

<sup>214</sup> Schadee 2008: 163-165, 175, Balsdon 1979: 60-62.

<sup>215</sup> Schadee 2008: 175. Rawlings, in a similar way, comments on Caesar's reduction of the 'other' to a stereotypical idea of increasing savagery and warlikeness in the North (Rawlings 1998: 171-172).

<sup>216</sup> Balsdon 1979: 172

<sup>217</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.4

---

frustrated longing for war in their confined territory (*angustos*).<sup>218</sup> These comments discredit a passing reference to their desiring to establish peace and friendship where they settled,<sup>219</sup> and he goes on to describe them as warlike (*bellicosos*), a great danger and threat to the province they wished to march through, that of the Aedui.<sup>220</sup> In contrast to the image of a ‘dangerous’ Helvetii he describes the Aedui as helpless, incapable of defending themselves or their property from invaders<sup>221</sup> and portrays them as asking for help against the Helvetii.<sup>222</sup> This contrasting image of aggressiveness and helplessness serves to justify Caesar’s attack on the Helvetii. Caesar describes the Germans as ‘unconquered’ (*invicti*)<sup>223</sup> and very strong (*fortissimo*).<sup>224</sup> He describes the Suebi, as the ‘most warlike’ (*bellicosissima*) of the Germans,<sup>225</sup> and later reports other German delegates as claiming that they would not seek war with Rome, but would fight if provoked, yielding only to the Suebi who are described as unconquerable, even by the immortal gods.<sup>226</sup> In reply to these delegates Caesar comments on the Germans’ inability to defend their own territories.<sup>227</sup> In his ethnographic excursus, Caesar describes the Germans as being strong, hardy and concerned with military pursuits.<sup>228</sup> Adcock notes how Caesar generally presents various opposing leaders as formidable, for example Ambiorix, Indutiomarus, Cassivelaunus and particularly Vercingetorix.<sup>229</sup> Caesar describes Vercingetorix as claiming that not even the whole world could resist them<sup>230</sup> which ultimately serves to make the Roman victory over them appear that much greater, that Rome could accomplish what no one else could.

---

<sup>218</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.2.3

<sup>219</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.3.2

<sup>220</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.10.2. The ‘other’ is often described as warlike. For example, Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 33, Sall. *Cat.* 40.1.5.

<sup>221</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.11.2

<sup>222</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.11.3

<sup>223</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.36.7

<sup>224</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.48.5

<sup>225</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.1.3

<sup>226</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.7.4

<sup>227</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.8.2

<sup>228</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.21. Miller and Savage note that by the time of M. Aurelius ‘Germans’ were stereotypically represented as both a potential threat and ‘petty nuisance’ (Miller and Savage 1977: 116).

<sup>229</sup> Adcock 1956: 54; Kraus notes Caesar’s treatment of Vercingetorix in the narrative and the way he is portrayed as a military match for Caesar (Kraus 2009: 171).

<sup>230</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.29.6.

Smith portrays the Xhosa as the unprovoked ‘aggressors’,<sup>231</sup> and overwhelmingly refers to the Xhosa as ‘hostile’.<sup>232</sup> He writes of the ‘hostile state of the [Xhosa] tribes’,<sup>233</sup> and Harington argues that he viewed the Xhosa populations as hostile generally.<sup>234</sup> He presents them as ‘attacking’ British people and troops,<sup>235</sup> and as the invaders,<sup>236</sup> making ‘inroads’,<sup>237</sup> into the Colony. He also describes the Xhosa as ‘war-making’<sup>238</sup> and ‘waging war’ on the Colony.<sup>239</sup> He describes the tribe under Boku as ‘warlike’,<sup>240</sup> and the Xhosa as possessing ‘warlike ability’.<sup>241</sup> The prevailing image he portrays of the Xhosa is one of aggression and instigation. Smith refers to the actions of the Xhosa as ‘annoyances’.<sup>242</sup> He refers to Hints’s confidential man as contemplating ‘mischief’,<sup>243</sup> to Hints himself as ‘meditating some mischief’,<sup>244</sup> and the Xhosa people in general as mischievous.<sup>245</sup> I would argue that the idea of mischievousness has a certain connotation of childishness or pettiness about it. He also writes of Umhala as giving him ‘trouble’,<sup>246</sup> of the Xhosa people as possibly becoming and being ‘troublesome’,<sup>247</sup> and fears that Hints will give them ‘trouble’.<sup>248</sup> The image of the ‘other’ as causing ‘trouble’ seems to imply

<sup>231</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 7 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4 Aug 1835, 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library. See also Lehmann 1977: 199, Harington 1980: 106, Mostert 1992: 716, 732. According to Strobel, the aggressive nature of the Xhosa ‘race’ was blamed for the 1850-53 war by both the settlers and many British officials (Strobel 2008: 86).

<sup>232</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 7 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835, 17, 18 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 56, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 7 Apr, 17 Apr 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853), Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 30 Aug 1851 in *Godlonton Correspondence*.

<sup>233</sup> Smith, *Proclamation* 25 Dec 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>234</sup> Harington 1980: 181.

<sup>235</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.57, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 28 Feb 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Letter to Grey* 6 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>236</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 26 Feb 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 2.

<sup>237</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4, 11 Aug, 7 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p.92, Smith, *Letter to Bowker* 3 Nov 1848 in *Correspondence* (1850). Smith uses the same word to describe his own actions (Smith, *Autobiography* p. 21).

<sup>238</sup> Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>239</sup> Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>240</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 20 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>241</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>242</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 24 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>243</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 37.

<sup>244</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 44.

<sup>245</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 19 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 30 Aug, 5 Dec 1835, 3 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>246</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 83.

<sup>247</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 1 May, 28 July 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 21 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>248</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 9 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

---

something trivial and bothersome rather than a serious threat, and more like the kind of exasperation one might have towards a disobedient child, as well as stressing their role as instigators of trouble, causing harm, vexation and anxiety.<sup>249</sup> Smith also notes the descriptions of a group of Xhosa labourers by other witnesses as ‘a nuisance’,<sup>250</sup> although he himself does not use the word.

In spite of this overwhelming image of the Xhosa as hostile, aggressive and warlike, Smith does not always admit that they were a threat. Smith initially dismisses the Xhosa as a danger,<sup>251</sup> assuming that the Xhosa would be intimidated by colonial military power.<sup>252</sup> He describes them as ‘most contemptible when assailed’,<sup>253</sup> the word ‘contemptible’ meaning that which is ‘worthy of scorn on account of its vileness or insignificance’.<sup>254</sup> Some scholars relate a change in Smith’s estimation of the threat and military ability of his enemies.<sup>255</sup> In a later response to accusations that the Xhosa were helpless victims in an unequal war, Smith describes the Xhosa force which had invaded the Colony in 1835 as ‘formidable’,<sup>256</sup> actually having had the advantage over the British initially.<sup>257</sup> He describes them as armed with guns<sup>258</sup> and later describes their attack as having been ‘irresistible’,<sup>259</sup> acknowledging their position in the dense bush ‘extraordinarily strong’<sup>260</sup> their warriors armed and determined.<sup>261</sup> Early on in his governorship of the Cape,

---

<sup>249</sup> Barclay 1811: 43, 652-3, 690, 938.

<sup>250</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 10 Dec 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>251</sup> Harington 1980: 24, 75, Mostert 1992: 680. Mostert argues that in reality Smith had no real notion of the nature of his enemy and that they were in reality a formidable opposition (Mostert 1992: 685).

<sup>252</sup> Mostert 1992: 664.

<sup>253</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 21 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>254</sup> Barclay 1811: 218.

<sup>255</sup> Lehmann 1977: 333, Harington 1980: 49, 75, Mostert 1992: 691, 695.

<sup>256</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*. Harington notes Smith’s portrayal of the ‘other’ as equal in his defense against accusations of an unfair war (Harington 1980: 65).

<sup>257</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 April 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>258</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*. Glenelg in his estimation of the Xhosa related them as ‘poorly armed’ (Lehmann 1977: 195). In reality the Xhosa were increasingly accumulating and using firearms in their confrontation with the British (Lehmann 1977: 343, Harington 1980: 106, 173, Wilson 1969: 242, Arndt 2010: 724).

<sup>259</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 11.

<sup>260</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 27.

<sup>261</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* 58, 66. D’Urban also describes the others as ‘armed and determined’ (D’Urban, *Letter* 21 May 1835 in *Autobiography*)

Smith regarded Sandile, and others as ‘harmless’<sup>262</sup> and was confident that there would not be another recurrence of hostility,<sup>263</sup> although if there was he claimed he could end it in ten days.<sup>264</sup> On the outbreak of another war, on being besieged at Fort Cox and faced with another war, his attitude changed.<sup>265</sup> He describes them as ‘well-armed’,<sup>266</sup> ‘formidable’<sup>267</sup> and that they ‘[couldn’t] be subdued without time and means’.<sup>268</sup> He writes that ‘no measure, no law, no battle can at once subdue’ the Gaikas, and goes on to advocate daily coercion and a large military force to ensure their ‘insignificancy’.<sup>269</sup> He still asserts that he will subdue them but ‘not in one moment’.<sup>270</sup> He again refers to a strong and formidable Xhosa people,<sup>271</sup> in an attempt to influence governmental policy against placing large numbers of Mfengu on the border of the Colony as they would be added to this force.<sup>272</sup> He occasionally refers to the ‘other’ as desirous of peace,<sup>273</sup> although he uses this during his campaigns as more of an indication that they have been tired out and defeated in battle and are ready to submit.

Both Caesar and Smith draw on the representation of the ‘other’ as an aggressive warlike people. Caesar, like many other Roman writers,<sup>274</sup> describes the ‘other’ as formidable, warlike and

<sup>262</sup> Harington 1980: 101.

<sup>263</sup> Harington 1980: 173-4, Mostert 1992: 1014.

<sup>264</sup> Harington 1980: 176.

<sup>265</sup> Harington 1980: 183, Mostert 1992: 1063. Davenport argues that it was not until 1852 that Smith really began to get a measure of his opponents (Davenport 1991:120).

<sup>266</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to the Duke of Wellington* 19 Dec 1851 [MS 617] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Correspondence*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>267</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 15 Jan 1851, 7 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Correspondence*, Smith, *Memorandum* 14 Jan 1852, *Letters to Grey* 7 April 1852, 17 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also Harington 1980: 185, 188. He also refers to the Khoi in this war as ‘formiddable’ and their combination with the Xhosa even more so (Harington 1980: 205, 209-210)

<sup>268</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to the Duke of Wellington* 19 Dec 1851 [MS 617] Cory Library.

<sup>269</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Correspondence*.

<sup>270</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Correspondence*.

<sup>271</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)

<sup>272</sup> Smith also refers to the Mfengu as potentially formidable, should they be placed on the border and become enemies to the Colony (Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)).

<sup>273</sup> For example, Smith, *Letter to Juana* 18 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Aug, 30 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan, 20 Jan, 16 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853), *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Correspondence*.

<sup>274</sup> Tacitus describes the Britons as inclined to war (*bella faciles*) (Tac. *Agr.* 21.1) and the northern Britons as distinguished in war (*clari bello*) (Tac. *Agr.* 29.4). He describes the renown and power of the German leader as based on war and risk (Tac. *Germ.* 14, *Ann.* 1.57). Tacitus attributes their wealth to war and plunder and portrays the Germans so eager for war that they would rather acquire by blood what they could have acquired by hard work (Tac. *Germ.* 14.4). Tacitus portrays German culture as influenced or revolving around war: Business transactions are carried out in the presence of arms and weapons (Tac. *Germ.* 13.1, 22.1), wedding presents are most often in the form of weapons (Tac. *Germ.* 18.3), and their sports, a dance amid swords and lances (Tac. *Germ.* 24.1). Tacitus portrays the Germans as delighting in war (*laeta bello*) (Tac. *Hist.* 4.16) and

---

aggressive, a common trope of the ‘northerner’.<sup>275</sup> Caesar, however, distinguishes between the nearer Gauls and further Germanic peoples in this regard. Where the nearer Gauls are concerned, Caesar describes them as once, but no longer, powerful and threatening,<sup>276</sup> as they had been represented in the past,<sup>277</sup> as a result of the legacy of having attacked Rome in 390 BC, and invaded Italy in 231 BC.<sup>278</sup> Caesar seems to firmly dismiss this ‘great threat’ portraying the ‘other’ as defenceless, something that Smith does not do as he does not use appeals for help from the ‘other’ as a reason for interference,<sup>279</sup> unlike Caesar, who states at one instance that the Aedui were so unable to look after their own that they asked Caesar for help.<sup>280</sup> While Caesar portrays the Gauls as helpless, he portrays the Germans as a threat.<sup>281</sup> Scholars argue that Caesar intentionally portrayed the Germans as a threat to be feared<sup>282</sup> and constantly brought to the reader’s attention the memory of the invasion of Italy by the Cimbri and Teutones,<sup>283</sup> all in order either to justify his campaigns and actions against them,<sup>284</sup> or as a reason why they had not yet been conquered or subjected.<sup>285</sup> According to Miller and Savage ‘great victories demand greater foes’.<sup>286</sup> One could argue, as Tacitus does when he refers to Emperor Nero, that he describes

---

born to arms (*ad arma natis*) (Tac. *Hist.* 4.64). cf. Cic. *Font.* 44, Plb. 22.21.4, Strab. 4.4.2, Plut. *Caes.* 20.4, *Mar.* 11.5, 19.2, Liv. 24.42.6, 38.17.1. Gruen comments on Tacitus’ use of this image of bellicose Germans in the *Germania* in contrasting one tribe against another, portraying some as even too peaceful to the point of foolishness, and in these ways ultimately deconstructing the stereotype (Gruen 2010: 165-66). Webster comments on this persistent image of innate Celtic aggressiveness and argues that it was in reality more likely increased militarisation as a result of Roman annexation (Webster 1996: 114-5, 118-119).

<sup>275</sup> Riggsby notes Roman authors’ depiction of northerners as warlike, *bellicose* with a tendency to start wars (Riggsby 2006: 57). Balsdon comments on the fact that Rome were never portrayed as the aggressors (Balsdon 1979: 4).

<sup>276</sup> The portrayal of the Gauls as once terrifying foes was a common stereotype of the people, due to the memory of the sack of Rome (Gruen 2006: 460, Balsdon 1979: 3). Smith describes the Mfengu as ‘powerless’, after acknowledging them as once a powerful nation, but no more having been beaten in war by other African groups (Smith, *Autobiography* p. 33).

<sup>277</sup> Cicero describes them once as able and willing to make war on Rome (Cic. *Cat.* 3.22) and at another as a great threat and power that might renew war, a great danger to the Roman Empire (Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 33, 34). Livy uses the words like *metus* and *terror* to describe the Gauls (Liv. 5.17.10, 6.42.7, 10.26.13, 21.25.3, 38.16.13). Velleius Paterculus describes them as feared by Rome (Vell. 2.109.1). Tacitus describes the Britons as a great formidable force (Tac. *Agr.* 35.3) and Plutarch describes the ‘other’ as feared by the Romans (Plut. *Cam.* 41.6, *Marc.* 3.2, *Caes.* 26.1).

<sup>278</sup> Meier 1995: 237, 241, Isaac 2004: 411, Gruen 2006: 471.

<sup>279</sup> Smith only once refers to the Mfengu as defenseless ‘poor wretches’ who sought British protection (Smith, *Letter to Juana* 2 May 1835 in *Autobiography*).

<sup>280</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 1.11. As suggested by Richard Evans, this ‘helplessness’ may rather have been politically rather than militarily helpless. Tacitus also mentions the enemy as inviting Rome for help with internal troubles (Tac. *Hist.* 4.73).

<sup>281</sup> Isaac 2004: 439.

<sup>282</sup> Meier 1995: 241.

<sup>283</sup> The memory of this encounter is said to have had quite an impact on Romans and were therefore often perceived as dangerous opponents (Meier 1995: 241). Balsdon notes the hysteria that followed the annihilation of Roman legions in Germany (Balsdon 1979: 99). See also Balsdon 1967: 71.

<sup>284</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 110-111.

<sup>285</sup> Isaac 2004: 437.

<sup>286</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 122.

---

them in this manner in order to make his victories seem all the greater.<sup>287</sup> Smith, while commenting on the ‘other’s’ warlike ability,<sup>288</sup> emphasises their role as aggressors and instigators of conflict using this image to justify his campaign against them.<sup>289</sup> The view of the ‘other’ as an actual threat is something that Smith did not expect. His admission of it is rare and depends on the purpose of his argument, sometimes possibly to make his supposed success the greater, like Caesar, but also to explain why in 1852 his conflict with them seemed unending. It is not surprising then that the ‘other’ is portrayed to a much lesser extent as ‘peaceable’ by Caesar and Smith, as by other Roman writers.<sup>290</sup> Regardless of the love for war which the ‘other’ supposedly possessed, the estimation of the ‘other’ as a military threat also depended on the possession or lack of a variety of qualities, such as physical strength, practical skills, numbers, organisation, as well as courage. The representation of this last quality will be discussed in the next chapter.

### 1.5.1 Physical Abilities

Caesar comments a few times on the huge body size (*magnitudo corporum*) of the Gauls and Germans.<sup>291</sup> However, these comments are more often than not qualified by remarks about a supposed lack of physical endurance in spite of their size and power. Caesar refers to the weariness of the Gauls in a battle (*defatigatione*) and describes the general spirit (*animus*) of the Gauls as feeble despite an initial eagerness for war.<sup>292</sup> He later perpetuates this idea, commenting

---

<sup>287</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.36.

<sup>288</sup> Arndt notes the representation of the ‘other’ as possessing martial strength common in early British military discourse (Arndt 2010: 712, 725).

<sup>289</sup> Harington 1980: 106. The Xhosa are reported to have accused the British of being the ‘aggressors’ (Mostert 1992: 1031).

<sup>290</sup> Liv. 39.54.6. cf. Strab. 4.1.5, 7.2.2. Tacitus only describes the furthest tribes of Germania as without violence, not provoking war, and having a love of peace (Tac. *Germ.* 35-36).

<sup>291</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.39.1, 2.30.4, 4.1, 7.42

<sup>292</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.19. See also Gruen 2010: 148.

---

on the inability of the Gauls to bear their attack for long.<sup>293</sup> Caesar also remarks once on the speed (*velocissimi*)<sup>294</sup> of the Gauls.<sup>295</sup>

Smith at times makes reference to the physical ability and size of the Xhosa. He describes one Xhosa man as ‘athletic’ and over six feet tall,<sup>296</sup> and often describes Xhosa men as ‘athletic’,<sup>297</sup> a word meaning at the time ‘strong, vigorous and active of body’.<sup>298</sup> Smith portrays Maqoma as referring to his own men as ‘strong’,<sup>299</sup> although this is portrayed as the word of the ‘other’. He also describes the Xhosa against whom he was fighting as ‘brawny savages’,<sup>300</sup> alluding to great strength and robustness.<sup>301</sup>

Caesar and Smith here describe the physical ability of the ‘other’ in very different ways. Caesar’s particular descriptions of the large stature, tall and muscular bodies,<sup>302</sup> but weak endurance<sup>303</sup> of

---

<sup>293</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.35.2.

<sup>294</sup> Tacitus uses the word *velocitas* to describe the German infantry (Tac. *Germ.* 6.4)

<sup>295</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.48.5.

<sup>296</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 15 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>297</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 July 1835, *Letter to Duke Wellington* 14 May 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 39, 67, Smith, H., *Letter to the Duke of Wellington* 19 Dec 1851 [MS 617] Cory Library, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>298</sup> Barclay 1811: 66.

<sup>299</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 27 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>300</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 57.

<sup>301</sup> Barclay 1811: 119.

<sup>302</sup> Other Roman writers also describe Britons, Gauls and Germans as possessing huge bodies. Livy comments on the large bodies of the Gauls often (Liv. 5.44.4, 7.9.8, 7.10.7, 7.26.1, 22.46.5, 38.17.3) and on the weight of a particular fallen Gaul and the amount of space he takes up on the ground (Liv. 7.10.10). Strabo comments on the large physique of the Gauls and Britons (Strabo *Geog.* 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.5.2) and that the Germans were taller than even the Celts (Strab. 7.1.2). Velleius comments on the huge tall bodies of the Germans (Vell. 2.106.1). Tacitus comments on the huge figure and broad extensive limbs of the Germans and the tallness of the Britons (Tac. *Ann.* 1.64, 2.21, *Agr.* 11.2, *Hist.* 5.14, 5.18, *Germ.* 4.2). Suetonius alludes to the tallness of Germans (Suet. *Calig.* 47.1). Plutarch also comments on the assumed large stature of the Gauls and Germans (Plut. *Marc.* 7.1, *Mar.* 11.3). Cicero remarks on the *robora* of the Gauls (Cic. *Har. Resp.* 19).

<sup>303</sup> Other Roman writers also comment on them as incapable of enduring battle, suffering or disease. Cicero describes the ‘other’ as wailing like women in sickness (Cic. *Tusc.* 2.65) and comments generally on ‘barbarians’ as fighting desperately to the end with the sword but unable to behave like men in sickness (Cic. *Tusc.* 2.65). Frequently in connection with the Gauls, Livy uses the words *fessus* and *taedium* (Liv. 5.44.5, 22.2.7, 27.48.16, 36.38.4, 38.27.1), their bodies soft and intolerant to disease, heat, labour and thirst (Liv. 5.48.3, 10.28.4, 27.48.16, 34.47.5, 35.5.7, 38.17.7). Livy also writes of how the Gauls did not expect the Romans to be able to endure chill and hunger (Liv. 38.19.4), but the narrative shows the Romans had the endurance. Like Cicero, Livy comments on the feminine weakness of the Gauls (Liv. 10.28.5). He describes them later as not being able to endure even the first attacks from the Romans (Liv. 38.27.4). Valerius Maximus writes of the ‘other’ as ‘lamenting’ when they are ill (Val. Max. 2.6.11). Tacitus writes of the ‘other’ as lacking the stamina to support a wound (Tac. *Ann.* 2.14), not being able to endure work, thirst or heat (Tac. *Germ.* 4.2, *Hist.* 2.93), unable to endure change in country and climate (Tac. *Hist.* 2.32) and vulnerable to disease (Tac. *Hist.* 2.93). Plutarch portrays the ‘other’ as weakened by siege, lack of supplies, diseased and dying (Plut. *Cam.* 28.1-2).

---

the Britons, Gauls and Germans, are similar to other Roman writers' descriptions,<sup>304</sup> and largely adhere to particular classical stereotypes about 'northerners',<sup>305</sup> although Kraus argues that Caesar veers away from the comically stereotyped oversized northerner,<sup>306</sup> and does not relate these traits to climate or geography as was common,<sup>307</sup> but to lifestyle and diet, thus revealing a degree of independent thinking.<sup>308</sup> Smith seems to make unqualified mention of the physical ability of the 'other'. I would argue Smith's descriptions were based largely on observation, as Caesar's may have been, and not on any common racial stereotype, particularly as the emphasis on 'athleticism' relates to the kind of guerrilla warfare and swift ambush tactics he was faced with, as opposed to the formal warfare he would have been more used to.

### 1.5.2 Great Numbers

Caesar, like many Roman writers<sup>309</sup>, writes of the great numbers<sup>310</sup> of the 'other', with such words as *milia*<sup>311</sup> and *multitudo*.<sup>312</sup> He describes the Gauls as being able to call up fresh replacements when others tired of fighting,<sup>313</sup> and the Suebi and Ubii as numerous.<sup>314</sup> Hirtius also portrays the 'other' as being a great *multitudo*.<sup>315</sup> The emphasis implied in these kinds of portrayals is in comparison between such a large force of the 'other' and a relatively smaller

---

<sup>304</sup> Livy writes that the Gauls' physical power and courage, effective only in attacks, weakened (*languesceret*) if they had to wait even for a short time (Liv. 7.12.11. cf 7.23.10, 38.27.1). See also footnotes 302 and 303.

<sup>305</sup> Balsdon 1979, Long 1986: 2, 60-62, 214, Isaac 2004: 412, Kraus 2009: 165, Riggsby 2006: 49, 62, Gruen 2006: 471. Schadee and Gruen remark specifically on Caesar's use of these stereotypes (Schadee 2008: 163, 165, Gruen 2010: 141).

<sup>306</sup> Kraus 2009: 166.

<sup>307</sup> Many ancient writers subscribed to various versions of environmental theory which assumed relation between geography and human qualities, for example in Herodotus, Hippocrates, Polybius, Posidonius, Vitruvius, and to an extent in Livy, Strabo and Pliny and referred to by Cicero (Isaac 2004: 56-109). cf. Tac. *Agr.* 11. See also Gruen 2006: 473. Meiners in the 1780s wrote of the Celts as once able to conquer parts of the world yet more sensitive to heat and cold, and fall more easily prey to sickness (Jahoda 1999: 66). Albertus Magnus linked Africans' black colour, curly hair and forward projection of the jaw to the consequences of a hot climate (Jahoda 1999: 34). Later Some nineteenth Century evolutionists also made links between human development to environmental conditions rather than biology (Jahoda 1999: 134).

<sup>308</sup> Isaac 2004: 97.

<sup>309</sup> Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 32, 34, Liv. 5.34.5, 5.38.1, 6.42.7, 21.25.14, 33.36.4, 35.3.5, 38.16.1, Vell. 2.120.4, Val. Max. 3.2.23, Tac. *Ann.* 2.12, 14.32, *Agr.* 17.1, 25.4, 29.4, 32.2, Plut. *Cam.* 15.1, 18.3, 40.1, *Marc.* 6.2, *Mar.* 11.2, 18.1, 19.2, *Caes.* 24.1, 25.2, 26.4, 27.2. Adcock notes the tendency of most ancient generals to consciously or subconsciously exaggerate the numbers of the enemy (Adcock 1956: 27).

<sup>310</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 2.4.5.

<sup>311</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 1.48.5.

<sup>312</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 2.8.1, 2.15.1, 3.2.1, 7.76.6.

<sup>313</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 3.4.

<sup>314</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 4.1.4, 4.3.

<sup>315</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 8.9.2.

---

number of Romans<sup>316</sup> who in the end were able to defeat them, which inevitably makes the Romans look that much more impressive.

Great numbers of Xhosa are, likewise, commented on over and over again by Smith. During the conflict in 1835 he describes the Xhosa as a ‘considerable number’<sup>317</sup> and ‘numerous’.<sup>318</sup> He gives a figure of 4000 warriors in one encounter<sup>319</sup> and upwards of 10 000 warriors in another,<sup>320</sup> later describes the British as surrounded by ‘thousands’.<sup>321</sup> The number later increases to ‘20 000 warriors’ as he attempts to refute the accusation that the contest was unequal,<sup>322</sup> also describing the Xhosa warriors at an assembly to discuss peace terms as ‘4000’, with a ‘numerous cavalry’.<sup>323</sup> He describes the Xhosa that attacked the Colony as numerous ‘hordes’.<sup>324</sup> Mostert makes the point that the mass of the enemy was referred to ‘merely’ as hordes of savages, diminishing them as a threat, assuming their only advantage was in their numbers while the British were supposedly superior in other ways.<sup>325</sup> Smith mentions a ‘considerable body’ of Xhosa again, fighting against the British whom they, with the help of a Khoi battalion, drove off, killing many and seizing thousands of cattle.<sup>326</sup> He refers frequently to the ‘immense numbers’ and ‘many hundreds’ of his adversaries threatening to attack,<sup>327</sup> making his defeats of the ‘other’ during this war seem all the more glorious. When put in charge of Queen Adelaide Province, he at first estimates the number of Xhosa under his control as ‘50 000’<sup>328</sup> and later as ‘70 000’<sup>329</sup>

---

<sup>316</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.8.1.

<sup>317</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>318</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 11, 16 Aug, 30 Nov 1835, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Mostert 1992: 736.

<sup>319</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>320</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>321</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*. He also uses the word later to describe the amount of warriors he faced (Smith *Letter to Godlonton* 10 Feb 1837 in *Godlonton Corresp.*)

<sup>322</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>323</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>324</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*. He uses the word ‘hordes’ again in Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Apr 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>325</sup> Mostert 1992: 694.

<sup>326</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 31.

<sup>327</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 54, 56, 63, 65.

<sup>328</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 26 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

---

and the population of the Gaika's to amount to more than '55 000'.<sup>330</sup> He refers to 'numerous' Xhosa assembled at his meetings.<sup>331</sup> On the imminent abandonment of the province, Smith remarks on it as 'extensive and populous, in which 10 000 warriors could assemble in two days.'<sup>332</sup> Reflecting back in his autobiography, he refers to 'upwards of 100 000' of the Xhosa who were under his control,<sup>333</sup> essentially giving the impression of the vastness of the power he held over so many. Scholars have noted Smith's generally tendency to exaggerate, especially with numbers,<sup>334</sup> and Lester puts the number of Xhosa under his command in Queen Adelaide as 73 800.<sup>335</sup> During his last conflict with the Xhosa he describes them as 'numerous hordes',<sup>336</sup> using word 'horde' fairly often during this campaign.<sup>337</sup> He comments on a 'great number' of Xhosa gathered to sue for peace.<sup>338</sup> When Smith refers to a considerable, numerous enemy in his description of the unsettled campaign against the Xhosa, counting '20 000 to 25 000' warriors,<sup>339</sup> he is trying explain his continuing inability to put down the war, while at the same time, however, attempting in his correspondence to create the impression that in spite of the 'great numbers' what victories they had were considerable, managing to kill thousands<sup>340</sup> in spite of the reality.

### 1.5.3. Practical Skills

Physical strength and large masses would not have been viewed as enough to win battles, with skill and training in the art of warfare just as, if not more important to the Romans. Caesar

---

<sup>329</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Nov, 8 Dec 1835, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>330</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>331</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 9 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>332</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 16 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>333</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 77, 94.

<sup>334</sup> Harington 1980: 21, 23, 39.

<sup>335</sup> Lester 1998: 227.

<sup>336</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to the Duke of Wellington* 19 Dec 1851 [MS 617] Cory Library.

<sup>337</sup> Smith, *Letters to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>338</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>339</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>340</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

---

comments fairly often on the Gauls' and Germans' skill at war, but uses various means to undermine these comments, if not dismissing them entirely. Caesar twice refers to the Germans as *exercitissimi*,<sup>341</sup> trained, disciplined<sup>342</sup> in arms, although he goes on to narrate how they were defeated. A Gaul, Camulogenus, is described by him as possessing unparalleled knowledge (*singularem scientiam*)<sup>343</sup> of warfare, but by noting that he is singled out by his own kind in this way, Caesar is distancing himself from the praise of a Gaul. This comment on his exceptional knowledge or skill<sup>344</sup> in warfare in particular is also later qualified by the fact that Caesar defeats the Gauls and would therefore be assumed to have even greater skill in warfare. Caesar does go as far as to refer to Gauls in one instance as 'being ignorant and inexperienced',<sup>345</sup> (*inscientia*)<sup>346</sup> in warfare, compared to the Romans. He also describes the Germans as *imperitos*,<sup>347</sup> inexperienced and ignorant,<sup>348</sup> later using the same word to describe the Gauls' lack of experience of strategy and siege operations.<sup>349</sup> He describes the cavalry and charioteers of the Britons as proving inferior to the Roman troops (*nostris... superiores*).<sup>350</sup> Caesar also a few times remarks on the Gauls' superior skill at ship-faring<sup>351</sup> and twice refers to the *scientia* of the Massilian ship pilots.<sup>352</sup> This acknowledgement seems for once to go unqualified, understandably so, as Caesar's own Roman ships did not initially stand up to the Gallic standards

---

<sup>341</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.36.7, 1.39.1.

<sup>342</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 684.

<sup>343</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.57.3.

<sup>344</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 1642.

<sup>345</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 962.

<sup>346</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.19.3.

<sup>347</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.10.2.

<sup>348</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 900.

<sup>349</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.29.3. Rawlings argues that this perception of military incompetence was more than likely merely that – perception – and that there are possible alternative readings of the situation from the perspective of the 'other', other means and strategies of warfare (Rawlings 1998: 174–176). Tacitus does once admit to these alternative kinds of possibilities (See chapter 2, footnote 135)

<sup>350</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 5.15.1.

<sup>351</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.12–13. Strabo also comments on the Massiliotes' skill in making instruments and equipment of ships (Strab. 4.1.5).

<sup>352</sup> Caes. *B.C.* 1.58.

---

of ship making.<sup>353</sup> Schadee comments on this skill as evidence of the ‘other’ as rational human beings,<sup>354</sup> and would also have been important in naval warfare.

Smith very rarely emphasizes the Xhosa people’s skill at arms<sup>355</sup> and when he does it seems to be in reference to more sinister skills. He portrays Nomsa as talking of her ‘inexperience and inability’.<sup>356</sup> When he is attempting to refute the accusation that the war against Hintsas was ‘unequal’, he describes the Xhosa warriors as ‘expert’.<sup>357</sup> Smith only once describes the Xhosa as having ‘warlike ability’.<sup>358</sup> He also describes the Xhosa as being ‘expert’ at driving off cattle,<sup>359</sup> but one should realize that he is commenting on their exceptional ability to commit a crime. In the same way he describes them as ‘dexterous’ in their ability to elude his capture and feign attacks so as to attack from another direction.<sup>360</sup>

Caesar, like other Roman writers,<sup>361</sup> makes much comment on the ‘other’s’ skill at war, although that skill is portrayed as still ultimately inferior of what the Romans were capable of. Smith, on the other hand, makes little mention of the military skills of the ‘other’ and when he does the stress is on criminality.

---

<sup>353</sup> Fuller 1965: 117.

<sup>354</sup> Schadee, 2008: 166.

<sup>355</sup> Smith does comment on the Mfengu as ‘far superior’ at carrying out police duties to Europeans, however, he carries on to explain that he thinks the reason for this is that the Mfengu are easier to control, essentially more subdued, and that they work for less pay, which tells us more about their status in society than their ability to do the job (Smith, *Letter to Grey* 2 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)).

<sup>356</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>357</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>358</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 2 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>359</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 56.

<sup>360</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 57.

<sup>361</sup> Polybius describes Ortiagon, a Gaul, as ‘skilful in the art of war’ (Plb. 22.21.4). Livy comments on the Gauls as ‘raw in the art of attacking towns’ (*ad oppugnandarum urbium artes rudis*) (Liv. 21.25.6) and lacking skill (*nec arte*) in stone-throwing (Liv. 38.21.6). Tacitus comments on the Germans’ skill (*artem*) in swords and lances (Tac. *Germ.* 24.1) and uses the same word to describe the Britons’ skill in using their swords and shields (Tac. *Agr.* 36.1). Plutarch describes the Gauls in general as outstanding in cavalry warfare (Plut. *Marc.* 6.4), but also describes them as having no skill in sword craft (Plut. *Cam.* 40.3). Other kinds of skills are also mentioned by other Roman sources. Livy admits – if a little patronisingly – that the Gauls have some artistic skill: *vasis, non infabre suo more factis* (Liv. 36.40.12). Tacitus alludes to Civilis’ attempts at engineering (Tac. *Hist.* 5.14), but also describes the Germans in general as illiterate (Tac. *Germ.* 2.3). He also describes them as ignorant (*ignotum*) of money-lending (Tac. *Germ.* 26.1), but this lack of knowledge was not necessarily viewed by Tacitus as something negative, similarly when he comments on the Britons’ supposed lack of skill in collecting pearls (Tac. *Agr.* 12.6). Strabo also comments, however, on the Britons’ lack of skill and experience in gardening and agriculture (Strab. 4.5.2). Tacitus describes the Batavians as diligent and learned (*artem... studio*) at swimming (Tac. *Ann.* 2.8, *Hist.* 4.12), the Britons’ national experience in swimming (Tac. *Agr.* 18.4), and the Germans as being accustomed to streams and waters (Tac. *Hist.* 5.14). Plutarch describes some Gauls as being excellent at mountaineering (Plut. *Cam.* 26.2).

---

#### 1.5.4 Disorder and Lack of Discipline

Linked to the perception of the ‘other’ as being inexperienced in war, is Caesar’s description of the ‘other’ as disorderly and undisciplined.<sup>362</sup> He describes the departure of a group of Gauls as without order or command (*nullo certo ordine neque imperio*),<sup>363</sup> implying a lack of discipline or leadership.<sup>364</sup> Hirtius repeats this idea of disorder when he describes a column of the ‘other’ as *perturbatum et confusum*.<sup>365</sup> Caesar also refers to the Germans as lacking discipline (*nullo officio aut disciplina*).<sup>366</sup> However, he does mention the orders, commands, line, rank and file of the Gauls,<sup>367</sup> implying the existence of order among them<sup>368</sup>, as well as using words such as *paratus* and *instructus*<sup>369</sup> in connection with their war preparations, which lends itself to the idea of a certain amount of organization.

Smith makes only one specific mention of the Xhosa’s actions as disorderly<sup>370</sup> but focuses quite a lot on their discipline or obedience<sup>371</sup> in general. He describes Pato and his captain as ‘well-behaved fellows’.<sup>372</sup> He describes the kind of warfare carried out by the Xhosa as of a ‘desultory’ nature,<sup>373</sup> which can refer to a kind of unsettled<sup>374</sup> disorder. In the same letter he refers to them as

---

<sup>362</sup> See also Fuller 1965: 99, Barlow 1998: 139. Balsdon notes the ‘undisciplined’ northerner as a fairly common trope (Balsdon 1979: 60).

<sup>363</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.11.1.

<sup>364</sup> cf. Livy: *nec certa imperia nec duces* (Liv. 7.24.8) and *turbatis* (Liv. 38.26.8), Tacitus: *non ordines, non in unum consulere* (Tac. *Hist.* 1.68), *ne duces quidem in unum consulere* (Tac. *Hist.* 4.70) and *inconditam turbam* (Tac. *Hist.* 4.67), and the chaotic display by the ‘other’ which the Romans encountered when they crossed to Mona (Tac. *Ann.* 14.30).

<sup>365</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 8.14.2.

<sup>366</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.1.9. Tacitus echoes this when he describes the Germans as not disciplined (Tac. *Germ.* 25.2). However, both Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus comment on the Roman discipline adopted by the ‘other’ at times (Vell. 2.109.1, Tac. *Germ.* 30.2), here acknowledging the ‘other’ capable of discipline but associating it with what is considered ‘Roman’ not ‘other’.

<sup>367</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 5.34.1.

<sup>368</sup> Plutarch described the ‘other’ as acting in a disciplined way in spite of having had too much food and wine (Plut. *Mar.* 19.3).

<sup>369</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.59.5.

<sup>370</sup> Glenelg in his accusations of D’Urban and Smith’s campaign against the Xhosa, dismissed the Xhosa as a threat and highlighted their ‘disorganisation’ (Lehmannn 1977: 195).

<sup>371</sup> Smith comments to a great extent on the ‘conduct’ and ‘behaviour’ of the Xhosa (Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 27 Sept, 5 Oct, 29, 30 Nov, 13, 15 Dec 1835, 10 Jan, 9 Feb, 25 Mar, 3, 18 Apr, 17 May, 8 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 15 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Correspondence*). See also Harington 1980: 180, Lehmannn 1977: 321.

<sup>372</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 16 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>373</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 5 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>374</sup> Barclay 1811: 276.

---

‘undisciplined’.<sup>375</sup> Smith also refers to the Xhosa groups several times as having become ‘unruly’,<sup>376</sup> alluding to them as undisciplined or ungovernable. He goes even further to refer to them as acting with ‘disobedience’,<sup>377</sup> however it should be noted that this is in reference to their disobedience to Smith’s own orders. At other times he acknowledges the tribes as ‘orderly’ and ‘obedient’.<sup>378</sup> He does acknowledge once that the Xhosa were ‘well prepared’ for battle.<sup>379</sup>

More often than not, both Caesar and Smith comment on the ‘other’ as undisciplined. Regarding Caesar this was largely drawing on a contrast with his own troops whom he portrayed as disciplined and ordered, or at least as capable of being restored to order,<sup>380</sup> thereby pointing out a military weakness in the ‘other’. Smith, however, ultimately sets the focus on himself. Although his actions should be seen against the background of nineteenth Century associations between the idea of disorder and the ‘other’,<sup>381</sup> his focus was on the ‘obedience’ to his rule, rather than the organization of the opposing army, which in turn is connected with his efforts to place the Xhosa under his direct rule and supervision.

### 1.6 The ‘Other’ Incapable of Defeating the Empire

As has become evident, regardless of any capabilities that are attributed to the ‘other’, they are ultimately portrayed as still inferior, the evidence of which lies in the narrative of their defeat. Caesar at times describes the enemy as fighting desperately, with no hope of safety or victory.<sup>382</sup>

---

<sup>375</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 5 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>376</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 71, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 10 Dec 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Reply to Xhosa Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>377</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>378</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.79, 99.

<sup>379</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 17 March 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>380</sup> Kraus 2009: 167.

<sup>381</sup> Berndt and Berndt 1971: 22.

<sup>382</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.27.3, 2.33.4. cf. Liv. 5.43.1. Livy writes of the Gauls when victorious as amazed and awed at their own victory as if they would not expect to win over Romans (Liv. 5.39.1). Strabo comments on the Britons as not being strong enough to attack Romans (Strab. 2.5.8) and Tacitus describes the enemy as making a half serious and weak attack on the Romans (Tac. *Ann.* 1.51) and in another instance as possessing inferior weapons (Tac. *Agr.* 35-38)

Defeat of the ‘other’ is portrayed as inevitable. As opposing forces, the Germans, Gauls and Britons are overwhelmingly described by Caesar as defeated by the Romans. He describes the Gauls as *superati*,<sup>383</sup> and *victi*.<sup>384</sup> He describes the Romans as killing as many of the Gauls as daytime allowed.<sup>385</sup> Caesar also describes the ‘other’ as retreating (*terga verterunt*)<sup>386</sup> or fleeing (*fuga*),<sup>387</sup> leaving the impression of the Romans as successful.<sup>388</sup> In the last example, connected to the idea of fleeing and defeat is dispersion (*dispersos*).<sup>389</sup> However, it should also be noted that Caesar quite often acknowledges the instances where the *Romans* are almost defeated or overcome by ‘other’.<sup>390</sup> The battle against the Gauls under Vercingetorix was definitely not portrayed as an easy win.<sup>391</sup> Balsdon notes the general portrayal in Roman sources of Roman success over the ‘other’, despite disasters which did occur.<sup>392</sup>

Smith also describes the fighting of the Xhosa against the British as ‘desperate’ attempts,<sup>393</sup> to inevitably be defeated. He describes the Xhosa towards the end of his first campaign as ‘desperate from despair’.<sup>394</sup> In letters to his wife, Smith comments on the ‘other’ as ‘fly[ing]’ from the sight of one of their own after having beaten the Xhosa out of the area<sup>395</sup> and how he ‘gave them a good licking’<sup>396</sup> in the Fish River bush so that they were all ‘flying’ into Hintza’s

<sup>383</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.7.1, 4.27.1.

<sup>384</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.7.1, 7.29.2.

<sup>385</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.11.6.

<sup>386</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.35.3.

<sup>387</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.27.1, 6.35.6. Other Roman writers also portray the ‘other’ quite often as in retreat. Livy uses the words *fuga*, *terga vertere* to describe the ‘other’ as departing and fleeing (Liv. 6.42.8, 7.24.8, 31.21.15, 33.36.12, 38.18.7, 38.23.1, 38.27). Frontinus uses the word *fuga* to portray the ‘other’ as fleeing (Front. *Strat.* 2.6.3); Tacitus uses the words *perfugere*, *effugium*, *terga praebuere*, *decedere*, *concedere* to describe the ‘other’ as escaping, fleeing, and withdrawing (Tac. *Ann.* 1.56, 2.17, 12.35, 14.37, *Agr.* 26.2, 36.3, 37.1, 38.2, *Hist.* 5.18, 5.23).

<sup>388</sup> Murphey 1977: 239.

<sup>389</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.35.6. Livy uses words such as *vagus*, *circumvenire*, *palari*, *error* to describe the ‘other’ as roaming or wandering in the wake of defeat (Liv. 5.44.5, 5.45.3, 6.42.8). Tacitus uses words such as *dispergere*, *rarus*, *vitabundus*, *palari* to describe the ‘other’ as dispersed, scattered and wandering in the aftermath of defeat (Tac. *Ann.* 1.56, *Agr.* 37.5, 38.1, *Hist.* 4.70, 71, 79). Plutarch also describes the ‘other’ as scattered (Plut. *Cam.* 29.5, *Caes.* 27.4).

<sup>390</sup> Kraus 2009: 166, 172, Adcock 1956: 40-41, 43, 55.

<sup>391</sup> Meier 1995: 326.

<sup>392</sup> Balsdon 1979: 4, 178-9, 182, 190. Tacitus admits of the Germans that they had not so much been conquered but had triumphs celebrated over their supposed defeat (Tac. *Germ.* 37.6).

<sup>393</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 66, 67.

<sup>394</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>395</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 Jan 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>396</sup> Smith *Letter to Juana* 13 Feb 1835, reiterated in *Letter to Juana* 26 Feb 1835 in *Autobiography*.

---

country.<sup>397</sup> Smith describes the Xhosa as having been driven in every direction<sup>398</sup> and as having ‘destroyed the enemy’.<sup>399</sup> Smith often describes the Xhosa as desperate from hunger and starvation,<sup>400</sup> implying he had managed to weaken them with his scorched earth tactics. He describes the Xhosa after they had submitted in 1835 as more ‘reduced’ than any other people ever were.<sup>401</sup> In his defence against the accusation that an unjust war was waged against a helpless ‘other’, Smith describes the Xhosa as having been victorious, possessing the whole frontier before he arrived on the scene.<sup>402</sup> Smith also occasionally, like Caesar, describes the Xhosa as ‘wandering’ or ‘dispersed’ in defeat.<sup>403</sup> He describes the Xhosa as ‘conquered’,<sup>404</sup> and beaten in war,<sup>405</sup> despite the fact that this was not strictly the case.<sup>406</sup>

In his conflict with the Xhosa in the 1850s he also describes Xhosa chiefs and their men as beaten in war.<sup>407</sup> He describes great numbers of the Xhosa as being killed, slain, slaughtered, fallen<sup>408</sup> and suffering considerable losses<sup>409</sup> most often of cattle.<sup>410</sup> He describes the Xhosa also as ‘broken’.<sup>411</sup> Smith also describes the ‘other’ as haven been driven away, beaten or driven off.<sup>412</sup> He often refers to the Xhosa as giving way and fleeing<sup>413</sup> in defeat. However, despite his constant claims of successes against the Xhosa, this was not really the case and he was unable to

---

<sup>397</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 26 Feb 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>398</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>399</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>400</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>401</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>402</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>403</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 17 Nov 1835, 3 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>404</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 22 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>405</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 70.

<sup>406</sup> In 1835, it is generally agreed that there was no evidence of an actual victory against the Xhosa, and that the British were incapable of expelling the Xhosa (Lehmann 1977: 152-3, Harington 1980: 25-26, 29-31, 47-49, Mostert 1992: 684, 692, Lester 1998: 221-245, Davenport 1991: 118, Peires 1982: 112-113). D’Urban and Smith were forced to compromise and negotiate the situation (Lehmann 1977: 185, Mostert 1992: 735, 751, Lester 1998: 226-7, 230) while insisting on claiming it as a victory and demanding unconditional surrender (Mostert 1992: 743-744). Smith only once admits to D’Urban that it proved impossible to expel the Xhosa (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 22 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*).

<sup>407</sup> Smith, *Letter to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>408</sup> Smith, *Letter to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852, *Letters to Grey* 20 Jan 1852, 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>409</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 March 1852, 17 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>410</sup> Smith, *Letter to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852, *Letter to Grey* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>411</sup> Smith *Letter to Grey* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>412</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 20 Feb 1852, 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852, *Letter to Cloete* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>413</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852, *Letter to Umhala* 27 March 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

---

end the war to the chagrin of his superiors.<sup>414</sup> Lehmann notes Smith's constant narration of success in order to magnify his own achievements.<sup>415</sup> He does, however, once admit that he was finding the war a difficult task.<sup>416</sup>

Connected to the image of the defeated is that of the surrendering or submission of the 'other'. Caesar describes the Remi as giving up, yielding, unconditionally surrendering<sup>417</sup> (*in potestatem populi Romani permittere*).<sup>418</sup> Caesar often refers to this activity by the 'other' with the verb *dedere* or the related noun *deditio*.<sup>419</sup> To surrender, in Caesar's words often does not imply that a battle has actually been fought, as in many cases a group is described as submitting to his control on the mere threat or possibility of conflict.<sup>420</sup> Caesar demanded universal obedience and submission,<sup>421</sup> but the latter did not necessarily imply the 'other' had been defeated in battle.<sup>422</sup> He also describes the 'other' as treating for peace.<sup>423</sup> Caesar also writes of the Gauls as having submitted to the rule of the Roman people.<sup>424</sup> Hirtius uses another word, *devinco*, to describe the Gauls as utterly subdued.<sup>425</sup>

Smith writes of the 'submission' of the Xhosa after his first campaign against them<sup>426</sup> and describes them as submitting to his decisions.<sup>427</sup> During his campaign against the Xhosa in the 1850s he describes the chiefs of the T'Slambies as keeping to their 'allegiance and submission to

---

<sup>414</sup> Lehmann 1977: 333, 338, 345, 347, Harrington 1980: 106, 183, 204, 217, Mostert 1992: 1097, 1098, 1107, 1109, 1127 – 1128.

<sup>415</sup> Lehmann 1977: 152.

<sup>416</sup> Harrington 1980: 204.

<sup>417</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 1348

<sup>418</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.3.2.

<sup>419</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.15.3, 2.28.2, 2.32.1, 3.16.4, 3.22.4, 7.40.6, 7.89.4. cf. Liv. 32.29.7, 32.30.13, Front. *Strat.* 3.17.7, Tac. *Ann.* 1.57, 12.35, *Hist.* 1.68, 4.79, Suet. *Aug.* 21.1, *Tib.* 9.2, *Calig.* 44.2). Burns notes the use of the word *dediti* to often describe the surrender of 'barbarians' (Burns 2003: 116-7)

<sup>420</sup> For example, Caes. *B.G.* 2.15.

<sup>421</sup> Meier 1995: 257.

<sup>422</sup> Meier 1995: 251-2.

<sup>423</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.27.1, 4.36.1.

<sup>424</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 5.54.5.

<sup>425</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 8.24.1.

<sup>426</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 18 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>427</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 22 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

Her Majesty's authority',<sup>428</sup> in this instance referring to the chiefs as being in submission to the control of the British. He refers in a further paragraph to the need for 'a general and unconditional surrender' from the Xhosa.<sup>429</sup> In this case the 'other' is not described as surrendered yet, Smith merely requires it so, and even alludes to the lack of genuine surrender previously, and perhaps a resistant uncompliant enemy. Smith does refer at times to the Xhosa as being 'relentless',<sup>430</sup> 'obstinate',<sup>431</sup> 'persevering',<sup>432</sup> and as having fiercely and determined to resist British advances.<sup>433</sup> He describes Maqoma as a 'hero', beaten but indomitable,<sup>434</sup> referring to a spirit of resistance. Although Smith seems to think he has forced the 'other' into submission,<sup>435</sup> this may not have been the reality.

Both Caesar and Smith describe the 'other' in various ways as overwhelmingly defeated, as other Roman writers<sup>436</sup> also do. Only some indication is made by Caesar of losses caused by the 'other',<sup>437</sup> while Smith concedes victories to the Xhosa only prior to his involvement.<sup>438</sup>

<sup>428</sup> Smith *Reply Through Gaika Commissioner* 15 January 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>429</sup> Smith, *Reply Through Gaika Commissioner* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>430</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>431</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>432</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>433</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 20 Jan 1852, 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>434</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 11 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>435</sup> Harington 1980: 180.

<sup>436</sup> Polybius describes the 'other' as defeated several times (Plb. 21.38.1, 21.39.1, 21.41.1). Livy uses the words *triumphus*, *victus*, *superatus*, *clades* to describe the defeat of the 'other' (Liv. 7.25.1, 32.31.2, 33.23.4, 33.36.15, 34.22.2, 36.40.11, 38.21.14). Strabo comments on the 'other' as easily defeated by the Romans in naval battle (Strab. 4.4.1). Velleius Paterculus uses the words *victoria*, *victus*, *triumphus* (Vell. 2.46.1, 2.47.1, 2.106.1) and describes the 'other' as defeated (Vell. 2.120). Tacitus often portrays the 'other' as beaten and defeated (Tac. *Ann.* 2.5, 2.22, 2.25, 14.36, *Germ.* 37.3, *Agr.* 22.3, 26.2, 33.4, 34.1, 38.5, 38.5) and uses words such as *clades*, *victus*, *pulsus* (Tac. *Ann.* 12.32, 14.30, *Hist.* 4.70, 71, 5.18, *Agr.* 18.7, 37.3). Suetonius uses the words *superatus*, *triumphus* to describe the 'other' as defeated (Suet. *Jul.* 25.2, *Dom.* 6.1). Plutarch also often describes the defeat of the 'other' (Plut. *Rom.* 22.2, *Cam.* 17.6, 29.5, *Marc.* 7.3, *Caes.* 19.5, 20.2, 26.4, 27.3). Augustus refers to the conquest of Spain, Gaul and the Dalmatia with the word *devinco*, a particularly strong verb (August. *R.G.* 5). Plutarch mentions the 'other' as in 'hiding' (Plut. *Caes.* 23.1). Tacitus refers to the 'other' as confused (*turbatis*) (Tac. *Ann.* 12.35). Velleius refers to the 'other' as *fracti* (Vell. 2.106.2). Tacitus refers to the failures (*adversis*) of the 'other' (Tac. *Ann.* 1.68). Livy and Velleius Paterculus refer to the 'other' as captured (*captis*) (Liv. 36.38.6, Vell. 2.46.1, 2.47.1). Livy uses the verbs *iaceo*, *caedes*, *caedo*, *occido*, *prolabor*, *dilabor* to describe the 'other' as dead, killed and fallen (Liv. 7.10.11, 7.23.10, 22.2.6, 31.21.15, 32.30.11, 34.22.2-3, 34.46, 36.38.4-6, 36.40.5, 38.23.7). Velleius Paterculus uses the words *trucido*, *caedo* to describe the 'other' as slaughtered and killed (Vell. 2.12.4, 2.46.1, 2.47.1, 2.119.2). Frontinus uses the word *caedo* to describe the 'other' as killed (Front. *Strat.* 3.17.7). Tacitus uses the word *trucido*, *cado*, *caedo*, *interficio* to refer to the 'other' as slaughtered, fallen, killed (Tac. *Ann.* 1.68, 14.37, *Agr.* 18.4, 37.6, *Hist.* 1.68, 4.71, 4.79). Plutarch also describes the 'other' as slaughtered (Plut. *Caes.* 26.4). Velleius goes to the extent of describing the 'other' as exterminated (*excisa*) (Vell. 2.12.4).

<sup>437</sup> Sallust comments on a victory of the Gauls over Romans (Sall. *Jug.* 114.1). Livy comments on the victory of Gauls over the Romans (Liv. 5.39.1, 6.42.7). Velleius writes of German victory over and slaughter of Romans (Vell. 2.8.3, 2.12.2, 2.117.1, 2.119-20). Valerius writes of the Gauls defeating Romans (Val. Max. 3.2.7). Tacitus writes of victories over the Romans (Tac. *Ann.* 14.32, *Hist.* 4.17, 5.22) and Roman losses the 'other' inflicted (Tac. *Hist.* 4.27). Suetonius writes of a German victory over the Romans (Suet. *Tib.* 17.1). Plutarch mentions a number of victories of the 'other' over Rome (Plut. *Num.* 12.5, *Cam.* 16.1-2, 18.6-7, 19.7, 20.2, *Mar.* 19.2, *Luc.* 27.7, *Marc.* 4.1).

<sup>438</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

Connected to the portrayal of the ‘other’ as defeated, is the description of them as surrendered or in submission. I would argue however, that defeated in battle does not necessarily have the same meaning as the latter which conveys a degree of compliance and lack of resistance. Both Caesar and Smith depict the ‘other’ in this way, as other Roman writers do.<sup>439</sup> These kinds of descriptions are not surprising considering both Caesar and Smith were military leaders who wished to be seen as successful conquerors and not to portray themselves as defeated, if even in the case of Smith this was often not a reflection of reality.

### 1.6.1 Pathetic Repentance

Specifically commenting on the attitude of the ‘other’ towards its conqueror in defeat, Caesar refers to the Gauls as throwing themselves at his feet in tears, anxious and concerned for themselves.<sup>440</sup> He refers to the Nervii as exhibiting a miserable or pitiful supplication (*in miseros ac supplices*).<sup>441</sup> He portrays the women and children of defeated Gauls as stretching out their hands begging for peace<sup>442</sup> and the Bellovaci and Aedui as begging for mercy and kindness (*clementia ac mansuetudine*).<sup>443</sup> He again later portrays the Aedui as begging for their lives.<sup>444</sup> He also goes as far as portraying the ‘other’ as apologizing,<sup>445</sup> or making excuses for going against Rome. He describes the deputies from Morini as making excuses (*excusarent*),<sup>446</sup> for making war against Rome.<sup>447</sup> The implication, although not particularly strong in this instance, is

---

<sup>439</sup> Polybius refers to the ‘other’ as in submission (Plb. 21.36.3). Cicero refers to the ‘other’ as subdued and taught to submit (Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 33). Strabo refers to the Germans as subdued (Strab. 4.5.3, 7.2.2). Tacitus describes the ‘other’ as swearing an oath of allegiance (Tac. *Hist.* 4.70) and complying, submitting to Rome (Tac. *Hist.* 4.71, *Germ.* 29.3). Plutarch describes the ‘other’ as subdued and surrendered (Plut. *Caes.* 20.2, 27.5).

<sup>440</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.1-2

<sup>441</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.28.3. Tacitus also refers to the *supplices*, supplication, of the ‘other’ (Tac. *Ann.* 2.22)

<sup>442</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.13.3.

<sup>443</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.14.5. cf. 2.31.4

<sup>444</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.40.7.

<sup>445</sup> A kind of apology is presented in the words which Tacitus gives to Segestes (Tac. *Ann.* 1.58).

<sup>446</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 681.

<sup>447</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.22.1.

---

that the ‘other’s conduct was ‘wrong’.<sup>448</sup> Linked to these portrayals of the ‘other’ as weak and supplicating is the portrayal of the ‘other’ as in awe of the Romans.<sup>449</sup> Caesar describes the Gauls as entreating for peace in utter awe and alarm at the Romans’ superior siege engineering.<sup>450</sup> Caesar’s portrayal of the ‘other’ in this way and the mention of *clementia*, a Roman virtue, reflects his self-perpetuated reputation for ‘mercy’ towards the enemy.<sup>451</sup>

Smith portrays the ‘other’ in similar ways. He describes Maqoma as evincing ‘something like contrition’<sup>452</sup> and acting ‘remorseful’.<sup>453</sup> He describes the excessive ‘humility’ of a few Xhosa messengers.<sup>454</sup> As in one of Caesar’s references, Smith portrays Maqoma as throwing himself at his feet, bathed in tears.<sup>455</sup> He describes Maqoma as ‘humble’ and ‘penitent’.<sup>456</sup> He also describes the Xhosa as seeking ‘mercy’.<sup>457</sup> Smith describes Hintsa as coming into his camp a ‘humble suppliant for peace and mercy’.<sup>458</sup> Like Caesar, Smith makes much out of his granting of ‘mercy’ to others,<sup>459</sup> implying both his own power and the morally wrong conduct of the ‘other’. This idea of Smith is emphasized to an even greater extent by his portrayal of the ‘other’ as confessing<sup>460</sup> and ‘penitent’.<sup>461</sup> These words carry Christian connotations of ‘sin’<sup>462</sup> and place the ‘other’ in a morally wrong position, which they are portrayed as acknowledging in

---

<sup>448</sup> Polybius portrays the ‘other’ as in atonement, as seeing themselves as having erred (Plb. 21.41.5-6)

<sup>449</sup> Velleius portrays the ‘other’ as in adulation of the Romans (Vell. 2.107.2)

<sup>450</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.31.

<sup>451</sup> Veyne 1993: 357, Balsdon 1967: 106, Meier 1995: 329. Augustus also made much of his *clementia* (August. *R.G.* 6).

<sup>452</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 18 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>453</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 23 Aug, 27 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>454</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>455</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 88.

<sup>456</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835, 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 104.

<sup>457</sup> Smith, *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>458</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 34.

<sup>459</sup> Smith refers often to his own and D’Urban’s ‘clemency’ and ‘mercy’ (Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 30 Aug, 1 Nov, 10 Nov, 17 Nov 1835, 3 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*, Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)). See also Lehmann 1977: 346. Harington comments on D’Urban’s magnanimity as a guise for compromise where defeat was impossible (Harington 1980: 50). He also interestingly notes Smith as being accused by his superiors for his leniency (Harington 1980: 208)

<sup>460</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 84.

<sup>461</sup> Smith *Letter to D’Urban* 21 Mar 1836 *Autobiography* p. 86.

<sup>462</sup> Barclay 1811: 221, 726.

---

themselves.<sup>463</sup> However, these kinds of protestations from the chiefs seem rather to have been examples of chiefs' playing Smith for their own ends, an example being Maqoma.<sup>464</sup> Similarly to Caesar, Smith also often portrays the Xhosa in awe and admiration of the British.<sup>465</sup>

### 1.7 Child-likeness

The overall image of the Xhosa as a negligible threat is epitomised in Smith's representation of the 'other' as children,<sup>466</sup> a term never used by Caesar. Smith claims that Hintsá called himself his 'son',<sup>467</sup> and that Hintsá, Tyali, Mhala and the Xhosa people whom he ruled over in Queen Adelaide province, called him their 'Father'.<sup>468</sup> Harrington asserts that the Xhosa people never called him or thought of him as their father.<sup>469</sup> It is possible that the terminology of 'father' and 'children', although an acceptable figurative way of describing deferential relationships in the Xhosa language, was misused and misunderstood by Smith,<sup>470</sup> possibly as a result of literal translations by his interpreters initially.<sup>471</sup> Harrington comments on Smith's regard for Hintsá as 'patronizing condescension, as something between a child and a dangerous pet'.<sup>472</sup> He often referred to the Xhosa as his 'children',<sup>473</sup> and subsequently himself as their 'Father'.<sup>474</sup> After

---

<sup>463</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 3 Nov 1835, 21 Mar, 28 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>464</sup> The supposedly 'ingratiating' and 'humble' chiefs (Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 27, 28 Sept 1835, 5, 6, 12 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*) had been playing Smith far more successfully than he imagined he was playing them (Mostert 1992: 772, 938, 1108). In flattering Smith, they managed to convince him to give them more land than the government had originally intended (Peires 1982: 114). After a number of letters to D'Urban describing the chiefs as acting amenable to and grateful for his policy (Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*), Smith recounts how 'Maqoma prayed so hardly for a small piece of land... that Captain Stretch and myself decided on giving it to him' (Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 27 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*. See also Mostert 1992: 765-6). According to Arndt, it was Captain Stretch who, in a private letter advised Maqoma to be submissive and remorseful in order to deprive D'Urban and Smith of any reason to renew hostilities and seize their land (Arndt 2010: 720-721).

<sup>465</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 18 Aug, 22, 28 Sept, 10 Nov 1835, 19 Jan, 21 Feb, 26 Mar, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 10 Feb 1837 in *Godlonton Correspondence*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>466</sup> It should be noted also that Smith also used this paternalist language to describe European soldiers under his command (Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 26 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*).

<sup>467</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 30 April, 3, 4, 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 41.

<sup>468</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 14, 15 Feb, 25 Mar, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 81, 96.

<sup>469</sup> Harrington 1980: 105.

<sup>470</sup> Mostert 1992: 770, 937.

<sup>471</sup> Smith conducted his communication with the Xhosa using interpreters (Mostert 1992: 767).

<sup>472</sup> Harrington 1980: 40.

<sup>473</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 10 Nov, 5 Dec 1835, 5 Apr, 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 82, 89, 98, Smith, *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*. Similarly Smith also refers to the Khoi as his 'children' (Mostert 1992: 707).

---

forgiving Maqoma for some transgression, Smith even refers to him as his ‘prodigal son’.<sup>475</sup> He is also supposed to have encouraged the Xhosa to refer to his wife Juana as their ‘mother’.<sup>476</sup> Harrington describes his attitude towards the Xhosa in general and at ‘best’ that of ‘tolerant condescension such as an impatient adult might extend to rather dull children’<sup>477</sup> and that Smith thought of them as resembling children who could be taught ‘adult’ behaviour.<sup>478</sup> Smith also uses the phrase of himself as ‘father’ figure when he writes of the giving of presents as he would to a child.<sup>479</sup> Mostert comments on Smith’s shifting emphasis from punitive to sentimental connotations in his use of this patronising language.<sup>480</sup> He writes of an incident of the Xhosa referring to Mhala as a ‘child’ and explains this as a ‘figurative expression of contempt and disapprobation and an allusion to him ‘not know[ing] any better’,<sup>481</sup> covertly possibly acknowledging the negative connotations implied when he himself referred to them as such. He also uses the idea of the Xhosa as his children in order to communicate his expectation that they should dutifully behave and obey his commands,<sup>482</sup> and if they did not he declared that they were not his children any more unless they were ‘good’ again.<sup>483</sup> Smith not only writes of them as his ‘children’ but inevitably treated them as such.<sup>484</sup> Smith took British imperial paternalism<sup>485</sup> to a whole new level.<sup>486</sup> Although his self-important, delusional personality played a large part in this idea and view of both himself and the ‘other’, it has to be mentioned that the trope of child-

---

<sup>474</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 82.

<sup>475</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>476</sup> Lehmann 1977: 189.

<sup>477</sup> Harrington 1980: 49.

<sup>478</sup> Harrington 1980: 55.

<sup>479</sup> Mostert 1992: 1003.

<sup>480</sup> Mostert 1992: 937.

<sup>481</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 18 April 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>482</sup> Lehmann 1977: 172, 186.

<sup>483</sup> Harrington 1980: 106, 107.

<sup>484</sup> Peires 1982: 111.

<sup>485</sup> Galbraith 1963: 64.

<sup>486</sup> Davenport refers to Smith’s particular brand of ‘paternalism’ (Davenport 1991: 121).

---

likeness was to an extent particular to the time of colonial expansion,<sup>487</sup> and provided an excuse for missionary and civilizing endeavours.<sup>488</sup> However, understanding Smith's own opinion of himself and slant on reality and how he wanted to view things, explains why he was the only one of his near contemporaries in the Cape who described the Xhosa in this personal way.<sup>489</sup> Some argue that the fact that Smith and his wife were childless may have played a role.<sup>490</sup> Ultimately the image is that of a simpler, inferior 'other', who needed to be taught knowledge and morals. The extent to which the 'other' was viewed as moral, virtuous or otherwise will be dealt with in the next chapter.

### 1.8 Conclusion

Although both Caesar and Smith seem to acknowledge intellectual and practical abilities of the 'other' they encountered, it is evident that much effort was made to qualify these comments. Caesar does to a certain extent subscribe to the conventional stereotypes about northerners present in earlier writings,<sup>491</sup> in the same way that common ideas and assumptions of the 'other'

---

<sup>487</sup> According to Jahoda the trope of child-likeness of savages only became evident sporadically from the time of the conquests in the Americas in the sixteenth Century (Jahoda 1999: 9, 19, 131, 132). Although during the Enlightenment of the eighteenth Century a positive view was engendered on the qualities of childhood and primitive 'mentality' (Jahoda 1999: 131), by the nineteenth Century it was a widespread derogatory reference to many peoples met as a result of colonial expansion (Jahoda 1999: 9, 131). Not intended as a literal ascription, the label was associated with an idea of a weak personality, lack of emotional control, intelligence, mature reason and morality, particularly linked to European ideas of innocence and original sin (Jahoda 1999:140-142, 145-147, 149). However, theories of social evolutionism and biogenic 'law' in the nineteenth Century provided a much more literal rationale for the attribute (Jahoda 1999: 131). Both missionaries and colonial administrators often used the analogy which was largely propagated by the former (Jahoda 1999:131, 144, 148). By the twentieth Century psychological theorists stressed the similarities between children and all kinds of 'savages', the latter as life-long children with similar mood swings, irresponsibility, irritability, curiosity, weakness of thought and naivety (Jahoda 1999: 23, 88-90). Images and representations of the 'other' would have been available to someone like Smith by the nineteenth century, as stories from travelers and sailors were diffused among maritime towns, incorporated into literature and drama (Jahoda 1999:197 - 199). Harrington writes of a general consensus in early Victorian Britain that Africans were in a state of 'cultural infancy' (Harrington 1980: 54).

<sup>488</sup> Jahoda 1999:16, 140, 143, 146.

<sup>489</sup> It is interesting, however, to see that a few did refer to the 'other' as children of the Government or State, such as Somerset, Calderwood and Mackinnon (Somerset, C., *Letter to Earl Bathurst* 22 May 1819 in Theal, G.M., *Records of the Cape Colony: from May 1818 to January 1820, copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London, Vol. 12* (London: William Clowes and Sons, 1902) Albany Museum, Calderwood *Letter to Woosnam* 6 Jul 1847 in Le Cordeur, B., Saunders, C., *The War of the Axe, 1847: Correspondence between the governor of the Cape Colony, Sir Henry Pottinger, and the Commander of the British forces at the Cape, Sir George Berkeley, and others* (Houghton: Breenhurst Press, 1981) Cory Library, Mackinnon, G., *Letter to Smith* 13 Mar 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850)) – Perhaps in the same way that Augustus viewed himself as the father to all people of the Empire (August. *R.G.* 6. cf. Suet. *Aug.* 58.1) and Pliny viewed Rome as 'fatherland' or 'nursing and mother to all other lands' (Plin. *H.N.* 3.39). Balsdon comments on the Roman Emperor emerging as a universal 'father-figure' (Balsdon 1979: 71).

<sup>490</sup> Lehmann 1977: 193, Harrington 1980: 56.

<sup>491</sup> Isaac 2004: 413, 415, Gruen 2006: 471, Miller and Savage 1977: 110, Riggsby 2006: 58.

---

are evident in Smith's comments. However, Caesar's evaluation of the 'other' is more complex, selective and considered, possibly due to his own first-hand experiences and observations.<sup>492</sup> Similarly, but more obviously, Smith seems constantly surprised at what he views as exceptions to common ideas about the 'other' from his first hand observations. Where Caesar tends not to make sweeping statements or assign national traits to peoples, often describing particular individuals or tribes in particular circumstances,<sup>493</sup> Smith's tendency is to express broad prejudice while pointing out the exceptions.<sup>494</sup> Miller and Savage argue that Caesar uses stereotypes selectively when it suits his agenda.<sup>495</sup> Many stereotypes and descriptions place the 'other' in a negative immoral light, which as the next chapter will discuss, further served to justify and rationalise behaviour or actions toward the 'other'.<sup>496</sup>

At various times Caesar and Smith acknowledge the strength and threat posed by the 'other' to their empire, particularly how many they were facing. Building up the enemy as a danger or threat would not only have had the advantage of providing justification for a campaign against them, but also served to bolster the reputation and glory of those who managed to defeat and subdue them,<sup>497</sup> which they are overwhelmingly portrayed as succumbing to. Rosenstein comments that the 'other', having submitted to Rome would then be liable to the label of rebellious and treacherous should they resist.<sup>498</sup> Conversely, portraying the 'other' as powerless, divided or weak served the purpose of justifying imperialistic interference on behalf of the 'other'.<sup>499</sup> Caesar and Smith also subscribed to the idea that it was the natural order of the world

---

<sup>492</sup> Isaac 2004: 413, Gruen 2006: 471-2, Riggsby 2006: 58.

<sup>493</sup> Gruen 2010: 148.

<sup>494</sup> Harington 1980: 37.

<sup>495</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 110.

<sup>496</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 110, 120.

<sup>497</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 111.

<sup>498</sup> Rosenstein 2009: 89.

<sup>499</sup> Rosenstein 2009: 89.

---

that the strong conquer the weak.<sup>500</sup> Although it was an idea accepted more Roman times,<sup>501</sup> Smith repeatedly used it to justify his actions in a society that largely no longer accepted it.<sup>502</sup>

Smith's emphasis on the 'other' as uneducated or child-like served to justify intervention and control in the affairs of the 'other', as he not only attempted to implement direct rule over the Xhosa in the Cape Colony, but as later chapters discuss, sought to teach them 'civilised' and Christian ways, an element of the latter found in his particular descriptions of the 'other' as 'penitent'.

---

<sup>500</sup> Veyne argues that in the Republican era, conquest spoke for itself and did not require comment or justification and goes further to say that there was not yet any need to justify war by the discourse of 'peace' and duty to protect allies (Veyne 1993: 359-360). I do not agree with the latter statement. Caesar takes great pains to outline why he felt compelled to campaign against various groups, which if Veyne is correct, would not have been necessary.

<sup>501</sup> Rosenstein comments that Roman society rested on a strong ethos of military service and that conquest and victory were applauded for their own sake (Rosenstein 2009: 89). See footnote 21.

<sup>502</sup> See footnote 58.

---

## CHAPTER 2

### *CORNELIUS TACITUS AND HARRY SMITH'S MORAL JUDGEMENTS ON THE CHARACTER OF THE 'OTHER'*

*'Your new-caught, sullen peoples, / Half-devil and half-child' – R. Kipling 'White Man's Burden'*

---

#### 2.1 Introduction

Many of the Roman stereotypical descriptions of Germans, Gauls and Britons comment on character flaws and, to a certain extent, virtues. Although one can find examples of this trend in many Roman sources, Cornelius Tacitus offers the most complex and nuanced view on the subject. I will, therefore, be limiting my discussion mainly to the works of Tacitus, namely *De vita Iulii Agricolae*, *De origine et situ Germanorum*, *Historiae* and *Annales*, in the comparison with Sir Harry Smith's descriptions of Xhosa character and behaviour. As I did in the previous chapter, the context and genres of Tacitus, and to a small extent Smith, will be examined before going into an in-depth textual analysis of relevant references found in these sources. Various kinds of perceived character flaws or virtues will be discussed as well as possible reasons and implications for such comments and the similarities and differences found between Tacitus and Smith. Many of the characterisations to be compared appear as binary opposites, or varying degrees of such traits, which makes them impossible to discuss separately and bring out the contradictions and complexities in both Tacitus' and Smith's representations of the 'other'.

---

## 2.2 Tacitus and Smith: Comparison of Backgrounds and Genres

Not much is known about Tacitus.<sup>1</sup> He was a politician,<sup>2</sup> involved in public life in Rome under Vespasian, Domitian and Hadrian,<sup>3</sup> and was a senator<sup>4</sup> and elected suffect consul in AD 97.<sup>5</sup> He seems to have owed much of his honours and career to particularly Vespasian,<sup>6</sup> and also Titus and Domitian.<sup>7</sup> He was constantly preoccupied with the corruption of values under autocratic regimes at Rome, particularly under rulers like Domitian.<sup>8</sup> Scholars argue that Tacitus, as a collaborator and surviving senator under the reign of Domitian, was attempting to justify or vindicate his collaboration,<sup>9</sup> preoccupied with the degradation and servility of his class,<sup>10</sup> whereas any justification on Smith's part had to do with his actions and policies in a military capacity. Tacitus' concerns, motivations and arguments were mainly political and centred on the metropolis of Rome.<sup>11</sup> He did not share the same immediate military and administrative goals towards the peoples whom he sought to describe and comment on, as Smith and Caesar did.

Unlike Caesar or Smith, Tacitus was not the leading actor in the events which he describes.<sup>12</sup> The proximity or contact he had with the Germans, Gauls and Britons whom he describes is uncertain and much is left to conjecture. It is possible that Tacitus himself was a born native of Gaul,<sup>13</sup> if so probably the 'romanised' southern Cisalpine Gaul.<sup>14</sup> Some postulate that his father was a

---

<sup>1</sup> Grant 1971: 7.

<sup>2</sup> Mellor 1993: 10. Benario makes the point that Tacitus' career should not be separated from his writings as his personal experience affected his historical outlook (Benario 1999: 2).

<sup>3</sup> Bowder 1980: 205.

<sup>4</sup> Mellor 1993: 1, Birley 2000: 234.

<sup>5</sup> Bowder 1980: 205, Mellor 1993: 8.

<sup>6</sup> Syme 1970: 128, Birley 2000: 234.

<sup>7</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.1, noted in Kraus 1997: 89. cf. Birley 2000: 234.

<sup>8</sup> Mellor 1993: 8, 13.

<sup>9</sup> Mellor 1993: 13.

<sup>10</sup> Goodyear 1982: 653.

<sup>11</sup> Grant 1971: 15.

<sup>12</sup> Grant 1971: 14.

<sup>13</sup> Syme 1970: 10, Mellor 1993: 6-7, Bowder 1980: 205.

<sup>14</sup> Grant 1971: 7.

---

financial procurator in Gallia Belgica<sup>15</sup> and that he too served as governor of the same province, and even had experience in Germany.<sup>16</sup> Birley also states that he may even have possibly served in Britain under Agricola.<sup>17</sup> Syme recognises a detailed knowledge of Gaul on the part of Tacitus,<sup>18</sup> and others note a possible pride in his Gallic origins, particularly of the Roman provincial elite.<sup>19</sup> However, when Britons and Germans are concerned, it is generally agreed that Tacitus worked largely from second hand sources, rather than first hand observations,<sup>20</sup> although his information on Britain would likely have come from an intimate source, his father-in-law Agricola.

Another point to take into account is that Tacitus, even more so than Caesar, was a literary man, unlike Smith. He received a Roman education and studied rhetoric among the leading orators of Rome,<sup>21</sup> and was himself a gifted orator.<sup>22</sup> The style of his works is commended by many scholars.<sup>23</sup> While Smith wrote correspondence and rough autobiographical notes, for the purpose of communicating events in the colony or chronicling and justifying his own actions,<sup>24</sup> Tacitus wrote primarily as a historian. As such his intended audience consisted of both his contemporaries and future generations.<sup>25</sup> Many scholars argue that his primary aim in these writings was interpretative, moralistic and instructive, using events to set forth examples of good and bad conduct – to provide the opportunity to learn from the past.<sup>26</sup> This, it is argued, was the

---

<sup>15</sup> Furneaux 1922: xx.

<sup>16</sup> Syme 1970: 28, Birley 2000: 235, 241.

<sup>17</sup> Birley 2000: 237-8.

<sup>18</sup> Syme 1970: 27.

<sup>19</sup> Mellor 1993: 6-7. As noted by Richard Evans, Tacitus' origins, if Gallic, would have been from a romanised part of Gaul.

<sup>20</sup> Goodyear 1982: 644, Mellor 1993: 14, Benario 1999: 3-4.

<sup>21</sup> Grant 1971: 7, Mellor 1993: 7.

<sup>22</sup> Mellor 1993: 7.

<sup>23</sup> Mellor 1993: 10, 27, Goodyear 1982: 650.

<sup>24</sup> See chapter 1.2.

<sup>25</sup> Classen 1988: 93.

<sup>26</sup> Kraus and Woodman 1997: 109-110, Goodyear 1982: 649, Mellor 1993: 2, Classen 1988: 115-116. cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.33.

---

legacy of Roman historiography.<sup>27</sup> Others also stress the epic nature of history and the aim of such writings of Tacitus to entertain, captivate and arouse emotion with vividness and drama.<sup>28</sup> It is also impossible not to consider the serious, reflective, and pessimistic tone of Tacitus' works,<sup>29</sup> which some argue to have been common tradition among ancient historians,<sup>30</sup> who sought to be sceptical of apparent causes, in the effort to find out the truth.<sup>31</sup> Over and above these considerations, it is important to look more closely at the individual genres and aims of each of the works I will be discussing.

The *Agricola*, dating from AD 98, was written as a semi-biography of his late father-in-law, Julius Agricola, and contains elements of a panegyric funeral laudation, history, ethnography and geography.<sup>32</sup> His aim was primarily to praise the actions of Agricola in Britain, but other motives include an attack on Domitian,<sup>33</sup> the defence of his own political creed,<sup>34</sup> that men can do their duty even under a bad emperor, attacking the political extremists who, unlike Tacitus and Agricola, perished under Domitian.<sup>35</sup> The *Germania*, published the same year, was presented as an ethnographic monograph,<sup>36</sup> with elements of the historical.<sup>37</sup> The aims of the ethnography are debateable and uncertain,<sup>38</sup> but it evidently involves more than simply informing Romans about ways and culture of another people,<sup>39</sup> although the interest and popularity of this kind of work

---

<sup>27</sup> Grant 1971: 10-12, 14, 16. Mellor argues that Roman historians were prone to subjectivity and regarded the detachment of Greek historians as impractical and not useful (Mellor 1993: 2).

<sup>28</sup> Grant 1971: 14, Goodyear 1982: 649, Woodman 1988: 166-167.

<sup>29</sup> O'Gorman 2000: 2-3, Mellor 1993: 4.

<sup>30</sup> O'Gorman 2000: 2-3, Grant 1971: 14.

<sup>31</sup> O'Gorman 2000: 2-3.

<sup>32</sup> Bowder 1980: 205, Grant 1971: 8, Furneaux 1922: xxi, xxiii, Mellor 1993: 10, Goodyear 1982: 643.

<sup>33</sup> Mellor 1993: 11, Syme 1970: 3.

<sup>34</sup> Furneaux 1922: xxviii.

<sup>35</sup> Syme 1970: 14.

<sup>36</sup> Mellor 1993: 14, Syme 1970: 19.

<sup>37</sup> Bowder 1980: 205. Goodyear notes the tendency of ancient historians to include ethnographies in their works, for example Livy, Seneca and Sallust, and uses this to explain Tacitus' tendency to evaluate and comment rather than merely describe (Goodyear 1982: 644. See also Burn 1969: 42).

<sup>38</sup> Grant 1971: 8.

<sup>39</sup> Gruen 2010: 160. Some scholars stress the conjectural nature of any ulterior motives and that it could possibly solely be intended as ethnographical literature (Dorey 1969: 13, Benario 1999: 3), and should be understood as such (Benario 1999: 3).

---

for its own sake in Rome<sup>40</sup> should not be dismissed.<sup>41</sup> One aim of the work which is commonly accepted is, by comparison with Germans, the implicit comment he makes on Roman social morality and political life.<sup>42</sup> Another common argument is that Tacitus wrote it to highlight the German people as a threat to Rome,<sup>43</sup> either to discourage the Romans from clamouring for war with Germany or to curb criticism of Trajan for staying so long on the German frontier.<sup>44</sup> The *Histories* and *Annals*, written later, were intended as the history of the Roman emperors.<sup>45</sup> The theme of these histories, although it often touches on events in the provinces, was the city and government at Rome,<sup>46</sup> and a concern with civil war and moral decline.<sup>47</sup> Foreign military campaigns were used by Tacitus to shed light on the emperors and their court.<sup>48</sup> The descriptions of the north-western peoples made by Tacitus, will be analysed with these different and specific motives and context in mind.

Despite their vastly different lives, experiences and literary works, a comparison between Tacitus and Smith in this context is both fascinating and worthwhile, as many stereotypes assumed or drawn on are seemingly similar, no matter the motive or reason for them being used. Tacitus was by the nineteenth century widely read in Europe,<sup>49</sup> and surely available to Smith.

---

<sup>40</sup> Burn 1969: 42.

<sup>41</sup> Goodyear argues that any moralistic comment is not consistent and that there is possibly no real alternative purpose but merely an ethnographic treatise written from a historical viewpoint and that any interpretative or evaluative element can be viewed in the context of the genre of historical works (Goodyear 1982: 644).

<sup>42</sup> Mellor 1993: 15, Dorey 1969: 12, Grant 1971: 8. Gruen argues that the Germania should not be reduced to this simplistic contrast (Gruen 2010: 160).

<sup>43</sup> Bowder 1980: 205, Dorey 1969: 12, Grant 1971: 8.

<sup>44</sup> Dorey 1969: 12-13. Gruen rejects the idea (Gruen 2010: 170). Benario also comments on the unlikelihood of a senator presuming to give advice on military matters (Benario 1999: 3), although I would argue his role as historian, rather than senator, would have given him opportunity to criticise or advise on current affairs, if that is what he attempted.

<sup>45</sup> Bowder 1980: 205, Grant 1971: 7.

<sup>46</sup> Mellor 1993: 24.

<sup>47</sup> Mellor 1993: 22.

<sup>48</sup> Mellor 1993: 24-25.

<sup>49</sup> Mellor 1993: 137-162, Goodyear 1982: 643, Grant 1971: 24.

---

### 2.3 The 'Other' as Reckless or Cautious

A common stereotype of the 'other' is that of recklessness. Tacitus uses the word *audax* (boldly reckless) to describe Germans and Gauls.<sup>50</sup> He also uses the word *temeritas*<sup>51</sup> to describe the approach of Germans and over-readiness for battle of Julius Sabinus, a Gaul.<sup>52</sup> The people of Cologne are represented as admitting that their own actions were taken 'with more keenness than caution (*avidius quam cautius*).<sup>53</sup> The Cugerni are described as careless (*parum intentos*) and the 'enemy' in the very next sentence as incautious (*incauto hosti*).<sup>54</sup> Tacitus describes the Britons as leaving safe positions for plunder, a sign of their lack of forethought or caution.<sup>55</sup> In one instance, he describes a group of Germans at a festival lying about careless of danger (*incuria... soluta*).<sup>56</sup> Tacitus uses a related word (*incuriosos*) to describe the Britons' neglect of their crops.<sup>57</sup> He also describes the Batavi as too impetuous (*praeferoces initio*).<sup>58</sup> However, Tacitus does admit the ability of the 'other' to form plans, tactics with due deliberation,<sup>59</sup> which indicates careful, cautious action, and he makes one comment on how Arminius did not immediately attack, although the way was clear to do so.<sup>60</sup> Tacitus, like other Roman writers, focuses on recklessness<sup>61</sup> far more than caution,<sup>62</sup> which is more often than not implied rather than intended,

---

<sup>50</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 24.1, 29.4.

<sup>51</sup> Caesar uses this word often to describe the Gauls (Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.13, 6.7.4, 7.42.2, 8.8.1).

<sup>52</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 2.22, 4.29, 4.67.

<sup>53</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.65.

<sup>54</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 5.18. Livy also describes the Gauls as usually *incauti* (Liv. 5.44.7).

<sup>55</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.33.

<sup>56</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.50.

<sup>57</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.38.

<sup>58</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.23.

<sup>59</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 11.1, *Ann.* 1.68, 2.20, 12.31, 12.33.

<sup>60</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.65.

<sup>61</sup> According to Isaac, Caesar often refers to the Gauls as impetuous and impulsive (Isaac 2004: 413). For example: *imprudencia* (Caes. *B.G.* 7.29.4), *subita et repentina consilia* (Caes. *B.G.* 3.8.3) and a reference to the speed with which they take up battle (Caes. *B.G.* 3.19.6). Sallust describes the Gauls as acting imprudently (*inconsulte*) (Sall. *Cat.* 42.2). Vitruvius describes people of the north as by nature reckless and without forethought (Vitr. 6.1.10). Livy describes the 'other' as lacking foresight (*improvidos*) (Liv. 5.45.3), and not prepared to wait (*gens minime ad morae taedium ferendum patiens* (Liv. 33.36.8) and refers to their lack of preparation (*non praeparassent*) (Liv. 38.21.6).

<sup>62</sup> Only Cicero and Livy allude to any kind of caution or forethought (Cic. *Sull.* 36, Liv. 5.38.3, 34.46.6).

---

impetuousness and improvidence reminiscent of common stereotypes of northerners, Gauls in particular.<sup>63</sup>

Smith describes the Xhosa as being ‘reckless’ with their lives<sup>64</sup> and ‘reckless of the future’.<sup>65</sup> He describes Maqoma as having a ‘reckless’ disposition”,<sup>66</sup> which is fairly ironic as Smith has been criticised for his own reckless personality,<sup>67</sup> perhaps explaining why his comments on recklessness of the ‘other’ are few and far between. Smith has even been described as contemptuous of ‘caution’,<sup>68</sup> which could perhaps cast a different light on his references to the ‘other’ in this way. He describes ‘Umtini’ as ‘cautious’<sup>69</sup> and alludes to caution on the part of the Xhosa in that he mentions that there were always a number of them on the look-out.<sup>70</sup> Interestingly he often describes the Xhosa as ‘suspicious’ people,<sup>71</sup> implying connotations of ‘untrusting’ rather than cautious, an almost sly mistrust possibly based on the British soldier’s own behaviour, as an example of ‘inversion’, or indicative of the Xhosa people’s real mistrust of the British.

### 2.3.1 Passion and Emotion

Connected to the idea of recklessness is the portrayal of the ‘other’ as overly passionate and emotional, in contrast to a more moderate or rational temperament. Tacitus writes of the Britons’

---

<sup>63</sup> Balsdon 1979: 65, Gruen 2010: 148. Balsdon also comments on the the northerner as portrayed as courageous to the point of foolhardiness (Balsdon 1979: 60).

<sup>64</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>65</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>66</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>67</sup> Mostert 1992: 768.

<sup>68</sup> Mostert 1992: 713.

<sup>69</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 36.

<sup>70</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 85.

<sup>71</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 3 Nov 1835, 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

---

rage (*ira*) in battle.<sup>72</sup> He describes the Germans as killing slaves on impulse and passion (*impetu et ira*), rather than strict discipline, as they kill their enemies in battle.<sup>73</sup> He describes Civilis, as ‘burning with rage’ (*incensus ira*) as he drove all the Batavian people into taking up weapons.<sup>74</sup> The Germans are described in one scene as confused and disordered, fighting only with mindless rage (*inconsulta ira*), compared to the ordered rational fighting of the Romans.<sup>75</sup> Tacitus refers to the ‘lust’ (*libido*) of Cartimandua,<sup>76</sup> and Cerialis, in the speech to the Gauls which appears in Tacitus’ narrative, it is *libido*, he claims, that drove the Germans to cross into the Gallic provinces.<sup>77</sup> The same word is used again a few chapters later, in Tutor’s complaint about the Germans’ lack of reliability, when Tacitus writes of the Germans as obedient only to their own *libido*.<sup>78</sup>

Smith often refers to the Xhosa as possessing a passionate temperament. He describes Hintsas as driven by ‘impulse’, for whom ‘desire stands for law and rectitude’.<sup>79</sup> He reiterates this idea when he states that the Xhosa are ruled by ‘arbitrary power, desire and self-will’,<sup>80</sup> claiming, in a similar way to Tacitus, that the ‘other’ is guided by desire, rather than morality or order, although Smith focuses more on the idea of right and wrong, rather than military obedience. Smith uses the word ‘fury’ to describe Hintsas’s actions against him,<sup>81</sup> and goes on to refer to a ‘fury of savages’.<sup>82</sup> He describes Maqoma in particular as possessing a ‘turbulent, uncontrollable

---

<sup>72</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 16.2. Livy makes much mention of the ‘other’s’ *ira*, acting in anger, wrath, blind passion, using imagery of fire and commenting on their *impotentia*, inability to control their passion, which takes over any judgement or sense (Liv. 5.36.8, 5.36.11, 5.37.4, 31.10.3, 38.17.7, 38.21.7-8).

<sup>73</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 25.2.

<sup>74</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.21.

<sup>75</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.29.

<sup>76</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 3.45.

<sup>77</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.73. Strabo describes the Gauls or Celts as driven by animal instincts which override any rational thought (Strab. 3.4.16)

<sup>78</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.76.

<sup>79</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 35.

<sup>80</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 77.

<sup>81</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 46.

<sup>82</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 59.

---

spirit'.<sup>83</sup> He describes the Xhosa as having a 'total absence of self control'.<sup>84</sup> He uses the word 'turbulent' to describe the Xhosa a number of times.<sup>85</sup> Smith also comments on their overt display of emotion upon hearing music,<sup>86</sup> their excessive displays of grief and lamentation, weeping and groaning, on hearing about Smith's recall and the withdrawal of the British from the area<sup>87</sup> and describes their emotion as 'over-excited' and 'uncontrollable'.<sup>88</sup> He places much emphasis on their state of 'excitement',<sup>89</sup> particularly when policies were changing or war was threatening; however he also attributed this kind of excitement to the settlers under the same circumstances.<sup>90</sup> He also comments on the 'other' as in a state of 'agitation' in these situations,<sup>91</sup> something apparently peculiar to 'barbarians'.<sup>92</sup> 'Agitation' at the time meant a 'disorder of the mind arising from the violence of different passions'.<sup>93</sup> Smith claims that should they be left to their own devices if the province were to be abandoned, the Xhosa would be reduced into a 'tumult of contending passions, storms and tempests, plainly denoting their state of mind'.<sup>94</sup> Much later in his career he describes them as possessing 'evil passions'.<sup>95</sup> He makes one mention of the 'licentiousness' of the Xhosa<sup>96</sup> and describes Tyali as 'pleasure loving'.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 87.

<sup>84</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 12 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>85</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 4, 8 June, 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>86</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 93.

<sup>87</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 98, 100.

<sup>88</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 100.

<sup>89</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 3 Nov, 10 Nov 1835, 4 June, 10 July, 28 July, 1 Aug in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D'Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 11, 43.

<sup>90</sup> Harington 1980: 176.

<sup>91</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.11, 43, 69, 88.

<sup>92</sup> Harington 1980: 77.

<sup>93</sup> Barclay 1811: 22.

<sup>94</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>95</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>96</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 14 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>97</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

Tacitus, a number of times, portrays the ‘other’ as acting out of rage or lust, similar to descriptions by other Roman writers of the ‘other’ as passionate and even insane.<sup>98</sup> The stereotype of the ‘other’ as dominated by passion, madness and emotion was common in Roman writings.<sup>99</sup> Smith comments on the overly emotional nature of the ‘other’, as well as their desire, passion and rage.<sup>100</sup> Both Roman and British societies valued virtues of moderation, rationality and restraint,<sup>101</sup> Europeans commonly stereotyping the ‘other’ as having little or no control over their senses or emotions,<sup>102</sup> something that was linked to ‘child-likeness’,<sup>103</sup> ‘wildness’ and ‘animal-likeness’. Tacitus does not comment, and Smith does so only once, on the idea of the sexual licentiousness of the ‘other’, a common and related image.<sup>104</sup> Crais argues that portrayals of the ‘other’ in this way, as libidinous and uncontrolled, amounted to an inversion of that which they felt repugnant in their own culture and reflected a common stereotype propagated by the conservative Settler elite in the eastern Cape Colony.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> Caesar associates the word *iracundia* with the ‘other’ (Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.13, 7.42.2, 8.19.8). Sallust describes Gauls as acting *per dementia* (Sall. *Cat.* 42.2). Livy refers to their ‘Gallic madness’ (*Gallicam rabiem*) (Liv. 38.17.8).

<sup>99</sup> Isaac 2004: 412, 437-8, Murphey 1977: 236.

<sup>100</sup> Jahoda 1999: 114.

<sup>101</sup> Tacitus particularly valued the virtue of *moderatio* (Mellor 1993: 8, Goodyear 1982: 643). Tacitus persistently praises moderation, for him a virtue (Furneaux 1922: xxxi). See also discussion on rationality and intelligence in chapter 1.3.

<sup>102</sup> During the Middle Ages, the mythic ‘wild man’ was depicted as a slave to his passions (Jahoda 1999: 5) and the image was later transferred to native Americans who were described in sixteenth century English works as moved by passion rather than reason (Jahoda 1999: 24), and to Africans who in the nineteenth Century were portrayed by missionaries as unable to conceal feelings, laughing, crying and acting on impulse, incapable of self control (Jahoda 1999: 145-7). The image of the African’s lack of self control persisted into the twentieth Century (Jahoda 1999: 149).

<sup>103</sup> According to Jahoda, an eighteenth century puritan preacher wrote of children as subject to unbridled passions and appetites (Jahoda 1999: 141). As late as the twentieth Century the childlikeness of ‘savages’ was connected to descriptions of mood swings and the lack of control over impulses and desires (Jahoda 1999: 90). See also the discussion on ‘child-likeness’ of the ‘other’ in chapter 1.7.

<sup>104</sup> According to Jahoda, in Greek tradition mythological images of satyrs, fauns, nymphs and sileni were characterized by an unrestrained sexual licentiousness (Jahoda 1999: 4). The mythical ‘wild man’ during the Middle Ages were portrayed in a similar way (Jahoda 1999: 5, 6, 235) as was the ‘ape’ around the fourteenth century (Jahoda 1999: 8), a trope which was linked to images of ‘savages’ to be discussed in chapter 3. Generic ‘savages’ were portrayed as excessively sexual, particularly during the Renaissance (Jahoda 1999: 225), and both indigenous Americans and Africans were described as sexually licentious (Jahoda 1999: 15, 16, 30, 31, 69, 70). See also Gidley 1992: 39, 53.

<sup>105</sup> Crais 2001: 128-9, 133.

---

#### 2.4 The 'Other' as Cowardly or Courageous

Despite their emotional and impulsive nature, the underlying courage of the 'other' is often acknowledged. Tacitus refers to the 'valour' of the Silures (*super virtutem hostium*),<sup>106</sup> although, in this instance he is by association making the victories of Julius Frontinus against the Silures even more laudable. He describes Britons within Agricola's ranks as very brave (*fortissimos*) and Calgacus as possessing *virtus*.<sup>107</sup> In a speech attributed to the latter, he is portrayed as acknowledging the Britons' own *virtus*.<sup>108</sup> Tacitus describes defeated Britons as fighting and dying in spite of being conquered, rallying against the Romans at the end with fury (*ira*) (in this case one can assume in a good sense) and *virtus*.<sup>109</sup> Tacitus writes of Caratacus as recalling the *virtus* of his Gallic ancestors.<sup>110</sup> He writes of the spiritedness (*animos*),<sup>111</sup> of the Britons<sup>112</sup> and later uses the same word to refer to the Germans (*animus*).<sup>113</sup> When writing of the Germans, Tacitus frequently refers to their *virtus*<sup>114</sup> and *fortitudo*.<sup>115</sup> He comments on a German, Inguiomerus, as defeated by a loss of *fortuna* and not of *virtus*.<sup>116</sup>

The 'other' is also described as 'bold' or 'daring', implying negative connotations such as arrogance and audacity as well as courage. Tacitus uses the word *audacia* to describe the boldness of the British, like the Gauls, in challenging danger.<sup>117</sup> The word, also used by other

---

<sup>106</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 17.2. The word *virtus* is used very often by Roman writers to describe the 'other' (Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.4, 1.2.2, 1.28.5, 1.31.7, 1.36.7, 1.39.1, 2.4.5, 2.8.3, 2.15.5, 2.24.4, 2.27.3, 3.21.1, 4.21.7, 5.25.2, 5.34.2, 6.23.2, 6.24.6, 7.22.1, 7.59.5, 8.45, 8.54.2, *B.C.* 3.59.1, 3.60.1, Sall. *Jug.* 114.2, Vitruv. 6.1.10, 6.1.11, Liv. 5.34.2, 5.36.6). As Gruen observes in the *Bellum Gallicum*, the term is applied more to Gauls than to Romans (Gruen 2010: 150).

<sup>107</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 29.4.

<sup>108</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 31.4.

<sup>109</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 37.4. Mellor notes this acknowledgement by Tacitus and connects it to Vergil's portrayal of the defeated Trojans and Italians (Mellor 1993: 4).

<sup>110</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.34.

<sup>111</sup> Other Roman writers also use the word *animus* to describe the 'other' (Caes. *B.G.* 2.27.5, 5.6.1, 7.76.2, Val. Max. 2.6.11)

<sup>112</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 3.45.

<sup>113</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.21.

<sup>114</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 13.4, 14.1, 29.1, 30.2, 31.1, 35.4, 42.1, *Hist.* 4.15, 5.17.

<sup>115</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 7.3. *Fortitudo* is another word used often by other Roman writers to describe the 'other' (Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.3, 1.2.5, 1.48.5, 2.33.4, 3.21.2, 8.19.8, *B.C.* 3.59.2, Vell. 2.118.2, Val. Max. 2.6.11)

<sup>116</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.21.

<sup>117</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 11.3.

---

Roman writers,<sup>118</sup> is used by Tacitus again to describe an individual and groups of Germans.<sup>119</sup> He portrays a ‘common’ Gaul as daring (*ausus*) to call himself a god and to challenge Rome.<sup>120</sup> Tacitus describes the German, Italicus, having won a victory, as lapsing into pride or arrogance (*superbia*).<sup>121</sup>

Tacitus’ references to the courage or daring of the ‘other’ are often preceded or followed by the mention that this bravery is only brief at the onset of a challenge<sup>122</sup> and that also more often than not it is something possessed by their ancestors and since lost. On introducing the Britons, Tacitus describes them as a people, like the Gauls, who challenge danger with boldness (*audacia*), but when it is upon them they shrink away in fear (*formido*).<sup>123</sup> Similarly, he comments on the Helvetii as being spirited (*feroces*) before a particular crisis, but afraid (*pavidi*) in the face of danger.<sup>124</sup> And as for the Germans (as presented by Tacitus), for all their arrogance when all was well they would flee in panic when it was not (*pavidos adversis*).<sup>125</sup> As mentioned in a previous paragraph, Sabinus is described as over-ready to begin the battle, but is then portrayed as fleeing in fear (*formidine*) from that same fight.<sup>126</sup> Tacitus remarks on the Gauls as having lost their courage (*virtus*), through peace and easy living, whereas he comments on the Britons as still possessing a measure of *ferocia*, here meaning a ‘spiritedness’ linked with the idea of *virtus*.<sup>127</sup> Similarly he describes the Helvetii, a Gallic people, as having once been famous for the great deeds in arms which were now only a memory.<sup>128</sup> This apparent loss of virtue and

---

<sup>118</sup> Caesar, Cicero and Valerius Maximus use it to describe the ‘other’ (Caes. *B.G.* 1.18.3, 5.15.4, 6.34.7, Cic. *Font.* 44, Val. Max. 2.6.14).

<sup>119</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.15, 4.23.

<sup>120</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 2.61.

<sup>121</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.17.

<sup>122</sup> Balsdon identifies this portrayal as a common stereotype of the ‘northerner’ (Balsdon 1979: 65).

<sup>123</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 11.3.

<sup>124</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.68.

<sup>125</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.14.

<sup>126</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.67.

<sup>127</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 11.4.

<sup>128</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.67.

---

courage could have been used by Tacitus (as by other writers)<sup>129</sup> to highlight vices such as luxury, which came to them through the Romans.

Tacitus describes the remaining Britons in a battle as those who have fled, afraid and timid,<sup>130</sup> (*ignavorum et timentium... extremo metu*).<sup>131</sup> He describes the Germans as not daring (*non ausi*) to come out of the marshes to fight<sup>132</sup> and writes of them as cowardly (*ignavum*) enemies.<sup>133</sup> Tacitus describes the Germans as melting away at the rumour of Roman approach.<sup>134</sup> Tacitus makes an interesting remark about the Germans in that their decision to give ground in battle, although considered cowardice or fear (by one would assume Roman standards), is considered by the Germans themselves as a planned strategy (*consilii quam formidinis arbitrantur*).<sup>135</sup>

Smith describes the Xhosa as having reassumed courage during the end of his campaign against them in 1835,<sup>136</sup> occasionally referring to the Xhosa as ‘courageous’.<sup>137</sup> He later describes their ‘courage’ as ‘effervescent’.<sup>138</sup> Smith describes the Xhosa as ‘gallant’ as his ‘Hottentot levies’<sup>139</sup> and uses the word again much later to describe the ‘Kafir police’ in his service.<sup>140</sup> Smith writes of Mhala as ‘never quail[ing] in the slightest as others did’,<sup>141</sup> admitting to his bravery but also intimating that this was the exception. He also writes of the Xhosa as ‘conscious of the

---

<sup>129</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.24.1, 6.24.5-6, 1.1.3. cf 2.4. See also Gruen 2006: 472.

<sup>130</sup> Other Roman writers also often describe the ‘other’ as ‘afraid’. For example, Caes. *B.G.* 4.25.2, 8.16.3, Liv. 5.39.1, 5.45.3, 7.10.12, 27.48.6, 32.31.6, 38.27.1.

<sup>131</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 34.3.

<sup>132</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 5.15.

<sup>133</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 5.16.

<sup>134</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.7.

<sup>135</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 6.6.

<sup>136</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 11 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>137</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>138</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 18 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>139</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 67.

<sup>140</sup> Smith *Letter to Grey* 2 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). Smith also describes the Mfengu as defending themselves ‘gallantly’ and ‘bravely’ (Smith, *Autobiography* p. 66) and describes the Mfengu to his wife as ‘full of heroism’ (Smith *Letter to Juana* 23 April 1825 in *Autobiography*).

<sup>141</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 83.

---

courage... they possess'.<sup>142</sup> Smith describes the Xhosa as 'undaunted',<sup>143</sup> a potentially positive term, but he associates it with words such as 'stealthy'.<sup>144</sup> He also uses the words 'temerity',<sup>145</sup> to describe the Xhosa, which at the time meant an 'unreasonable contempt of danger',<sup>146</sup> possibly alluding back to their perceived 'recklessness'. Words used most often by Smith to describe attempts made by the Xhosa against the British are 'bold', 'daring' and 'intrepid',<sup>147</sup> the latter meaning at the time that they were 'not affected with fear at the prospect of danger'.<sup>148</sup> He also uses a variety of words such as 'confidence',<sup>149</sup> 'overbearing',<sup>150</sup> 'insolent',<sup>151</sup> 'contemptuous' and 'indignant',<sup>152</sup> to describe the conduct of the Xhosa. He does, however, also use some similar words like 'boldness' to describe his own conduct towards the 'other'.

Smith describes the Xhosa to his wife at one stage as 'disheartened',<sup>153</sup> and 'dreadfully' and 'terribly frightened',<sup>154</sup> betraying his tendency to claim he understood the feelings and ways of the Xhosa.<sup>155</sup> He describes Tyali and others as flying about 'literally afraid for their lives' and the Xhosa as 'cowards'.<sup>156</sup> He describes the Xhosa as motivated by fear.<sup>157</sup> He describes Sarili as in a state of 'fear and anxiety',<sup>158</sup> and Xhosa messengers as fearful and despondent.<sup>159</sup> Smith indirectly implies that many of the Xhosa leaders, unlike Mhala, 'quailed' under his violent

---

<sup>142</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>143</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 35, 58.

<sup>144</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 58.

<sup>145</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 54.

<sup>146</sup> Barclay 1811: 916.

<sup>147</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 11 Aug, 1 Sept, 5 Dec 1835, 25 Apr, 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 55, 56, 65, 67, 86, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan 1852, 27 Jan 1852, 5 Feb 1852, 17 Mar 1852, 7 April 1852, 17 April 1852, *Reply* Dec 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also comments by Mostert (1992: 733, 736).

<sup>148</sup> Barclay 1811: 549.

<sup>149</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 54.

<sup>150</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 70.

<sup>151</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 25 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p.70, 99.

<sup>152</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 88.

<sup>153</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 14 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>154</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 15 April 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>155</sup> See chapter 1, footnote 122.

<sup>156</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 2 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>157</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library: "[Hintza's] race are... actuated by two great principles – love of wealth, cattle and fear"

<sup>158</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 3 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>159</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

---

animadversions.<sup>160</sup> He soon after describes a crowd of Xhosa as ‘perfectly petrified’ after Smith made a speech and dictated his rules to Mhala.<sup>161</sup> Much later he describes the Xhosa people as ‘cowards all’.<sup>162</sup> Smith describes the Xhosa as ‘cowed’ by his continued efforts against them.<sup>163</sup> He also makes a comment on one chief as accusing another chief of cowardice.<sup>164</sup>

Both Tacitus and Smith often label the ‘other’ as cowardly or afraid as other Roman writers do. Like Tacitus in some instances, Smith also at times acknowledges the bravery of the ‘other’ but qualifies it and distances himself from these images. A particularly interesting description of the ‘other’ is the tendency of both the Tacitus and Smith to comment on their arrogance, daring and overconfidence.<sup>165</sup> These descriptions are invariably used to describe attacks of the ‘other’ against the Romans or British, using negative connotations instead of alternatives like ‘courage’ or *virtus*, essentially implying arrogance on their part in thinking that they dare attack or resist them. Tacitus, however, often does, as other Roman writers do,<sup>166</sup> describe the ‘other’ as courageous, even possessing *virtus*, which is particularly significant as it is a word most often associated with the Romans,<sup>167</sup> and according to Riggsby an unambiguously positive quality that implies approval.<sup>168</sup> Gruen argues that this assignation of *virtus* to the ‘other’ serves to overlap the culture and values of the ‘other’ with the Romans, thereby uniting them with the ‘other’ on a

---

<sup>160</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 83.

<sup>161</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 86.

<sup>162</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 22 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>163</sup> Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>164</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>165</sup> Caesar uses the word *arrogantia* to describe the ‘other’ (Caes. *B.G.* 1.33.5, 1.46.4, *B.C.* 3.59.3). Hirtius uses the word *insolens*, insolent (Caes. *B.G.* 8.13.4), which is also used by Livy (Liv. 5.48.9). Strabo comments on the arrogant, boastful nature of the ‘other’ (Strab. 4.4.5). Plutarch describes the apparent daring, impetuosity, audacity and shamelessness of the ‘other’ (Plut. *Cam.* 27.3, *Mar.* 16.3).

<sup>166</sup> Polybius refers to the ‘other’ as ‘high spirited’ and ‘brave’ (Plb. 21.38.7, 22.21.4). Caesar refers to them as not afraid (*non timide*) (Caes. *B.G.* 3.25.1). Sallust describes the ‘other’ as undertaking dangerous and difficult tasks (Sall. *Cat.* 40.4). Strabo refers to the ‘other’s’ courage, zeal, high spiritedness, daring and fearlessness (Strabo. 3.4.17, 4.1.5, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 7.2.1). Plutarch refers to the ‘other’s’ fierce spirits, courage and daring (Plut. *Mar.* 11.8, 19.7). See footnote 106.

<sup>167</sup> The word *virtus*, meaning courage, manhood, excellence and virtue, was important to a Roman aristocrat who was expected to exhibit this trait in warfare, as Tacitus portrays Agricola, Germanicus and Corbulo (Goodyear 1982: 643). For examples see Caes. *B.G.* 5.52.4, 7.22.1, 7.47.3. Gruen describes *virtus* as a value of highest esteem for the Romans which best manifests as bravery on the battlefield (Gruen 2010: 150).

<sup>168</sup> Riggsby 2006: 83. Although its etymological meaning is ‘manliness’, Riggsby notes its meaning in actual usage as excellency shown in service of the state, notably the courage and endurance of an ideal soldier and that which leads to success in battle (Riggsby 2006: 83).

---

fundamental level.<sup>169</sup> Tacitus' comments on the Britons as courageous are often heavily qualified in the *Agricola*, the purpose being here to provide a contrast with the virtues of Agricola, who ultimately defeated them, whereas he emphasizes the bravery of the Germans in the *Germania*, still undefeated, possibly aiming to highlight these people as a threat<sup>170</sup> and to compare the courage of the 'other' against Roman lifestyles<sup>171</sup> and even senatorial cowardice,<sup>172</sup> while the German legions in the *Histories* are portrayed as cowardly and corrupted by tyranny.<sup>173</sup> Miller and Savage note the stereotype of Germans as both valorous and cowardly at the same time.<sup>174</sup> Arndt notes that it was common during Smith's time for British soldiers to label the Xhosa as 'cowardly and treacherous'.<sup>175</sup>

### 2.5 The 'Other' as Lazy or Industrious

Although the nature of the 'other' was often portrayed as warlike and courageous, a stereotype of general 'laziness' seems to have been used alongside this image. Tacitus describes the Gauls as 'slothful' having followed the Roman way of life (*segnitia cum otio intravit*).<sup>176</sup> The adjective to *segnitia* is used later to portray the Britons as sluggish in their work (*laborum segnes*).<sup>177</sup> Tacitus portrays the Germans as a warlike and active people, but only in war: if they become slothful (*torpeat*), during a prolonged time of peace (which is seen as likely due to their scorn for labour), the young will seek out battle, for although they treat inaction with scorn, they view it as weak to gain by labour what could be won through war.<sup>178</sup> He comments on the same tendency in the

---

<sup>169</sup> Gruen 2010: 150, 172-4.

<sup>170</sup> See footnote 43. Similarly, Caesar describes Germans in the same way to highlight them as a threat needed to be crushed and in the defeat to magnify his own glory (Miller and Savage 1977: 111).

<sup>171</sup> Benario 2005: 278.

<sup>172</sup> Mellor 1993: 26.

<sup>173</sup> Mellor 1993: 22.

<sup>174</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 116.

<sup>175</sup> Arndt 2010: 722.

<sup>176</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 11.4.

<sup>177</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.33.

<sup>178</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 14.2.

---

next chapter, that the Germans in time of peace are prone to idleness (*inertiam*) and how this seems to him strange in that it is the same men who are so brave, warlike and averse to peace.<sup>179</sup> An amusing comment is made that the Germans are so lazy that on plundering a town, that which is hidden or buried is overlooked, either because it is unknown or because it would require the Germans to search for something.<sup>180</sup> Tacitus portrays the Germans as passing whole days lying by the hearth,<sup>181</sup> drinking excessively and waking up late,<sup>182</sup> and not exerting themselves.<sup>183</sup> Tacitus comments on the exception of one German tribe which takes the time to cultivate produce, different from the general *inertia* of the Germans,<sup>184</sup> a word that he also uses to describe the Gauls.<sup>185</sup> In this case Tacitus is using an exception of a hardworking tribe to accentuate the failure of the rest from the norm.<sup>186</sup> On describing the furthest tribes he mentions the *torpor* of their nobles.<sup>187</sup> Tacitus describes the Treveri and Nervii as claiming German over Gallic descent due to the glory of the German people, as opposed to the *inertia* of the Gauls.<sup>188</sup> It seems that Tacitus' preoccupation over the intertwining of laziness, Roman luxury and peace, which he sees in the Gauls, is contradicted by his portrayal of the Germans who, although active and warlike in battle, lapse into complete un-industriousness and slothfulness in peacetime.

Smith describes the Xhosa as 'indolent'.<sup>189</sup> He portrays Maqoma as referring to his own men as 'idle'.<sup>190</sup> Smith alludes to the laziness of the Xhosa, in asking if they think the English possess

---

<sup>179</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 15.1. Gruen notes Tacitus' particular relishment in the irony of Germans as warlike yet indolent (Gruen 2010: 164-5).

<sup>180</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 16.4.

<sup>181</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 17.1.

<sup>182</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 23.2.

<sup>183</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 26.2.

<sup>184</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 45.4.

<sup>185</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 28.4.

<sup>186</sup> Gruen 2010: 166.

<sup>187</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 46.1.

<sup>188</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 28.4.

<sup>189</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 16 Aug, 28 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>190</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 27 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

what they do ‘by lying sleeping all day long under a bush’.<sup>191</sup> He describes the Xhosa as beginning under his guidance to emerge from his ‘habitual sloth’.<sup>192</sup> Smith only a few times further refers to them as ‘vagabonds’,<sup>193</sup> ‘vagrants’,<sup>194</sup> ‘drunkards’,<sup>195</sup> and ‘wanderers’,<sup>196</sup> – terms which were often associated with vice and laziness. Similarly he at times refers to them as ‘rogues’<sup>197</sup> – a ‘rogue’ at the time meant ‘a wandering beggar, a vagrant... or thief’.<sup>198</sup> He does however occasionally describe the Xhosa as ‘active’,<sup>199</sup> ‘vivacious’,<sup>200</sup> and ‘lively’,<sup>201</sup> and even refers to them at one point as ‘energetic’.<sup>202</sup> He also describe the Xhosa alert in battle as ‘enterprising’<sup>203</sup> – one who attempts endeavours or engages in opportunities.<sup>204</sup>

While Tacitus very often describes the ‘other’ as lazy<sup>205</sup> without exception,<sup>206</sup> Smith occasionally refers to the ‘other’ as both lazy and active and enterprising. Tacitus here is drawing from a fairly common stereotype<sup>207</sup> used by other Roman writers.<sup>208</sup> Smith is also to a certain extent drawing on a stereotype of the ‘other’,<sup>209</sup> more particularly a contradictory one prevalent in the Cape Colony, particularly among the Settler population.<sup>210</sup> Crais argues that the Xhosa were portrayed on the one hand as potentially ‘enterprising’ and ‘intrepid’ as an argument for using them as

<sup>191</sup> Smith, *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>192</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library. See also Harington 1980: 77.

<sup>193</sup> Smith *Letter to D’Urban* 1 Sept 1835, 25 Mar, 12 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>194</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 24 May 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>195</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 10 Dec 1849, 28 Feb 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>196</sup> Smith *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Gilbert* 3 Nov 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 4 June 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>197</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 20 April, 9 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 27 Sept, 6 Oct 1835, 12 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>198</sup> Barclay 1811: 818.

<sup>199</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 21 July, 4 Aug, 30 Nov 1835, 17 Apr in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>200</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 22 Sept, 19 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>201</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>202</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>203</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 67.

<sup>204</sup> Barclay 1811: 341.

<sup>205</sup> Gruen and Benario note Tacitus’ theme of indolence throughout the *Germania* (Gruen 2010: 164-5, Benario 1999: 81).

<sup>206</sup> Caesar describes the ‘other’ a couple of times as staying away from wine or luxury (Caes. *B.G.* 2.15.4, 4.2.5). He also mentions the ‘other’ as eager for work and hardship (*labori ac duritiae student*) (Caes. *B.G.* 6.21.3).

<sup>207</sup> Isaac 2004: 438.

<sup>208</sup> Caesar comments once on the Gauls as unaccustomed to toil (*insueti laboris*) (Caes. *B.G.* 7.30.4). Livy also only once comments on the ‘other’ as *pigerrima*, idle (Liv. 21.25.6).

<sup>209</sup> According to Jahoda, indigenous Americans and Africans were commonly described as lazy (Jahoda 1999: 20, 21, 50, 70, 90).

<sup>210</sup> Crais 2001: 128-132.

---

labour, and then paradoxically portrayed as lazy and indolent when they realised the Xhosa were not to be the docile ‘workers’ they so desired.<sup>211</sup> Smith also occasionally uses the word ‘wandering’, a term used often to intimate lack of employment or work, rather than ‘defeat’ as mentioned in chapter one, although one reference is made by Strabo to the ‘other’ as ‘wandering’ in association with acts of brigandage and piracy.<sup>212</sup> What is interesting is the different motives Tacitus and Smith have for using this stereotype. Tacitus uses ‘idleness’ quite often to highlight the vices of civilized ‘Roman living’, whereas Smith uses it to contrast it with British industry which he associates with British civilisation, claiming that through industry and labour, the British attained their superiority and civilisation.<sup>213</sup> There was a common and perpetuated belief at the time among missionaries and imperialists that industry was an important virtue, particularly connected with Christian ideals and economic agendas.<sup>214</sup> Where Tacitus links idleness and vice to Roman living, and ‘wandering’ is associated with defeat, the British did not (in most cases) acknowledge that wandering, vagrancy and drunkenness could be linked to the displacement and alcohol that they brought with them.

### 2.6 The ‘Other’ as Greedy

Not only was the ‘other’ seen as lazy, but also often ‘greedy’. Tacitus describes the Germans as charmed with gifts<sup>215</sup> and greedy for booty (*praedae cupidine*).<sup>216</sup> This idea is perpetuated later in his descriptions of the Germans as crossing into Gallic territory and going into battle purely out of *avaritia*,<sup>217</sup> greedy for booty.<sup>218</sup> He also describes the Gauls as greedy (*avaritia*).<sup>219</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup> Crais 2001: 128-132. Crais’ argument is also commented on by Arndt (2010: 711).

<sup>212</sup> Strab. 7.2.1.

<sup>213</sup> Smith *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836

<sup>214</sup> Jahoda 1999: 143. See also chapter 3, footnote 379 and Chapter 4, footnote 77.

<sup>215</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 21.3.

<sup>216</sup> The same phrase appears in Tac. *Hist.* 4.23, 4.63 and the word *cupidine* in Tac. *Ann.* 1.68. Caesar uses a related word to describe the ‘other’ as very eager (*cupidissimi*) for cattle (Caes. *B.G.* 6.35.6).

<sup>217</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.73. This word is used by other Roman writers to portray the greediness of the ‘other’ (Caes. *B.G.* 7.42.2, Liv. 5.51.10, Val. Max. 2.6.11). Livy also describes the Gauls as *avidissima* covetous of gold (Liv. 21.20.8, 38.27.7).

---

Tacitus even goes as far as to describe the Gauls and Germans as so greedy that they would, in victory, drop their arms and weapons and forget their enemies in order to fill their hands with booty.<sup>220</sup> He states that it was to the Romans' advantage that the Germans were prone to leave killing in favour of booty.<sup>221</sup> He also comments on the Britons' delight in plunder (*laeti praeda*).<sup>222</sup> Tacitus also comments on the Germans as drinking excessively,<sup>223</sup> which as we have seen was linked to laziness. Tacitus does, however, make one comment on the Germans as caring little for gold or silver.<sup>224</sup> While Benario notes Tacitus' possible contemplation here of the fact that the Germans could be better off without that which led Rome into wars and conflict,<sup>225</sup> Gruen picks up on the irony, that they possibly did not value it because they did not possess it, not because they were especially virtuous.<sup>226</sup>

Smith portrays the Xhosa as cupidinous<sup>227</sup> and describes Mhala as 'avaricious'.<sup>228</sup> Smith particularly portrays the Xhosa as greedy for presents and trinkets. He writes to his wife of Hintsa's and Sarili's extraordinary delight in presents<sup>229</sup> and recounts an episode when he went among the Xhosa with tobacco and had 'such fun... throwing it in amongst them and making them scramble for it'.<sup>230</sup> He comments that he 'knew' that presents would bring the rain-makers to him.<sup>231</sup> He describes the Xhosa as driven by a principle of 'love of wealth and cattle',<sup>232</sup> and

---

<sup>218</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.78.

<sup>219</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.51.

<sup>220</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.78, 5.17.

<sup>221</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.65.

<sup>222</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.33.

<sup>223</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 23.

<sup>224</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 5.5.

<sup>225</sup> Benario 1999: 69.

<sup>226</sup> Gruen 2010: 166-167.

<sup>227</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 10 Apr, 25 Apr, 8 June, 28 July in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D'Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>228</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 28 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>229</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 30 Apr, 4, 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>230</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 2 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>231</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 81.

<sup>232</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

---

the Xhosa custom as teaching them ‘to possess all they can acquire in any way’.<sup>233</sup> Smith also comments on the Xhosa as drinking and eating a great deal,<sup>234</sup> alluding to gluttony, a more physical kind of greed.

Both Tacitus and Smith make comments on the greediness and gluttony of the ‘other’, as other Roman writers do.<sup>235</sup> Isaac argues that since Polybius, the Gauls portrayed as greedy, became a common stereotype.<sup>236</sup> By Smith’s time the image of a gluttonous ‘savage’ was common<sup>237</sup> and may have influenced his writing. The similar image of the ‘other’ as enthralled by and greedy for gifts, mentioned by both Tacitus and Smith, is particularly interesting and perpetuated by other Roman writers.<sup>238</sup> Smith in particular made it part of his negotiations to offer presents and gifts to chiefs.<sup>239</sup> Smith, however, does not overtly state them to be liable to temptation of bribes or cattle. Conversely the portrayal of the ‘other’ as uninterested in mineral wealth could possibly serve to justify the conqueror taking it.<sup>240</sup>

### 2.7 The ‘Other’ as Treacherous or Loyal

An image used most often to justify actions against the ‘other’ was the representation of the ‘other’ as ‘treacherous’. Tacitus describes Civilis, in his plans for rebellion, the Gauls, in their actions, and the Chauci, in allowing Arminius passage, as acting with treachery<sup>241</sup> (*fraude*).<sup>242</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>234</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 36.

<sup>235</sup> On greediness of the ‘other’ in general see Caes. *B.G.* 1.28.4, 3.18.2, 7.31.1, 7.43.3, Liv. 22.1.2, 23.24.13. On weakness for food and drink see Liv. 5.33.2-3, 5.44.6, Plut. *Cam.* 15.2, 41.2-3, *Mar.* 19.2-3.

<sup>236</sup> Isaac 2004: 412, Gruen 2010: 141.

<sup>237</sup> According to Jahoda gluttony and debauchery were often part of the stereotype of Africans from the thirteenth century (Jahoda 1999: 27), and was a vice often associated with carnal excess (Jahoda 1999: 17, 70, 90).

<sup>238</sup> Some other Roman writers also comment on this idea of the ‘other’ as enthralled or obsessed with gifts, trinkets and shiny things (Liv. 21.24.5, Strab. 4.4.5).

<sup>239</sup> Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 Mar 1849, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850). See also chapter 4, footnote 128.

<sup>240</sup> During early Atlantic exploration some humanist scholars portrayed the ‘other’ as lacking an interest in gold and silver preferring a simple and idyllic way of life (Jahoda 1999: 11).

<sup>241</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.16, 4.57, *Ann.* 2.17.

<sup>242</sup> Both Livy and Velleius use the same word in their portrayals of the ‘other’ (Liv. 22.1.3, 38.25.8, Vell. 2.107.3).

---

The word *insidiae* is used to describe the actions of Civilis, in his plans against the Roman legions.<sup>243</sup> The word *dolus*<sup>244</sup> ('treachery' and 'craftiness') is used to describe Cartimandua's actions against Caratacus (*per dolum*)<sup>245</sup> and the actions of Civilis and Britons against the Romans.<sup>246</sup> Arminius is one of those described by Roman soldiers as 'treacherous and breakers of peace' (*perfidus et ruptores pacis*):<sup>247</sup> compare Vocula's description of the Gauls (*ruptores foederum*).<sup>248</sup> Civilis' actions are described moreover in terms of betrayal and treachery (*proditione... perfidia*).<sup>249</sup> The word *perfidia* is used again to describe the actions of Arminius and the Germans against Rome.<sup>250</sup> The idea of faithlessness and disloyalty, a lack of *fides*, is placed into the Britons' own words to describe themselves.<sup>251</sup> Inevitably, many of these words are related to descriptions of revolts, desertions and conspiracies against Rome.<sup>252</sup>

Of the Roman authors, Tacitus is, however, one of few<sup>253</sup> that comment on the loyalty of the 'other'. He describes Cogidumnus as a most loyal (*fidissimus*) ally.<sup>254</sup> He describes the Hermunduri and the Lingones, as loyal (*fida*) to Rome.<sup>255</sup> Tacitus portrays Segestes as portraying himself as loyal (*fidei et constantiae*) to the people of Rome.<sup>256</sup> Vannius and Sido are similarly praised.<sup>257</sup> He uses the word *constantia* to describe the loyalty of Sabinus' friends

---

<sup>243</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.16, *Ann.* 11.19. The word *insidia* is used in reference to the 'other' by other Roman authors (Caes. *B.G.* 4.13.1, 6.34.6, 8.16.4, Liv. 22.1.3, 38.25.8)

<sup>244</sup> Caesar also makes use of the word *dolus* in his portrayal of the 'other' (Caes. *B.G.* 4.13.1)

<sup>245</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 3.45.

<sup>246</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.16, *Ann.* 12.32.

<sup>247</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.13.

<sup>248</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.57.

<sup>249</sup> *Perfidia* is common word used by Roman authors to describe the actions of the 'other' (Caes. *B.G.* 4.13.4, 4.14.3, 7.17.7, 7.54.2, *B.C.* 2.14.4, Liv. 21.52.8, 25.33.2, Vell. 2.119.2). According to Murphey, *perfidia* was a theme of Caesar's *B.G.* 4 (Murphey 1977: 238).

<sup>250</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.55, 2.8, 2.13.

<sup>251</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 32.2.

<sup>252</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.14, *Ann.* 2.13, 11.18-19, 14.31.

<sup>253</sup> Caesar comments on the loyalty of the 'other' towards each other and the Romans (Caes. *B.G.* 3.22, 4.21.7, 5.5.4, 7.21.1, 7.40.7). Valerius also notes the *fides* of the 'other' (Val. Max. 2.6.11).

<sup>254</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 14.2.

<sup>255</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 41.1, *Hist.* 4.67.

<sup>256</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.58.

<sup>257</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.30.

---

(*egregia adversus nos fide*).<sup>258</sup> However, the ‘loyalty’ of the ‘other’ as an ally never seems wholly presented as trustworthy, and rather bought with ‘fear and terror’,<sup>259</sup> something also evident from Smith’s writing.<sup>260</sup> I would argue that loyalty was the expectation rather than the reality.

As different events emerge, Smith attributes both loyalty and treachery to the ‘other’, at times to the same person. Smith accuses the Xhosa of treachery generally for their attack on the Colony,<sup>261</sup> describing the whole Xhosa ‘race’ as ‘perfidious’<sup>262</sup> and faithless.<sup>263</sup> He exclaims that ‘little faith can be expected’ from them.<sup>264</sup> Smith describes Hintsas as ‘treacherously’ evading the British government,<sup>265</sup> his acts ‘treacherous’,<sup>266</sup> and his people in ‘absolute want of all faith’.<sup>267</sup> Sarili and Boku are described as ‘treacherous’ and having ‘false faith’ for failing to fulfil a treaty.<sup>268</sup> Likewise Nqeno is described as a ‘breaker of treaties’.<sup>269</sup> He does comment on Faku’s and Maphasa’s ‘faithful’ conduct in the previous war.<sup>270</sup> While in charge of Queen Adelaide province, Smith describes a councillor Ganya as ‘faithful’<sup>271</sup> and his Xhosa messengers as ‘emphatically loyal’ to his rule.<sup>272</sup> He describes at one point the ‘loyalty of every one’ of his Xhosa subjects as ‘conspicuous’.<sup>273</sup> He writes of how he has yet not discovered any of the ‘bad

---

<sup>258</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.67.

<sup>259</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 32.2, *Hist.* 1.64. Similarly Caesar comments on the need to bribe a Gallic auxiliary to spy on his people, calling into question his ‘loyalty’ to Rome (Caes. *B.G.* 3.18.2).

<sup>260</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>261</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 16 Aug, 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Address to Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 32, 70, 80. See also Harington 1980: 66. D’Urban also referred to the Xhosa in this way (Mostert 1992: 727) as did the settlers (Lester 1998: 226).

<sup>262</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>263</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 21 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>264</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>265</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>266</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 42, 46, 59. See also Harington 1980: 65.

<sup>267</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 3 May 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 38.

<sup>268</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 29 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>269</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 21.

<sup>270</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 15 Dec 1835, 21 Feb, 1 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>271</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 101, 103.

<sup>272</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>273</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

faith' for which Maqoma is apparently known.<sup>274</sup> This opinion however changes when he discovers that Maqoma had called a secret assembly urging his people to leave the province<sup>275</sup> and proceeds to refer to his 'treachery.'<sup>276</sup> However, later he writes of Maqoma as 'faithfully adhering' to his promise.<sup>277</sup> He also describes Mhala, Gasela and Siyolo as his 'faithful children' whom he will use against Maqoma if necessary,<sup>278</sup> and even goes as far as to refer to his servant Mani as a 'most faithful dog',<sup>279</sup> in this way lending inferior and demeaning connotations to the portrayal of the loyalty of the 'other'.

Before the outbreak of war in December 1850, Smith had reported on the 'loyal feeling' of the Xhosa towards the Colonial government.<sup>280</sup> On the outbreak of war, however, he repeatedly describes the Xhosa generally as 'treacherous'<sup>281</sup> and acting with 'perfidy',<sup>282</sup> feeling personally betrayed by the Xhosa and particularly his native levies. To his disappointment he realised he could no longer depend on his 'kafir police',<sup>283</sup> in whom, before the war, he had confidence,<sup>284</sup> describing them as acting without 'a single act of treachery',<sup>285</sup> almost as if that would be the expectation. He describes the Xhosa enemy 'rebels' as 'traitors',<sup>286</sup> and concluded that they were unreliable.<sup>287</sup> During the war he does describe most of the T'Slambie chiefs and Faku as 'faithful' allies to the British.<sup>288</sup> Smith comments also on the faithfulness and loyalty of Pato to

---

<sup>274</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 3 Apr 1836, reiterated Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 5 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>275</sup> See Harrington 1980: 57.

<sup>276</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 88. See also Lehmann 1977: 193. Interestingly, D'Urban had apparently previously warned Smith of Maqoma's possible deception (Mostert 1992: 774).

<sup>277</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>278</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>279</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 103.

<sup>280</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 24 May 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>281</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 31 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Corresp.*, Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan, 20 Feb 1852, *Memorandum* 14 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also Harrington 1980: 102, Mostert 1992: 1071.

<sup>282</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>283</sup> Harrington 1980: 181.

<sup>284</sup> Harrington 1980: 170.

<sup>285</sup> Smith, *Letter to Bowker* 3 Nov 1848 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>286</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 30 Aug 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>287</sup> Harrington 1980: 179.

<sup>288</sup> Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852, *Letter to Grey* 16 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

---

the Queen,<sup>289</sup> although he seems to have become unsure of this at some stage.<sup>290</sup> He describes Mhala as ‘very loyal lately’,<sup>291</sup> giving the impression of inconsistent and fleeting loyalty.

For both Tacitus and Smith, the question of whether the ‘other’ is portrayed as either treacherous or loyal depends on their relationship with Rome or Britain respectively. It would seem that any action taken against the Romans or British was seen in morally deviant terms. Romans often commented on the infidelity of the ‘other’.<sup>292</sup> If the ‘other’ was allied to and assisted the empire for which they were fighting, they were inevitably praised for their ‘loyalty’. It was not considered that they might be loyal to their own by rebelling against the empire, or in the same way, treacherous to their own in being allied to the Romans or British. Roman writers do, however, provide a couple of examples of being described as treacherous towards their own.<sup>293</sup> Treachery, according to Smith, justified hostility and acts of war against the Xhosa, what he terms as ‘punishment’.<sup>294</sup> Arndt argues that the image of the Xhosa as ‘treacherous savages’, as the sole culprits for the frontier wars,<sup>295</sup> was used to justify occupation and severe postwar policies on the Xhosa in the name of future colonial security.<sup>296</sup> According to Arndt this was a common stereotype among the British colonial army, one that took firmer and firmer hold<sup>297</sup> and was especially advocated by Smith, who seems to have presented the ‘other’ in this way even before he reached the frontier for the first time.<sup>298</sup>

---

<sup>289</sup> Smith, *Letter to Maclean* 27 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also Lehmann 1977: 326. According to Lehmann, Smith delighted in Pato’s loyalty (Lehmann 1977: 179).

<sup>290</sup> Lehmann 1977: 338.

<sup>291</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 July 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>292</sup> Romans tended to, when defeated, console themselves as victims of treachery (Isaac 2004: 430). Caesar, Horace and Livy describe the ‘other’ as *infidelis* (Caes. *B.G.* 7.59.2, Hor. *Epod.* 16.6, Liv. 21.52.7). Cicero comments on the *periuria* of the ‘other’ (Cic. *Font.* 45). Livy describes the ‘other’ as breaking faith and agreements (Liv. 5.51.10, 21.25.6), and untrustworthy (Liv. 27.48.5). Strabo describes the Germans as betrayers and untrustworthy (Strab. 7.1.4).

<sup>293</sup> For example, Liv. 32.30.8-10.

<sup>294</sup> Mostert 1992: 932, 1127, Strobel 2008: 76.

<sup>295</sup> Arndt 2010: 717 – 722.

<sup>296</sup> Arndt 2010: 722

<sup>297</sup> Arndt 2010: 722

<sup>298</sup> Arndt 2010: 718, 722

---

### 2.7.1 Deceit and Dishonesty

Connected to the image of treachery is that of dishonesty. Tacitus describes Civilis as secretive, concealing his plans to revolt (*occultato... consilio*).<sup>299</sup> He uses a related Latin word *occultus* to describe attempts and rebellions made by the Britons against the Romans.<sup>300</sup> However, he particularly remarks on the Germans as being without natural or acquired cunning (*gens non astute nec callida*).<sup>301</sup>

Smith, on the other hand, uses a variety of words to describe the Xhosa as secretive and dishonest. He describes the Xhosa as having a heart of ‘deceit’,<sup>302</sup> particularly referring to the rainmakers, Mhala and Maqoma as ‘deceitful’,<sup>303</sup> the latter as also duplicitous.<sup>304</sup> He describes the Xhosa as the ‘most determined and practised liars in the universe’.<sup>305</sup> He refers to the ‘duplicity’ of the chiefs, in particular Hintsas,<sup>306</sup> and to the ‘subterfuge’ of Boku’s people in joining Mhala.<sup>307</sup> He describes Hintsas’s offer of himself as a hostage as an intended ‘cloak’ while meditating his escape.<sup>308</sup> The words ‘stealthy’ and ‘wily’ are used to describe the Xhosa.<sup>309</sup> Smith describes Hintsas as ‘shuffling’ and ‘evasive’,<sup>310</sup> both at the time alluding to tricks and artifices,<sup>311</sup> and later uses the same terms to describe Mhala and other chiefs.<sup>312</sup> He writes of the

---

<sup>299</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.14.

<sup>300</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.32, 14.31, 14.32.

<sup>301</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 22.4.

<sup>302</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 19 April 1835 in *Autobiography*. He describes the Xhosa general as ‘deceitful’ (Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*)

<sup>303</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 81, 82, 84.

<sup>304</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Apr 1836, reiterated Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>305</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 18 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>306</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 30 Aug, 27 Sept 1835, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>307</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 26 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>308</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 37.

<sup>309</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 12 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 55, 58, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 17 Mar 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>310</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 9 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 1 Nov 1835, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 33, 34, 42.

<sup>311</sup> Barclay 1811: 352, 855.

<sup>312</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Message to chief Umhala* 27 Jan 1852, *Letter to Grey* 16 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

Gaikas spreading ‘lies’.<sup>313</sup> Smith refers to the actions of the Xhosa against the British as ‘covert’.<sup>314</sup> He highlights their ‘affected’ pretence at acquiescence<sup>315</sup> and describes Nqeno as ‘double-faced’.<sup>316</sup> He portrays the rain-makers as dishonest,<sup>317</sup> Mhala, and the Xhosa in general, as ‘liars’,<sup>318</sup> Gasela is portrayed as describing Maqoma as ‘false’<sup>319</sup> and in an address to the chiefs, called their practices ‘lies’, ‘perjury’ and ‘false’.<sup>320</sup> Smith also describes the Xhosa as using lies and delaying tactics in order to gain time to ready themselves for battle,<sup>321</sup> but instead of acknowledging a sound stratagem they are labelled as morally wrong. Smith does, however, once comment on the honesty of Gasela<sup>322</sup> and also quite uncharacteristically describes the Xhosa as ‘honest and unprejudiced’ and as speaking plainly ‘without lying’ in council or jury, although writing that they would ‘lie fast enough’ on trivial occasions.<sup>323</sup> It must be noted, however, that he also once describes himself as ‘evasive’.<sup>324</sup>

Although Tacitus focuses more on descriptions of betrayal, and Smith more obsessively on dishonesty and secretiveness, both portray an image of an untrustworthy ‘other’.<sup>325</sup> While other Roman writers mention dishonesty and pretence on the part of the ‘other’,<sup>326</sup> Tacitus very seldom comments on the ‘other’ as deceitful or secretive in spite of his hatred of pretence.<sup>327</sup> No matter their claims of loyalty from their ‘allies’, it would seem that there was an inherent distrust and fear of treachery from the ‘other’, which could have been well founded. Instances occur in

<sup>313</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 4 Mar 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>314</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>315</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 40, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Feb 1852, 20 Feb 1852, 17 Mar 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)

<sup>316</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 21.

<sup>317</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 83.

<sup>318</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 84.

<sup>319</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 88.

<sup>320</sup> Smith, *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>321</sup> Interestingly, Caesar mentions this as an example of deceit (Caes.*B.G.* 4.9), as does Polybius (Plb. 21.39).

<sup>322</sup> Smith *Autobiography* p. 89.

<sup>323</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 11 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>324</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 3 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>325</sup> LeVine and Campbell 1972: 9.

<sup>326</sup> Some Roman writers comment on the pretence (*simulatione*) put up by the ‘other’ (Caes. *B.G.* 4.13.4, Liv. 21.25.6, Suet. *Aug.* 79.1) and their dishonesty (Cic. *Font.* 45, Vell. 2.118.4, Plut. *Cam.* 28.4)

<sup>327</sup> For example evident in his criticism of Tiberius (Tac. *Ann.* 3.31).

---

Roman literature, for example, of Gallic mercenaries conspiring to desert the Romans for the Carthaginians because of pay.<sup>328</sup> Despite some of Smith's assertions of the loyalty to himself he comments on his expectation of 'underhandedness' on the part of the Xhosa chiefs.<sup>329</sup> The Romans and British seem to have demanded 'loyalty' and 'honesty', and regarded anything less as base and intolerable behaviour, but realised on some level that the 'other' might not necessarily want to be 'loyal' to them, as they were not entirely one of them, but 'other'.

### 2.7.2 Inconstancy

Connected to portrayals of treachery and dishonesty, is the description of the 'other' as 'fickle' or 'inconstant', which implies more of a weakness of character than a morally devious intention. Tacitus refers to Gauls on one occasion as capricious (*levissimus*),<sup>330</sup> which is similar to the view of other Roman writers.<sup>331</sup> According to Isaac, *levitas*, in opposition to the Roman virtue of *gravitas*, became a common stereotype of the 'other'.<sup>332</sup> According to Riggsby the representation and idea of the 'northerners' as living a 'wandering', 'nomadic' life was connected to an image of both psychological and social 'fluidity'.<sup>333</sup>

The image seems to have persisted or re-emerged<sup>334</sup> as Smith comments a number of times on the fickleness of the Xhosa. Smith describes Hintsá and Sarili as 'fickle'<sup>335</sup> and the Xhosa generally as 'fickle'.<sup>336</sup> He writes of the Xhosa mind as 'prone to sudden change'<sup>337</sup> and the

---

<sup>328</sup> Front. *Strat.* 3.16.2.

<sup>329</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 87.

<sup>330</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 29.4

<sup>331</sup> cf. Caes. *B.G.* 2.1.3, 3.10.3, 4.5.1, 4.13.3. Livy also describes the 'other' as *levitate* (Liv. 22.1.3).

<sup>332</sup> Isaac 2004: 412-414, Rawlings 1998: 174, Gruen 2010: 141.

<sup>333</sup> Riggsby 2006: 55 – 57, 61.

<sup>334</sup> According to Jahoda, Queen Isabella described native Americans as untruthful and inconstant, shallow like the reports of trees that had shallow roots in the area (Jahoda 1999: 19)

<sup>335</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith *Letter to Grey* 20 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>336</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 30 Aug, 27 Sept, 12 Oct, 17 Nov, 15, 17 Dec 1835, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also Harington 1980: 102.

<sup>337</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

Xhosa as ‘delighting in change’.<sup>338</sup> He writes of the Xhosa as ‘volatile’,<sup>339</sup> which at the time meant to be ‘fickle’.<sup>340</sup> He also uses the word ‘vacillating’ to describe the Xhosa,<sup>341</sup> a word that meant ‘irresolution’ and ‘inconstancy’.<sup>342</sup> He often also comments on the ‘caprice’ of the chiefs,<sup>343</sup> which according to Barclay refers to a ‘sudden change of sentiment not founded on reason’.<sup>344</sup> Arndt refers to the image of a ‘supposedly unpredictable enemy’ that was appropriated by Smith and D’Urban to justify occupation in the name of future colonial security.<sup>345</sup> Ironically, Smith comments disparagingly on the changeability of British policy and its likely hostile reaction from the Xhosa,<sup>346</sup> which could, perhaps less ironically, be seen as the acknowledgement of unpredictability as a justifiable excuse for aggression on either side. Similar to the idea that the ‘other’ was unstable and fluid, as commonly found in Roman texts, is the description of the ‘other’ as ‘restless’, which at the time that Smith was writing referred to something which is in ‘continual motion’, ‘unquiet’ and ‘unsettled’.<sup>347</sup> Smith describes Maqoma and his councillors as ‘restless’<sup>348</sup> as well as Sarili, chiefs and the Xhosa people generally.<sup>349</sup> He also describes the Xhosa as ‘desultory’,<sup>350</sup> meaning ‘unfixed’ or ‘unsettled’.<sup>351</sup> Smith, however, never contemplates the possibility that it could be the presence of the British that caused restlessness on the part of the Xhosa, in resistance to foreign occupation.

---

<sup>338</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)

<sup>339</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 30 Aug, 22 Sept, 15 Dec 1835, 23 Jan, 29 June, 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 80.

<sup>340</sup> Barclay 1811: 959.

<sup>341</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 27 Sept, 10 Nov, 5 Dec 1835, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>342</sup> Barclay 1811: 945.

<sup>343</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 8 Dec 1835, 16 May in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>344</sup> Barclay 1811: 147.

<sup>345</sup> Arndt 2010: 719.

<sup>346</sup> See Introduction, footnote 32.

<sup>347</sup> Barclay 1811: 802.

<sup>348</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 5 Apr, 1 May, 28 July in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 87, 88.

<sup>349</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 12 May, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 March 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Letter to Grey* 20 Jan 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also Harington 1980: 77.

<sup>350</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 5 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)

<sup>351</sup> Barclay 1811: 267.

---

## 2.8 The 'Other' as Violent or Cruel

By far the most disparaging of moral judgements is the image of the 'other' as cruel and violent. Tacitus describes Arminius as 'by nature violent' (*insitam violentiam*),<sup>352</sup> and uses the same word (*violentia*) to portray the invasion of Britons into the territory of the Roman allies.<sup>353</sup> Tacitus describes a tribe far north as possessing a natural cruelty (*truces insitae*)<sup>354</sup> which they exhibit in their battle shows.<sup>355</sup> He uses the same adjective to describe the battle cries of the German infantry (*cantu truci*).<sup>356</sup> The Britons at Verulamium are portrayed as plundering and destroying the town with excessive violence: killings, gibbets, fires, crosses (*caedes, patibula, ignes, cruces*).<sup>357</sup> The lack of conjunctions and apparently random combination of the abstract and concrete in this passage are appropriate to the sense of arbitrary violence.

According to Smith the actions of the Xhosa during war were 'cruel' and 'merciless',<sup>358</sup> relating the Xhosa as committing 'merciless murders'.<sup>359</sup> Xhosa robbers are 'bloodthirsty',<sup>360</sup> and the killing by the Xhosa tribes of the Colonists during the 1835-36 war is 'cold-blooded' and 'horrid'.<sup>361</sup> Their actions are 'horrifying' and 'remorseless'.<sup>362</sup> The actions of Hints and Sarili in the Colony are described as 'outrages'.<sup>363</sup> Maqoma as 'violent'.<sup>364</sup> Other individual Xhosa men

---

<sup>352</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.59. Caesar describes the Gauls as 'even going so low as to punish the innocent (*etiam ad innocentium supplicia descendunt*) which is undeniably written with a degree of moral overtones (Caes. *B.G.* 6.16.5) and as putting to death with fire and excruciating torture any wife suspected of killing her husband (Caes. *B.G.* 6.19.3) and specifically to Vercingetorix he attributed severe punishments with fire, tortures, cutting off of ears and gouging out eyes (Caes. *B.G.* 7.4.9-10). Caesar describes Aedui as massacring Roman citizens or dragging them off into slavery (Caes. *B.G.* 7.42.3).

<sup>353</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.31.

<sup>354</sup> Caesar describes Litavicus as putting Romans to death *crudeliter excruciatos* (Caes. *B.G.* 7.38.10) and Critognatus' speech as *nefarium crudelitatem* (Caes. *B.G.* 7.77.3). Cicero describes some Gallic tribes as very cruel (*crudelissimis* Cic. *Font.* 43). Riggsby notes Caesar's depiction of Gallic society as perverse, corrupt and with many references of torture and cruelty (Riggsby 2006: 64).

<sup>355</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 43.5.

<sup>356</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 2.22, *Ann.* 1.65.

<sup>357</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 4.33.

<sup>358</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 80, Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*. See also Lehmann 1977: 185.

<sup>359</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 16 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>360</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>361</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 11, Smith, *Message to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>362</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 18, Smith, *Arrangements of Movements* 21 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>363</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 43, Smith, *Letter to Maclean* 27 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>364</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 25 Apr 1836, reiterated in *Letter to D'Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 69.

---

are ‘violent’,<sup>365</sup> and one man is of a ‘violent turbulent character’.<sup>366</sup> Their attack on the Colony is carried out with ‘horrid excesses, murders, spoliations’ and the colonists were ‘murdered in cold blood’ and ‘inhumanely butchered’.<sup>367</sup> Smith goes on to describe how a group of Xhosa ‘beat out [the] brains [of a colonist] with clubs’.<sup>368</sup> He refers to the Xhosa as carrying out ‘bloody aggressions’,<sup>369</sup> as ‘bloodthirsty’ with a ‘love of rapine’,<sup>370</sup> an ‘act of taking away the goods of another by violence’.<sup>371</sup> To Maqoma and Tyali, Smith recounts telling them that their conduct against the Colony was ‘brutal’.<sup>372</sup> He accuses the Xhosa of ‘cruelly’ murdering the Mfengu<sup>373</sup> and even writes of the ‘cruelty’ that would be inflicted on the people by their own chiefs if they were let alone.<sup>374</sup> It is noted that in writing of the British actions in Spain, he does admit the British capable of ‘cruelty’.<sup>375</sup>

Both Tacitus and Smith are similar in portraying the ‘other’ as violent and cruel, perhaps Smith more excessively so. Violence and cruelty in these contexts are very difficult to judge or define, as many acts of war which we would consider violent could well have been considered legitimate acts of war in their time. However, by their choice of words specifically labeling the actions of the ‘other’ excessively cruel or violent, it would seem that negative judgments were being made. Gruen does note a Roman tendency to describe the West as cruel and ferocious.<sup>376</sup> It has been argued that Smith and D’Urban used the image of a violent, cruel, merciless ‘other’ as

---

<sup>365</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 15 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 10 Dec 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>366</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>367</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>368</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>369</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>370</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>371</sup> Barclay 1811: 784.

<sup>372</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 69-70.

<sup>373</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>374</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>375</sup> Mostert 1992: 622.

<sup>376</sup> Gruen 2006: 460.

---

an excuse for making war against and ‘punishing’ Hintsa.<sup>377</sup> Arndt argues that the metaphor in military discourse of the Xhosa as cruel ‘merciless barbarians’, arose from the violence of conflict in the frontier wars,<sup>378</sup> and was used to justify, hypocritically, a cruel, unlimited and total warfare against the Xhosa.<sup>379</sup>

### 2.8.1 The ‘Other’ as Criminal or Lawless

Often these representations of cruelty and violence were given further connotations of criminality. Tacitus does not make much mention of the ‘other’ as ‘criminal’, although he does describe the Germans as disregarding human and divine law (*non divini, non humani iuris*).<sup>380</sup> The leader of the Chauci, Gannascus, is portrayed as pillaging and raiding (*praedabundus*) like a pirate.<sup>381</sup> Tacitus describes the acts of Classicus and Tutor against Roman legions in terms of a crime (*scelere*).<sup>382</sup>

Smith sometimes describes the Xhosa as ‘delinquents’,<sup>383</sup> a word that meant one who has wilfully committed a crime,<sup>384</sup> and ‘culprits’,<sup>385</sup> in other words criminals,<sup>386</sup> and engaging in ‘misdemeanours’.<sup>387</sup> Smith describes the Xhosa as committing ‘atrocities’ in the Colony.<sup>388</sup> ‘atrocities’ at the time meant ‘that which heightens the enormity of a crime’, or ‘enormously criminal’.<sup>389</sup> He accuses Hintsa of three cold blooded murders which he describes as

---

<sup>377</sup> Mostert 1992: 714, Strobel 2008: 76.

<sup>378</sup> Arndt 2010: 723 -729.

<sup>379</sup> Arndt 2010: 730 – 734.

<sup>380</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.14.

<sup>381</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.18. Allen-Hornblower mentions the description of the Germans in Caesar as bandits, but argues that the focus here is less on the lawless but rather on their status as ‘outsiders’ (Allen-Hornblower 2014: 685).

<sup>382</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.72.

<sup>383</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 7 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p.78, Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>384</sup> Barclay 1811: 267.

<sup>385</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 78.

<sup>386</sup> Barclay 1811: 248.

<sup>387</sup> Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>388</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>389</sup> Barclay 1811: 66.

‘atrocities’.<sup>390</sup> Smith describes the actions of the Xhosa chiefs and people as ‘lawless’<sup>391</sup> and acting with ‘impunity’.<sup>392</sup> He refers to the practice of witchcraft as a ‘crime’<sup>393</sup> and the actions taken against the Colony as ‘unjust’.<sup>394</sup> He also comments that laws are lost on ‘savages’.<sup>395</sup> Smith refers to the rule of the chiefs as ‘tyranny’,<sup>396</sup> a word which at the time signified ‘acting without regard to the laws, rights, or properties of the people’ and also indicated ‘outrageous cruelty and oppression’.<sup>397</sup> He labels the Xhosa ‘fugitives’,<sup>398</sup> those who run away from the law and a word that at the time also alluded to a state of instability and volatility.<sup>399</sup> He refers to the Xhosa frequently as ‘thieves’ and ‘robbers’,<sup>400</sup> implying that their actions are criminal, rather than acts of war. He even describes Mqhayi’s people as ‘princes of thieves’.<sup>401</sup> At various times the Xhosa are referred to as ‘bandits’,<sup>402</sup> those ‘outlawed thieves’ who ‘live on plunder’<sup>403</sup> and committing ‘depredations’,<sup>404</sup> acts of ‘spoiling’ and robbery.<sup>405</sup> He even refers to the Xhosa as ‘murderers’ and frequently so.<sup>406</sup> On being accused himself of ‘murder’ during the 1835 war, Smith argues that if his actions were ‘murder’ then every conqueror would be a ‘murderer’.<sup>407</sup>

<sup>390</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>391</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 71, 78.

<sup>392</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>393</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>394</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 70.

<sup>395</sup> Harington 1980: 198.

<sup>396</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Nov, 8, 17, 28 Dec 1835, 4 Feb, 10, 17 Apr, 4, 6 June, 28 July 1836, *Letter to Lord Fitzroy* 16 May 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 Jun 1851 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 74, 76. See also Harington 1980: 171.

<sup>397</sup> Barclay 1811: 944.

<sup>398</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 Mar 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>399</sup> Barclay 1811: 396.

<sup>400</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 32, 38, 92, Smith, *Letter to Juana* 26 Feb 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 24 July, 22, 27 Sept, 6 Oct, 10, 30 Nov, 5 Dec 1835, 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 23 Aug 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850), *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan 1852, 7 April 1852, *Letter to Maclean* 27 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>401</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>402</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*, to Godlonton 1 July 1851, Smith, *Memorandum* 14 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>403</sup> Barclay 1811: 79.

<sup>404</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 24 July 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 23 Aug 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>405</sup> Barclay 1811: 272.

<sup>406</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 2, 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835, 17, 25 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 10 Feb 1837 in *Godlonton Corresp.*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 11, 21, 33, 38, 65, 70, 95, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to Bowker* 3 Nov 1848, *Letters to Grey* 23 Aug 1849, 7 Jan 1850, *Proclamation* 25 Dec 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 Mar 1852, 7 April 1852, *Reply to chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>407</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

Although the point he wishes to make is that his actions were not illegal, it does highlight the idea that ‘might’ is ‘right’, with the weaker, defeated peoples portrayed as in the ‘wrong’.

Although Tacitus refers once to the ‘other’ as disregarding the law, as other Roman writers also sometimes do,<sup>408</sup> Smith describes the ‘other’ as ‘criminal’ to a much greater extent. These representations reflect the assumption that Roman and British legal systems were the only legitimate ones. Often actions against the ‘Empire’ were viewed as crimes rather than legitimate acts of war, particularly in descriptions of the ‘other’ as thieves or pirates, as the language used by other Roman writers.<sup>409</sup> Veyne notes that if foreigners to Rome failed to behave as loyal clients they were labelled rebels or criminals.<sup>410</sup> Cattle raiding and ‘thieving’ was a particular theme and pretext for conflict in the Eastern Cape during Smith’s time. Crais writes of ‘thievishness’ and criminality as having been made a stereotypical part of the ‘innate’ Xhosa character and the rise of ‘illegal’ discourse among the Settlers.<sup>411</sup>

### 2.9 The ‘Other’ as Virtuous or Immoral

Despite this image of a cruel, violent and even criminal ‘other’, Tacitus does credit the Germans in particular with virtue. He comments on the holiness which the Germans are believed to see in their women (*inesse...sanctum aliquid*).<sup>412</sup> He comments on the Germans’ strict marriage code, aversion to adultery and corruption<sup>413</sup> and on the chastity (*pudicitia*) of the German women.<sup>414</sup> He mentions again in the next chapter the youthful purity and chastity of the young German

---

<sup>408</sup> Polybius refers to the Gauls as lawless (Plb. 18.37.8-10, 21.412-3). Caesar refers to their crime, fraud and corruption (Caes. *B.G.* 6.34.8, 7.42.5, 7.43.3)

<sup>409</sup> Other Roman writers refer to the ‘other’ as brigands, robbers or pirates (Caes. *B.G.* 6.35.7, Strab. 4.4.2, 7.2.1-2, Plut. *Mar.* 11.3)

<sup>410</sup> Veyne 1993: 361.

<sup>411</sup> Crais 2001: 132, 139. Crais’ arguments are also commented on by Arndt (2010: 711).

<sup>412</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 8.2.

<sup>413</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 18-19.

<sup>414</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 19.1.

men.<sup>415</sup> He describes the Germans as a people who do not laugh at vice,<sup>416</sup> are sexually virtuous and raise their children properly.<sup>417</sup> Delegates of the Tencteri, a German tribe, are described as calling on the people of Cologne to regain their purity and integrity (*sincerus et integer... populus*).<sup>418</sup> Tacitus, like other Roman writers,<sup>419</sup> also often refers to Britons, Gauls or Germans as noble,<sup>420</sup> although this could point more to their status as royalty<sup>421</sup> than to moral virtue.

Smith, on the other hand, comments overwhelmingly on the general immorality and vice of the Xhosa, often referring to their ignorance of right and wrong.<sup>422</sup> The Xhosa war against the Colony was seen as ‘unrighteous’.<sup>423</sup> He comments on the ‘vice’ of the Xhosa<sup>424</sup> and writes of the Xhosa as ‘vicious’,<sup>425</sup> the latter derived from the former, meaning actions ‘contrary to virtue’.<sup>426</sup> Various words are used labelling the Xhosa as ‘scoundrels’,<sup>427</sup> ‘rascals’,<sup>428</sup> and ‘blackguards’<sup>429</sup> – similar words meaning those with ‘base principles’.<sup>430</sup> He often describes them as having done ‘wrong’,<sup>431</sup> measuring them against British notions of ‘wrongdoing’<sup>432</sup>

<sup>415</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 20.3. This echoes Caesar’s comment (Caes. *B.G.* 6.21.4).

<sup>416</sup> Mellor 1993: 16. According to Benario, this is one of Tacitus’ most famous lines and a particularly harsh judgement on Roman society (Benario 1999: 86).

<sup>417</sup> Isaac 2004: 439.

<sup>418</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.64.

<sup>419</sup> Caesar describes Orgetorix as the *nobilissimus* among the Helvetii (Caes. *B.G.* 1.2.1) and another as *nobilissimo* among the Bituriges (Caes. *B.G.* 1.18.6). Massilian envoys and Surus an Aeduan are described as *nobiles* (Caes. *B.C.* 1.34.3, *B.G.* 8.45.2). Velleius describes Maroboduus and another as *nobilis* (Vell. 2.108.2, 2.118.2).

<sup>420</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 3.45, 4.12, 4.71, *Ann.* 1.57, 11.16, 12.36, 12.37.

<sup>421</sup> Caesar also describes Tasgetius as a man of high birth (*summo loco natus*) among the Carnutes (Caes. *B.G.* 5.25.1). Tacitus refers to Julius Paulus and Julius Civilis and parts of the German Cherusci as *regia* (Tac. *Hist.* 4.13, *Ann.* 11.16) and Brinno of the Canninefates as, born of illustrious descent (*claritate natalium insigni*) (Tac. *Hist.* 4.15). Smith describes Suta, Nonube, and Hintsas’ wives as ‘queens’ (Smith *Autobiography* p.91, Smith, *Letter to Juana* 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*). He refers to a deputation of men from Hintsas as of ‘royal blood’ (Smith, *Letter to Juana* 19 April 1835 in *Autobiography*), Hintsas later as his ‘Royal Son’ (Smith, *Letter to Juana* 4 May 1835 in *Autobiography*), and the guests of Sarili and others as his ‘Royal guests’ (Smith, *Letter to Juana* 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*). Smith refers in a letter to Hintsas’ ‘palace’, ‘harem’, ‘queen’ and ‘royal mother’ (Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library).

<sup>422</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 35, 77, 91, 99, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 15 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 58.

<sup>423</sup> Mostert 1992: 936.

<sup>424</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 6 Oct, 22 Nov 1835, 12 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>425</sup> Smith, *Letters to Godlonton* 26 Dec 1850, 15 Jan 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.* See also Harington 1980: 188.

<sup>426</sup> Barclay 1811: 951.

<sup>427</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 18 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>428</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 16 Apr, 1 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 11 Aug, 5 Dec 1835, 1 Mar, 6 Mar, 25 Mar, 3 Apr, 5 Apr, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letters to Godlonton* 1 May, 17 June 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>429</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 18 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>430</sup> Barclay 1811: 103, 838, 784.

<sup>431</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>432</sup> Mostert 1992: 766.

---

opposed to supposed ‘virtue’ of Civilisation.<sup>433</sup> He even writes of the Xhosa supposedly acknowledging that they were in the ‘wrong’<sup>434</sup> and professing the desire to ‘do right’.<sup>435</sup>

It is not surprising, then, that Smith does not often portray the Xhosa as virtuous. He mostly comments only on their fine manners, ‘graceful air and gentlemanlike manner’,<sup>436</sup> which he often notes he finds ‘astonishing’. He describes Hintsas as ‘acting majesty with great dignity’.<sup>437</sup> He describes Hintsas’s and Maqoma’s sons as a ‘fine’ young men<sup>438</sup> and others as ‘modest’.<sup>439</sup> He comments on Sarili as a ‘youth of most engaging manners’.<sup>440</sup> He describes one Xhosa man as having an ‘excellent character’,<sup>441</sup> Siyolo as a ‘fine young chief’<sup>442</sup> and Ganya as an ‘upright man’.<sup>443</sup> He refers to one chief as ‘a very good man’<sup>444</sup> and to the conduct of the ‘Kafir Police’ as ‘exemplary’ and ‘admirable’.<sup>445</sup> Gasela, he writes, is the ‘finest’ Xhosa he has dealt with<sup>446</sup> and Maqoma a ‘noble savage’.<sup>447</sup>

The ‘other’ is portrayed as much more ‘vicious’ than ‘virtuous’, something only mentioned by a few Roman writers.<sup>448</sup> The *Germania*, unlike Tacitus’ other works,<sup>449</sup> idealises Germans to a certain extent in an effort to contrast this with Roman decadence and immorality as Tacitus saw it.<sup>450</sup> These references particularly reflect Tacitus’ concern with the moral decline of Rome and

---

<sup>433</sup> Harington 1980: 61.

<sup>434</sup> Harington 1980: 107.

<sup>435</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>436</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 15 April, 2, 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>437</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>438</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>439</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 3, 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>440</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>441</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>442</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 22 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 100.

<sup>443</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 101.

<sup>444</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>445</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>446</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>447</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 18 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>448</sup> Livy mentions the purity and dignity (*sanctitate et gravitate*) of the ‘other’ (Liv. 38.24.11)

<sup>449</sup> Mellor 1993: 21.

<sup>450</sup> Mellor 1993: 15, Isaac 2004: 432-3.

---

often link sexual licence with the collapse of political morality.<sup>451</sup> Gruen, however argues that this representation is done in a shifting and problematic way.<sup>452</sup> Veyne notes a broader trend of Roman thought that the Romans had lost their purity and vigour, which then only the ‘other’ retained,<sup>453</sup> and Dorey confirms a tradition in rhetorical schools of romanticising the simple, unsophisticated life of the ‘past’.<sup>454</sup> Tacitus’ portrayal of the Germans in the *Germania* as inherently having a certain purity and integrity, untouched by what he perceives as Roman vice, was in a way similar to later European ideas of the ‘noble savage’,<sup>455</sup> a perception that Smith does not generally share, although he does sometimes comment on their behaviour in terms of admiration. How he treated them depended on the moral terms in which he saw them. Smith in 1850s made it known that he would ‘punish’ only those ‘bad’ rebels, distinguishing the ‘good’ from the ‘bad’ depending on whether they rebelled against the Colony.<sup>456</sup> He also claims to keep a record of whether or not they were ‘good’ or ‘bad’.<sup>457</sup> Smith’s emphasis on the immorality of the Xhosa is also indicative of his ‘concern’ for their moral instruction and ‘improvement’.<sup>458</sup>

### 2.10 Religion: Superstition and Cruelty

Often the judgement of the character of the ‘other’ was linked to their religious beliefs and practices. Tacitus uses the word *superstitio* as opposed to *religio* many times to describe the religious beliefs of the Britons, Gauls and Germans.<sup>459</sup> Although the Romans were relatively tolerant of foreign religions (barring Christianity and Judaism), Tacitus, and at times other

---

<sup>451</sup> Mellor 1993: 26-7.

<sup>452</sup> Gruen 2010: 162-4, 168-9.

<sup>453</sup> Veyne 1993: 344.

<sup>454</sup> Dorey 1969: 14.

<sup>455</sup> Gidley 1992: 49, Berndt and Berndt 1971, Jahoda 1999: 6, 11, Nandy 1983. Benario even uses the term ‘noble savage’ in his comments on the theme of the simplicity of the ‘other’ shown superior to Rome’s own civilisation (Benario 1999: 4).

<sup>456</sup> Lehmann 1977: 323.

<sup>457</sup> Harington 1980: 108.

<sup>458</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850). He writes of the Xhosa as having to be forced to do right (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*), and of his wife, Juana, teaching Xhosa woman lessons in ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ (Lehmann 1977: 189). See also Harington 1980: 59, 171-172.

<sup>459</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 11.4, *Germ.* 39.4, 43.4, 45.3, *Hist.* 4.54, 4.61, *Ann.* 11.15, 14.30.

---

Roman writers, often belittles the beliefs of Germans, Gauls and Britons, or condemn their behaviour as sacrilegious,<sup>460</sup> and shows a marked hostility towards the Druids, particularly in his comments on human sacrifice as savage and cruel. The Germans' participation in rituals of human sacrifice, he describes as unlawful and barbarous.<sup>461</sup> Another reference to sacrificial slaughter is made in the case of the slaughter of tribunes and chief centurions at altars.<sup>462</sup> British Druidic practices are described in terms of blood and gore (*cruor*), portraying a scene of altars strewn with blood of captives and human entrails, ie. human sacrifice.<sup>463</sup> Although, as Gruen notes, Tacitus does refrain from praising or disparaging the religion of the Germans in the *Germania*,<sup>464</sup> there are some associations with cruelty in his other works that should be considered.

Smith, in a similar manner to Tacitus, refers to the religious beliefs of the 'other' as ignorance and folly.<sup>465</sup> He uses the word 'superstition' of the Xhosa belief in 'witchcraft'.<sup>466</sup> He writes of a woman as 'violently beaten' for 'witchcraft',<sup>467</sup> which he comments on as 'fanaticism'.<sup>468</sup> The ceremony of slaughtering an ox to Smith is 'horrible to behold' and 'appalling'.<sup>469</sup> Another custom portrayed by Smith as 'brutal' is a festival wherein the girls are compelled to attend what Smith terms a 'Rape of the Sabines'.<sup>470</sup> He refers a couple of times to the abduction and violation

---

<sup>460</sup> Cicero comments on the Gauls as sacrilegious, or without religion, waging war not in defence of religion or immortal gods, but against them, despoiling and disturbing sacred places (Cic. *Font.* 30-31). On the other hand, Gruen argues that Caesar's representation of Druids and Celtic religion as straightforward and respectful with little effort to disparage or underscore their 'otherness' (Gruen 2010: 156-7).

<sup>461</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 9.1, 39.2. Gruen writes of both Caesar and Tacitus avoiding judgement on this practice, although he admits Tacitus the institution as reprehensible in itself (Gruen 2010: 157-8, 175).

<sup>462</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.61.

<sup>463</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.30.

<sup>464</sup> Gruen 2010: 177.

<sup>465</sup> Smith *Letter to D'Urban* 28 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*. See also Harington 1980: 56, 61.

<sup>466</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D'Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library. See also Harington 1980: 55, 169.

<sup>467</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>468</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>469</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 35, 36.

<sup>470</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 77.

---

of women by the Xhosa.<sup>471</sup> Smith took a hostile view of the religious and cultural beliefs of the Xhosa, particularly their practices of ‘witchcraft’, referring to the ‘witchdoctors’ as ‘villains’,<sup>472</sup> as well as describing the practice as ‘fallacy’.<sup>473</sup> He describes Tyali as a ‘fool’ for believing in ‘witchcraft’ before Smith apparently convinces him to acknowledge it as ‘nonsense’.<sup>474</sup> He also associates ‘witchcraft’, or more specifically the accusation and punishment of the practice, as a means by which the chiefs exercise oppression and tyranny.<sup>475</sup> The ordinary people, he writes, refer to ‘witchcraft’ as ‘tyrannical cruelty’.<sup>476</sup> He writes of Mhala as ‘cruelly’ burning a man with red-hot stones as a punishment for ‘witchcraft’,<sup>477</sup> and details various ‘horrid penalties’ inflicted on victims, labelling the inflictors as ‘diabolical tormentors’.<sup>478</sup> In the English of the time ‘diabolical’ would have meant ‘partaking of the qualities of the devil, extremely impious and wicked’<sup>479</sup> – a more intense meaning than is often the case today. The practice is also referred to as ‘wicked’<sup>480</sup> and ‘horrid’.<sup>481</sup> Unlike the Romans, Smith makes no mention of cannibalism or human sacrifice.<sup>482</sup>

### 2.10.1 Evil and Wickedness

The imagery of evil and sin, is particular to Smith’s descriptions, drawing on Christian moral discourse,<sup>483</sup> and therefore absent from the writing of Tacitus or other early Roman writers.

---

<sup>471</sup> Smith, *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 15 March 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>472</sup> Smith, *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>473</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>474</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 26 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>475</sup> See footnote 396.

<sup>476</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 1 Aug 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>477</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 4 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 83.

<sup>478</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library

<sup>479</sup> Barclay 1811: 278.

<sup>480</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>481</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>482</sup> Although Smith does not mention it, Cathcart does make mention of ‘cannibals’ (Cathcart, G., *Letter to Secretary of State for the Colonies* 14 Nov 1852 in *Correspondence of Lieut.-General the Hon. Sir George Cathcart, K.C.B., Relative to his Military Operations in Kaffraria* (London: John Murray, 1856) Cory Library).

<sup>483</sup> According to Jahoda, indigenous Americans (Jahoda 1999: 16, 18, 23) and Africans (Jahoda 1999: 26, 34, 69) were very often depicted as immoral and sinful. Early Christian fathers in the West associated the colour black with darkness, evil and the devil (Jahoda 1999: 26) and in the Middle Ages images of Africans and Muslims became conflated into ‘moors’ who were often depicted as sinful or evil (Jahoda 1999: 27).

---

Smith refers to the Xhosa as ‘heathen’,<sup>484</sup> a label unique to Christianity, meaning those ‘unacquainted with the doctrines contained in the Old or New Testament’.<sup>485</sup> He frequently refers to the Xhosa as ‘devils’.<sup>486</sup> He refers to the ‘devil’ as having established himself in the Xhosa.<sup>487</sup> He describes the Xhosa as fighting ‘like devils’.<sup>488</sup> Smith writes of Kuba as possessing the cunning of ‘Satan’.<sup>489</sup> He describes Maqoma as an ‘inflammatory devil’<sup>490</sup> and Hintsa at his end as ‘a devil... breath[ing] liquid flame’.<sup>491</sup> He calls Mhala a ‘devil’ and a ‘villain.’<sup>492</sup> Boku and other Xhosa are also labeled ‘villains’,<sup>493</sup> a word that at the time meant something like ‘wicked’.<sup>494</sup> When Maqoma and Tyali refuse offers of peace, Smith writes of how ‘some devil has got in amongst them and wickedly advised’ them<sup>495</sup> and how they used their powers of reason ‘wickedly’.<sup>496</sup> The word ‘wicked’ according to Barclay referred to anyone ‘living in habitual contrariety to the laws of God’, ‘wickedness’ meaning ‘given to vice’ and ‘moral ill’.<sup>497</sup> Their thieving is remarked of as ‘wicked’<sup>498</sup> and they were apparently easily swayed by ‘wicked’ men.<sup>499</sup> He refers to some as acting as enemies to society with ‘wickedness’ and ‘sin’.<sup>500</sup> He

---

Animality, particularly apelikeness (Jahoda 1999: 8, 18, 45) and childlikeness (Jahoda 1999: 9, 140, 142) were also associated with immorality and sin. Immorality was also worked into theories of scientific racism (Jahoda 1999: 77) and was used frequently by missionaries describing those who were not yet converted to Christianity (Jahoda 1999: 146). See also LeVine and Campbell 1972: 9, Galbraith 1963: 80, Lester 1998: 228.

<sup>484</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90.

<sup>485</sup> Barclay 1811: 462. Similar to the word ‘pagan’, which originated from the Latin *paganus*, and went from meaning ‘someone who lives in the country’ to ‘someone who doesn’t believe in your god’, the word ‘heathen’ originally came from the Old English word *haeth* which meant ‘wild uncultivated country’, ‘the people who lived in the *haeth*’ being *haethen*, later ‘heathen’ (Ayto 2002: 210). As Christianity was introduced to the Germanic peoples and took hold mainly in the towns, so ‘heathen’ became associated with those who lived in the country and remained unconverted, and hence ‘not Christian’ (Ayto 2002: 210). In his explanation of the word ‘heathen’, Ayto interestingly calls to mind the word ‘civilisation’ as a similar example of the expression of people in towns and vilages being suspicious of those living out in the wilds (Ayto 2002: 210). See also chapter 3, footnote 272.

<sup>486</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 12 April, 3, 4 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 29 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 24 June 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>487</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 27 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>488</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 28 Feb 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>489</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 33.

<sup>490</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>491</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 18 May 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>492</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 84.

<sup>493</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 2 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 21 July, 30, 31 Aug, 29 Sept, 6 Oct 1835, 1, 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letters to Godlonton* 31 Dec 1850, 6 Jan 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>494</sup> Barclay 1811: 952.

<sup>495</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>496</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>497</sup> Barclay 1811: 972.

<sup>498</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>499</sup> Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>500</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

describes Hintsas's and others' acts as 'sins',<sup>501</sup> and the Xhosa generally as 'born in sin' and 'sinners'.<sup>502</sup> He portrays Nomsa as talking of her 'sins'.<sup>503</sup> He refers to the actions of Maqoma in the war as 'sins'.<sup>504</sup> He equates those Xhosa against the Colony with 'evil', which he intends to root out.<sup>505</sup> He also describes a Xhosa councilor as 'evil'.<sup>506</sup> Their thieving and vagrancy is referred to as 'evil'.<sup>507</sup> The Xhosa are described as possessing 'evil passions'.<sup>508</sup> Smith refers to them in their state before he came among them as 'benighted',<sup>509</sup> referring 'figuratively' to a 'darkness' of the mind.<sup>510</sup> Linked with this idea of darkness is the word 'sable', which meant 'blackness'.<sup>511</sup> He uses the word 'sable' in reference to the Xhosa,<sup>512</sup> and even describes them as his own 'sable warriors' and 'sable community'.<sup>513</sup> He is likely playing on an allusion to the colour of their skin as well as evil, which he makes evident in his comment on the devil as the 'sable king' who 'often wears a white face'.<sup>514</sup> In this case he is alluding to Dr Philip and other missionaries,<sup>515</sup> whom he refers to as 'white-faced devils'.<sup>516</sup>

Although there is something to be said for the unique situation of the British Empire with its Christian intolerance of other religions and missionary beliefs,<sup>517</sup> particularly the label of heathenism, wickedness and evil, both Tacitus and Smith portray the beliefs of the 'other' as

<sup>501</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>502</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 6 Oct 1835, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 106.

<sup>503</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>504</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 88.

<sup>505</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 11 Dec 1850 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>506</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>507</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 24 May 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>508</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>509</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 98.

<sup>510</sup> Barclay 1811: 95.

<sup>511</sup> Barclay 1811: 825.

<sup>512</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 14 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>513</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 1 Nov 1835, 2 Feb, 10 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>514</sup> Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>515</sup> Harington 1980: 62.

<sup>516</sup> According to Lehmann, Smith often refers to the missionaries as 'wicked' (Lehmann 1977: 336).

<sup>517</sup> Unlike Rome's tolerance towards other religions (see footnote 521), Christianity accepted the existence of only one God and the missionary movement of the nineteenth century sought to actively convert other peoples to abandon their own beliefs and convert to Christianity (Wilson 1969: 238 – 239). The idea of 'paganism' came about during the Middle Ages and the crusades when European identity was modeled around the ideal of 'Christendom' as distinct from Muslims and 'pagans' who included Scandinavians, Celtic Welsh, Irish and Scots (Sardar 1993, Jahoda 1999: 2). Since the fifteenth century and the slave trade, Africans were viewed as 'pagans' (Jahoda 1999: 29). See also Gidley 1992: 47-8.

---

superstition or ignorance, as if in some way invalid when compared to Roman or Christian beliefs respectively. Both Tacitus and Smith also condemn many cultural and religious practices of the ‘other’ as cruel and unsavoury, Tacitus particularly dwelling on images of human sacrifice and cannibalism, a common representation of the ‘other’ in ancient times,<sup>518</sup> regardless of whether or not it was true.<sup>519</sup> Smith does not comment on the cannibalism of the ‘other’, although it was by the nineteenth century still a common stereotype of the ‘other’,<sup>520</sup> possibly because through his direct involvement with the people whom he described he would have known it was not true. Although Romans bore a relative tolerance to local custom and particularly religion,<sup>521</sup> they did at various times go as far as banning Druidic religious practices.<sup>522</sup> So too Smith attempted to discredit and ban certain Xhosa customs and practices.<sup>523</sup> While sources of the time cite cruelty and greed as moral reasons for the suppression of Druidism, it was more likely that religious or traditional customs were seen as a political threat to imperial rule,<sup>524</sup> which would go some way to explain why they were not tolerated. Smith’s

---

<sup>518</sup> Other Roman writers also comment on practices of sacrifice (Caes. *B.G.* 6.13-14, 6.16-18, Cic. *Font.* 31.8, Strab. 4.4.5-6). Strabo also makes reference to cannibalism (Strab. 4.5.4). According to Jahoda, cannibalism, has been one of the most powerful images of savagery through the ages (Jahoda 1999: 97). In Greece, numerous myths dealt with cannibalism and distant peoples such as Scythians were labeled among those termed ‘anthropophagi’ (Jahoda 1999: 98-99). Ancient writers such as Herodotus, Pliny the Elder and Solinus portrayed various groups of ‘other’ or monstrous races as cannibals (Jahoda 1999: 1, 31, 110).

<sup>519</sup> Jahoda touches on the issue of ‘cannibalism’ as fact or myth (Jahoda 1999: 104-109).

<sup>520</sup> By the fifteenth Century cannibalism was a regular stereotype of the topography of exotic lands and according to Jahoda, become an obsession of European writers (Jahoda 1999: 101). Accusations of cannibalism were directed at all kinds of ‘other’ from the mythic ‘wild men’, ‘witches’ (Jahoda 1999: 99, 103), the Irish (Jahoda 1999: 214), indigenous Americans (Jahoda 1999: 15, 16, 24, 99, 100) and Africans (Jahoda 1999: 29). The trope was linked to sexual deviance, aggression, lack of impulse control and animality (Jahoda 1999: 102, 214), and was often associated with images of human sacrifice (Jahoda 1999: 100). In the nineteenth Century there was a great deal of material written on cannibalism (Jahoda 1999: 122). See also Gidley 1992: 39, 54.

<sup>521</sup> Goodman 1997: 138, Haverfield 1915: 20. Unlike Christianity, Roman religion was pluralistic and polytheistic in nature, and Gruen argues that far more than ‘tolerating’ other religions, Rome ostensibly embraced alien cults (Gruen 2006: 467).

<sup>522</sup> Goodman 1997: 208, Isaac 2004: 422-3, Gruen 2006: 472, Balsdon 1979: 65.

<sup>523</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 6 Oct, 8, 28 Dec 1835, 4, 14, 28 Feb, 6 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library. See also Wilson 1969: 266, 269-270, Mostert 1992: 766, 768, 937, 962, 998-999, Lehmann 1977: 190-191, Strobel 2008: 78.

<sup>524</sup> Scholars argue that the reason possibly had more to do with the Druids as being seen as a dangerous subversive force that held significant authority within the Celtic population (Isaac 2004: 422-3, Gruen 2006: 472; Syme 1970: 25). Smith viewed what he termed ‘witchcraft’ as the means by which the chiefs exerted authority and accumulated wealth (Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 74-76, also as discussed by Strobel 2008: 78). As his primary objective was to undermine the power of the chiefs (Mostert 1992:762, Lester 1998: 236), this custom was seen as a direct threat to his plans. Neither efforts at suppression were successful (For the Romans see Isaac 2004: 422-3, 426. For the British see Lester 1998)

---

particular emphasis on evil and wickedness is indicative of his view of the role of the British to rid the ‘other’ of ‘evil’ and to convert them to Christianity.<sup>525</sup>

### 2.11 Conclusion

Although Tacitus and Smith do at times acknowledge virtues the ‘other’ possess, much more emphasis is placed on their character flaws, many times perpetuating common stereotypes.<sup>526</sup> Isaac notes that in Tacitus’ portrayal the Germans in particular either have enormous failings or great merit,<sup>527</sup> the lesson rather than the facts being of greater importance to him.<sup>528</sup> Gruen goes further to argue that ‘irony trumps ideology’ and stereotype.<sup>529</sup> In Tacitus’ case portraying the virtues of the ‘other’ in some instances served to critique his own society, which was something Smith never entertained. Kraus indicates that the tendency of Tacitus to blur the categorisations, criticising Romans and praising the ‘other’, suggests the way is opened for the concept of assimilation of the ‘other’ into Roman society.<sup>530</sup> Smith highlights the loyalty and good conduct of the ‘other’ when it reflects well on his own influence and power over the Xhosa. Descriptions of the ‘other’ as loyal or treacherous essentially depended on their relationship with the empire as enemies or allies.<sup>531</sup>

There was a great deal of emphasis on the violent and cruel nature of the actions and practices of the ‘other’ by both Tacitus and Smith. In both ancient and modern societies images of a

---

<sup>525</sup> Mostert 1992: 772, 949-50. Lester notes that with D’Urban and Smith, conversion began to become part of British policy (Lester 1998: 229, 238).

<sup>526</sup> Mellor 1993: 15, Benario 2005: 278, Isaac 2004: 432, 434, 438.

<sup>527</sup> Isaac 2004: 432. Benario notes that although Tacitus portrays a generally favourable picture of the Germans, he does not hesitate to mention their faults (Benario 1999: 77).

<sup>528</sup> Isaac 2004: 435.

<sup>529</sup> Gruen 2010: 159-161, 178.

<sup>530</sup> Kraus and Woodman 1997: 166.

<sup>531</sup> Cicero compares bitterest foes of the empire (*inimicissimos imperio*), with allies and citizens who are described as true and loyal (*bonis ac fidelibus*) (Cic. *Font.* 32). The Aedui are often described as ‘brothers’ to the Romans (Cic. *Att.* 1.19.2) and hence ascribed the label of loyal. Enemies of the Roman Republic, the Carthaginians, were demonized although Virgil is able to give us a moving representation of Dido (Gruen 2006: 468- 470). Likewise Indigenous Americans were treated cruelly unless proved useful as allies in wars against other tribes (Jahoda 1999: 23). See also Berndt and Berndt 1971.

---

depraved, violent and cruel ‘other’, partaking in cannibalism or human sacrifice, served to justify their own ill or cruel treatment towards the ‘other’.<sup>532</sup> Smith, however, often does, unlike his contemporaries, acknowledge his own systems of attack, plunder and booty as part of the justified usages of war which go back to ancient and even biblical times,<sup>533</sup> something similar to Caesar and his acknowledgement that a certain degree of cruelty is natural to war, and the belief that if you can win, you have the right to claim conquest, rule and land<sup>534</sup> – something that the humanitarian movement was starting to view differently in London in the nineteenth Century, making out Smith’s endeavours to be inhumane and cruel. Going further and describing the behaviour of the ‘other’ as criminal gave justification for ill treating the ‘other’ and labelling it ‘punishment’.<sup>535</sup> In Smith’s own words: ‘My cause is more than ever the just one – and their punishment the more merited.’<sup>536</sup> Portrayal of the ‘other’ in derogatory ways justified imperialism,<sup>537</sup> which both Tacitus<sup>538</sup> and Smith believed in.

Moral deviation and the ‘sinful’ ‘other’, particularly during Smith’s time, was used as a justification and motive for intervention and, in the case of missionaries, conversion.<sup>539</sup> If the ‘other’ was portrayed as immoral, more argument could be made that they needed to be ‘saved’ and would be better off as part of their Empire, hence justifying imperial expansion.<sup>540</sup>

---

<sup>532</sup> Jahoda 1999: 11, 99, Miller and Savage 1977: 111-112.

<sup>533</sup> See Chapter 1, footnotes 56-58.

<sup>534</sup> See chapter 4, footnote 4.

<sup>535</sup> Smith also viewed any severe action taken against the ‘other’ as ‘just severe and wholesome punishment’ (Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)).

<sup>536</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>537</sup> Adler 2008: 174.

<sup>538</sup> Mellor argues that Tacitus supported Imperialism and was even strongly against a lack of expansionism (Mellor 1993: 16, 22, 109). See also Isaac 2004: 434, Benario 1999: 98-99. See Tac. *Germ.* 33.2, *Ann.* 4.32.

<sup>539</sup> Jahoda 1999: 11, 143-5. See also Nandy 1983.

<sup>540</sup> Jahoda 1999: 126. Galbraith notes the tendency of British governors to appraise virtue and vice on the frontier in finite terms (Galbraith 1963: 62) and Lester specifically argues that D’Urban and Smith couched their military designs in evangelical rhetoric (Lester 1998: 244).

---

## CHAPTER 3

### *ROMAN AND HARRY SMITH'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE 'OTHER' AS DIFFERENT FROM OR LIKE THEMSELVES*

*'Savages we call them because their manners differ from ours, which we think the perfection of civility' – Benjamin Franklin*

---

#### 3.1 Introduction

Besides comments on their strength and judgments on their vices, Roman and British writers largely identified the groups we have been discussing as an 'other', viewing them as separate or apart from how they viewed themselves. This chapter will focus on the extent to which Roman writers and Harry Smith describe the 'other' as distant or different from the ways of life and behaviour familiar to and valued by them. Particular attention will be paid to the images and language used to differentiate themselves from the 'other', the prevalence of these kinds of representations and the possible reasons and implications for the use of such discourse. Rather than focus on a particular Roman writer, I will be comparing all relevant Roman sources pre AD 300 with the writings of Harry Smith.

#### 3.2 The 'Other' as Distant and Unknown

An intellectual distance from the 'other' was created by Roman writers who were prone to describing the 'other' as 'unknown'. Cicero admits that nothing was known about the regions and races of Gaul and Germania (*nullae antea litterae, nulla vox, nulla fama notas fecerat*).<sup>1</sup> He later again associates the term *ignotus* with the Allobroges.<sup>2</sup> Livy comments on the Romans

---

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 33.

<sup>2</sup> Cic. *Cat.* 3.22

---

having no experience of the more unknown (*ignotior*) Gauls<sup>3</sup> and describes the invading Gauls and Alpine tribes as previously ‘unseen’ (*invisitatem*)<sup>4</sup> and ‘new’ (*novos*).<sup>5</sup> For Roman audiences *novus* could have had negative connotations.<sup>6</sup> Strabo comments on the regions of Britain and Ireland as ‘unknown’<sup>7</sup> and admits an ignorance in regard to peoples further north of Germania.<sup>8</sup> Velleius describes the Germans as ‘almost unknown even by name’ (*paene nominibus incognitae*).<sup>9</sup> Pliny records that the extent of the German territories is impossible to state and that there was disagreement between different writers who had written about them.<sup>10</sup> Tacitus’ description of the Germans as ‘recently made known’ (*nuper cognititis*)<sup>11</sup> suggests that they were previously unknown. He had made a general comment about the Britons that, as with other foreign peoples, too little or not enough was known for certain about them (*parum compertum*)<sup>12</sup> and refers to the Britons presently or previously as ‘unknown’ (*ignotas*)<sup>13</sup> and ‘new’ (*novas gentes*).<sup>14</sup> Suetonius similarly, if somewhat incorrectly, describes Britain as *ignotos* before Caesar’s invasion.<sup>15</sup> This preoccupation with and acknowledgement of the ‘unknown’ could echo a need or desire to ‘discover’ other lands or peoples different or far removed from their own,<sup>16</sup> and to praise those who opened up new knowledge of far off lands to the Romans.

---

<sup>3</sup> Liv. 5.32.7. cf. 5.38.6.

<sup>4</sup> Liv. 5.17.8, 5.35.4, 27.39.8.

<sup>5</sup> Liv. 5.17.8, 5.35.6.

<sup>6</sup> The word ‘*novus*’, meaning ‘to make new’, ‘renew’ or ‘to change’, was also associated in a political respect with revolution as it appears as ‘*novare res*’, meaning ‘to overthrow the government’ or ‘make or effect a revolution’, as it does in Livy, Tacitus and Sallust (Lewis and Short 1879: 1220). The word *novus* could also indicate that which was ‘strange’ and ‘unusual’ (Lewis and Short 1879: 1220).

<sup>7</sup> Strab. 2.5.8.

<sup>8</sup> Strab. 7.2.4.

<sup>9</sup> Vell. 2.106.1.

<sup>10</sup> Plin. *H.N.* 4.98.

<sup>11</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 1.1.

<sup>12</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 11.1.

<sup>13</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 24.1. cf. Tac. *Agr.* 30.3.

<sup>14</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 22.1.

<sup>15</sup> Suet. *Jul.* 25.2. As noted by Richard Evans, a rather generalised and simplistic comment by Suetonius as the Britons were at least known of by Caesar before he invaded.

<sup>16</sup> Tacitus notes that Britain was both subdued and discovered (*inventata*) after the exploits of Agricola (Tac. *Agr.* 33.3).

---

Britain and the Britons are often described with the adjectives *ultimus* and *remotus*, the remotest of lands and peoples.<sup>17</sup> Often poets, such as Catullus and Horace, would use a trope such as the ‘far flung remoteness’ of the Britons, to add to their poetic meaning, rather than to make the point for its own sake. Virgil describes the Britons as wholly separate from all the world (*toto divisos*).<sup>18</sup> Strabo also comments on the isolatedness of Britain.<sup>19</sup> Cicero places strong emphasis on Gaul’s remoteness from Greece (*tam procul... in ultimis terris*).<sup>20</sup> Livy describes the Gauls as remote and distant (*longinqua*)<sup>21</sup> and the Ligures in particular as the farthest (*extremos*).<sup>22</sup> Tacitus refers to Britain as the ‘limit’ (*terminus*) of the earth, and ‘remote sanctuaries’ (*extremos recessus*).<sup>23</sup> According to Clarke, the geographical location, namely the insular and remote nature, of Britain is crucial for a wider interpretation of the *Agricola* as ‘Agricola’s mission is to reveal, uncover, bring all within the compass of Roman knowledge’.<sup>24</sup> Intellectual knowledge and understanding of the land are connected to the possibility of its conquest, as Tacitus links discovery with subjection.<sup>25</sup>

According to Plutarch, when Caesar was in Gaul, he was thought of as very far removed from Rome.<sup>26</sup> Caesar himself never comments on Gaul as remote, far away or mysterious, only going as far as to label Britain as unknown (*incognita*), in this case even to the Gauls.<sup>27</sup> Schadee argues that Caesar creates, from the beginning of *De Bello Gallico*, the impression of Gaul as ‘known’ and demarcated, in a sense an intellectual conquest, in spite of the reality.<sup>28</sup> According

---

<sup>17</sup> Cat. 11.12, 29.4, Hor. *Carm.* 1.35.30, 4.14.48.

<sup>18</sup> Verg. *Ecl.* 1.66.

<sup>19</sup> Strab. 2.5.8

<sup>20</sup> Cic. *Flac.* 63.

<sup>21</sup> Liv. 5.32.7.

<sup>22</sup> Liv. 35.4.1.

<sup>23</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 23.2, 30.4.

<sup>24</sup> Clarke 2001: 94, 100.

<sup>25</sup> Clarke 2001: 100.

<sup>26</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 51.1.

<sup>27</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.20.3.

<sup>28</sup> Schadee 2008: 162-163.

---

to Schadee, as the narrative progresses, particular tribes farther off ‘outside’ the Roman world, such as the Belgae and Nervii, are introduced as intellectually distant, in need of inquiry and investigation, which serves to enhance the impression of Caesar as an innovative campaigner, crossing boundaries unknown and extending the Roman horizon.<sup>29</sup> Schadee then goes further to discuss how the Germans across the Rhine are presented as not merely ‘unknown’, but ‘unknowable’, and hence both intellectually and physically unconquerable.<sup>30</sup> Allen-Hornblower argues that Caesar uses the description of the remote, isolated Herculian forest, with its strange and unheard of animals, to enhance his portrayal of the Germans as isolated and detached from the Roman world.<sup>31</sup> In crossing the Rhine, Caesar is portrayed as one prepared to venture into the unknown,<sup>32</sup> portraying Germania as a place to explore but not necessarily conquer.<sup>33</sup> This could possibly be an attempt to justify a failed campaign.<sup>34</sup> Similarly, his expedition to Britain is presented as an exploration into previously unknown territory, although according to Schadee, Britain is not portrayed as entirely ‘unknowable’.<sup>35</sup> It is possible that Caesar was using the impression of intellectual control again to take attention away from military defeat.<sup>36</sup> The portrayal of these far flung areas as ‘unknown’ and ‘novel’ essentially emphasises Caesar’s role as an ‘explorer’.<sup>37</sup>

Whereas Roman sources seem overwhelmingly to associate the ‘other’ with the unknown and remote, Smith does not ever refer to the Xhosa in this way. He only goes as far as to describe

---

<sup>29</sup> Schadee 2008: 164-5

<sup>30</sup> Schadee 2008: 168-169

<sup>31</sup> Allen-Hornblower 2014: 687-690.

<sup>32</sup> Schadee 2008: 169.

<sup>33</sup> Schadee 2008: 170

<sup>34</sup> Schadee 2008: 170

<sup>35</sup> Schadee 2008: 172-175

<sup>36</sup> Schadee 2008: 172-175

<sup>37</sup> Schadee 2008: 171, Adcock 1956: 38-39.

---

their ways as ‘peculiar’ or ‘extraordinary’.<sup>38</sup> This is possibly because, not only did he live among them, but to describe them as ‘unknown’ would act against his assumption of his superior knowledge of their ways.<sup>39</sup> If one considers Schadee’s arguments, one does begin to see a correlation between Caesar’s and Smith’s use of a kind of perceived intellectual conquest over the ‘other’. Also the British would have generally been less inclined by the nineteenth century to describe African people as ‘unknown’, due to their arrogance and the abundance of anthropological and travel writing available at the time.<sup>40</sup> It is also relevant to note that the association of remoteness with ‘monstrous’ or ‘savage beings’ stretches as far back as Pliny and on to the 11<sup>th</sup> Century<sup>41</sup>, the image of ‘separateness’ being as much psychological as geographical.<sup>42</sup>

### 3.3 The ‘Other’ as Different

Once the ‘other’ was encountered or considered ‘known’ it was also common to take note of visible differences in the ‘other’. Roman writers, like Strabo, often comment on the different physical appearance of the ‘other’, such as mentioning the golden, yellow or red long hair<sup>43</sup> of the Britons, Gauls and Germans,<sup>44</sup> their keen blue eyes<sup>45</sup> and large physique.<sup>46</sup> Roman writers describe the skins or different clothing they wore,<sup>47</sup> their golden necklaces,<sup>48</sup> and their different

---

<sup>38</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.101.

<sup>39</sup> See chapter 1, footnote 122.

<sup>40</sup> Asad 1973, Jahoda 1999: 4.

<sup>41</sup> Jahoda 1999: 1.

<sup>42</sup> Jahoda 1999: 1; See also Sardar 1993, Berndt and Berndt 1971.

<sup>43</sup> Strab. 4.1.1. The image of ‘hairy’ mythic wild men was prevalent in the Middle Ages and carried on to be imposed upon representations of indigenous Americans (Jahoda 1999: 5, 15).

<sup>44</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 5.14.3, Verg. *Aen.* 8.659, Liv. 21.32.7, 38.17.3, Strab. 4.4.3, 7.1.2, Plin. *H.N.* 4.105, Tac. *Agr.* 11.2, *Germ.* 4.2, 38.4, *Ann.* 1.17, Suet. *Calig.* 47.1. Balsdon notes the northerners as marked by red and fair hair (Balsdon 1979: 215). See also Riggsby 2006: 49.

<sup>45</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.39.1, Hor. *Epod.* 16.7, Plut. *Mar.* 11.3, Tac. *Germ.* 4.2.

<sup>46</sup> See chapter 1.5.1. Balsdon discusses the tendency of the Romans to note the tallness and large stature of the Gauls, Germans and Britons (Balsdon 1979: 214). See also Riggsby 2006: 49.

<sup>47</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 5.14, 6.21, Verg. *Aen.* 8.659-660, Strab. 4.4.3, Tac. *Germ.* 17. The northerners were identifiable by their thick black cloaks, and trousers, and interestingly, Balsdon points out the Romans’ criticism for any who adopted Gallic dress, such as Cicero’s remarks on Antony’s wearing of Gallic sandals and cloak on his return to Rome in 45 BC (Balsdon 1979: 221).

<sup>48</sup> Verg. *Aen.* 8.660-661, Liv. 33.36.13. See also Riggsby 2006: 49.

---

kinds of weapons and armour.<sup>49</sup> Caesar and Tacitus comment on a custom of painting themselves.<sup>50</sup> Another common Roman description of Britons, Gauls and Germans is their lack of clothing, as partially or completely naked,<sup>51</sup> an attribute that might be assumed by the reader to be an indication of immorality. Tacitus interestingly uses such an assumption in a literary misdirection, when, in describing Germanic women in a state of semi-undress, he is actually emphasising the purity of their way of life, particularly their marital fidelity.<sup>52</sup>

Occasionally comment is made on the appealing or unappealing features of the 'other'. Livy describes a Gallic woman as being of great beauty (*forma eximia*).<sup>53</sup> Tacitus describes the Germans' bodies as admired by the Romans<sup>54</sup> with their hardy frames, and close knit limbs.<sup>55</sup> Plutarch describes a Gaul as stately and handsome.<sup>56</sup> Virgil's more ethereal descriptions include connections with darkness and shadows (*tenebris opacae*) and then as connected with shiny golden light (*aurea... lucent*).<sup>57</sup>

Some Roman authors, particularly within the context of ethnographical monographs or excursus, spend much time commenting on and describing the different customs and ways of life of the Britons, Gauls or Germans. Cicero comments on how widely the Gauls differ from all other nations in habits and character.<sup>58</sup> Comments are made on their different living arrangements and

---

<sup>49</sup> Verg. *Aen.* 8.661-662, Liv. 7.10.7, 22.46.5, 38.17.3, Strab. 4.4.3, Tac. *Ann.* 1.64, 2.14.

<sup>50</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 5.14.2, Tac. *Germ.* 43.5. See also Balsdon 1979: 66.

<sup>51</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.1.10, Liv. 5.45.3, 22.46.6, 38.21.9, Tac. *Germ.* 6.2, 17.3, 20.1, 24.1, *Hist.* 2.22

<sup>52</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 17.3-18.1. Benario notes that this kind of nudity 'would be impossible in Rome, where female private parts were always covered, save by prostitutes and actresses. Yet this does not in any way affect the morality of the Germans' as the next chapter opens with the line that 'in spite of this marriages there are strict', *quamquam severa illic matrimonia* (Benario 1999: 30-31, 84).

<sup>53</sup> Liv. 38.24.2.

<sup>54</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 20.1.

<sup>55</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 30.2.

<sup>56</sup> Plut. *Cam.* 17.5.

<sup>57</sup> Verg. *Aen.* 8.658-661.

<sup>58</sup> Cic. *Font.* 30.

---

dwellings,<sup>59</sup> foodstuffs and farming,<sup>60</sup> government, class and administration,<sup>61</sup> recreation and sports,<sup>62</sup> family life<sup>63</sup> and religious customs.<sup>64</sup> Roman writers, particularly Caesar, comment on different or new fighting techniques of the ‘other’,<sup>65</sup> specifically mentioning their habit of fighting from chariots.<sup>66</sup> Allusions are also made to guerilla warfare,<sup>67</sup> a particularly frustrating approach for both the Romans and the British who were more accustomed to fighting in formations. Mention is also made quite often about the custom of the ‘other’ of bringing their families, and sometimes their possessions, to battle.<sup>68</sup> Tacitus particularly focuses on the use of woman war leaders in British societies, something different from Roman practice.<sup>69</sup>

Smith comments very little on the different physical appearance of the Xhosa, only mentioning them once as ‘curly haired’.<sup>70</sup> He describes the kaross and headdresses worn by the Xhosa people,<sup>71</sup> but similarly to some Roman writers, focuses more on their near or complete nudity,<sup>72</sup> which he seems to have associated with ‘savagry’ and ‘sin’.<sup>73</sup> Smith also comments on individual Xhosa men’s and women’s beauty or lack thereof,<sup>74</sup> but seemingly without any general prejudice. Smith, according to Mostert, was not prejudiced about skin colour and was

---

<sup>59</sup> For example, Caes. *B.G.* 4.1.7, 5.12.3, Strab. 3.4.16, 4.4.3-4, 4.5.2, Tac. *Germ.* 16, *Hist.* 4.63.

<sup>60</sup> For example, Caes. *B.G.* 4.1.8, 4.10.5, 5.12.6, 5.14.2, 6.22.1, Strab. 4.4.3-4, Tac. *Germ.* 23.

<sup>61</sup> For example, Caes. *B.G.* 6.11-12, 6.15, 6.23, Strab. 4.1.1, 4.4.3-4, Tac. *Hist.* 6.61

<sup>62</sup> For example, Tac. *Germ.* 24.

<sup>63</sup> For example, Caes. *B.G.* 5.14.4, Tac. *Germ.* 18-20.

<sup>64</sup> For example, Caes. *B.G.* 6.13-14, 6.16-18, 6.21, Liv. 23.24.13, Strab. 3.4.16, 4.4.5-6, 4.5.4, 7.2.3, Tac. *Germ.* 9-10.

<sup>65</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.2.3, 5.16, *B.C.* 1.44, Tac. *Ann.* 1.64

<sup>66</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.33-4, Prop. 4.3.9, Strab. 4.5.2

<sup>67</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.11.2, 3.28.3, 6.34.6, Liv. 35.4, Front. *Strat.* 1.3.10.

<sup>68</sup> Plb. 21.37., Caes. *B.G.* 4.14.5, 8.14.2, Liv. 38.18.15, 38.23.9, Strab. 4.4.2, 7.2.3, Tac. *Germ.* 7.3, *Ann.* 14.34, Plut. *Caes.* 20.4.

<sup>69</sup> Adler 2008: 180. See Tac. *Agr.* 16.1, *Germ.* 45.9, *Hist.* 4.61.

<sup>70</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>71</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90, Smith, *Letters to Juana* 18 Apr 1835, 19 Apr 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>72</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 26 July, 6 Oct 1835, 25 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>73</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 26 July 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90. Lester notes Smiths’ association of nakedness with sin (Lester 1998: 229).

<sup>74</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90, 92, 101, Smith, *Letters to Juana* 27 Feb, 30 Apr, 5 May 1835 in *Autobiography*

---

often entranced by the beauty of the Xhosa.<sup>75</sup> Lehmann describes Smith as finding them beautiful but revealing too much.<sup>76</sup>

Smith, in his autobiography, goes to some length to describe Xhosa customs, such as the slaying of oxen,<sup>77</sup> practices of circumcision,<sup>78</sup> and funerary customs<sup>79</sup>, the latter which he sought to change.<sup>80</sup> He also goes into a fair amount of depth in describing their legal customs,<sup>81</sup> which he sought to incorporate or codify in his system of rule in Queen Adelaide province.<sup>82</sup> His preoccupation with certain customs, for example ‘witchcraft’, which he attempted to eradicate, has already been discussed.<sup>83</sup>

Roman writers and Harry Smith comment on the different appearance and customs of the ‘other’. In the ethnographic tradition in both the ancient and later European times, descriptions of the ‘other’ reveal a persistent fascination with ways unlike their own.<sup>84</sup> Descriptions of different military practices would also have had the added function of providing information for military endeavours, for example in Caesar. There also seems to have been a similar preoccupation with the nudity of the ‘other’, which was a particularly prevalent image for hundreds of years prior to the nineteenth century, and was associated with animality,<sup>85</sup> immorality,<sup>86</sup> sexual promiscuity,<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Mostert 1992: 770.

<sup>76</sup> Lehmann 1977: 190.

<sup>77</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 36.

<sup>78</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 92.

<sup>79</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 91.

<sup>80</sup> Mostert 1992: 766.

<sup>81</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 74-76.

<sup>82</sup> Lehmann 1977: 189, Harington 1980: 62. Harington notes that, despite Smith’s recommendation in this regard during his rule in Queen Adelaide, he did not do so later when, as governor, he could have (Harington 1980: 170).

<sup>83</sup> See Chapter 2, footnote 523.

<sup>84</sup> Mellor notes the widespread interest in exotic peoples and customs in the ancient world and the centuries of ethnographic material produced (Mellor 1993: 14). Anderson notes that, for example when the *Agricola* was written, there was an assumption that there would be an interest in Rome about Britain and its people (Furieux 1922: xlii).

<sup>85</sup> Jahoda 1999: 7, 100.

<sup>86</sup> Jahoda 1999: 16, 100

<sup>87</sup> Jahoda 1999: 100.

---

but also a more idyllic life.<sup>88</sup> According to Mostert, Smith pronounced nudity unacceptable,<sup>89</sup> echoing the missionary views of the time.<sup>90</sup> Describing the ‘other’ as different more often than not arose from a sincere curiosity about the unfamiliar, but also functioned as a way of distancing the ‘other’ from themselves. In the case of Smith, however, comments are made only on those customs which he sought to change or incorporate into his ‘system’, since he was writing as an official in charge of a province, rather than in any specific ethnographic treatise.

### 3.4 Sounds and Cries

A specific behaviour or custom of the ‘other’ frequently commented on is the making of loud, often inarticulate, cries and noises, usually in battle. Livy often refers to the ‘loud noise’ (*clamor magnus*) made by the Gauls,<sup>91</sup> the Gauls being naturally given to wild singing and discordant shouting (*truci cantu clamoribusque variis horrendo... sono*)<sup>92</sup> the latter quote linking ‘songs’, ‘shouts’, ‘sounds’ and ‘noise’,<sup>93</sup> with words meaning ‘wild’, ‘savage’, ‘rough’, and ‘terrible’.<sup>94</sup> He remarks on the the dissonant howls and songs (*ululatus cantusque dissonos*) of the Gauls.<sup>95</sup> He makes a point of singling out the fact that one particular Gaul did *not* sing or dance about:<sup>96</sup> from this one would assume that that was the expected behaviour. He portrays the *cantus... ululates et tripudia*, songs, shouting and leaping about as an ancestral custom of the Gauls before battle and links the clashing of arms with the word *horrendus*.<sup>97</sup> With the Gauls Livy associates savagery (*trux*) with the sound (*sonus*) they make.<sup>98</sup> Again Livy remarks on the harsh cries (*truci*

---

<sup>88</sup> Jahoda 1999: 11, 27.

<sup>89</sup> Mostert 1992: 766.

<sup>90</sup> Mostert 1992: 954, 957.

<sup>91</sup> Liv. 5.37.5. cf. 38.22.8.

<sup>92</sup> Liv. 5.37.8.

<sup>93</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 281, 348, 1729.

<sup>94</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 864, 1905

<sup>95</sup> Liv. 5.39.5.

<sup>96</sup> Liv. 7.10.8.

<sup>97</sup> Liv. 38.17.4.

<sup>98</sup> Liv. 6.28.7.

---

*clamore*) of the Gauls<sup>99</sup> and their discordant cries (*ululatibus*).<sup>100</sup> Livy also refers to the uproar (*fremitu*) of the Gauls.<sup>101</sup> Tacitus echoes many of Livy's descriptions. He describes the Britons as responding to Calgacus' speech with songs, shouts and discordant cries (*fremitu cantuque et clamoribus dissonis*), which he comments on as being usual among 'barbarians',<sup>102</sup> a point which is repeated later when he describes the Germans as 'clashing arms and dancing wildly according to their custom' (*sono armorum tripudiisque*).<sup>103</sup> He describes the Germans of having songs to rouse their courage for battle, but these are described as inarticulate sounds (*fractum murmur*) rather than songs<sup>104</sup> and German women are described as wailing (*ululatus*) at the battle lines to encourage them on.<sup>105</sup> Tacitus uses similar words to describe the Germans: *cantu truci, truci sonore*<sup>106</sup> and *cantu aut clamore*.<sup>107</sup> Tacitus describes the British women as emitting 'foreign cries and shrieks' (*externos fremitus, ululatibus*)<sup>108</sup> and writes of the sounds (*sonores*) and empty menaces of the 'barbarians'.<sup>109</sup> Plutarch also refers to the speech and cries of the Germans as strange, ferocious and unlike those of other peoples.<sup>110</sup>

Smith too describes Xhosa warriors as responding to their chief's appeal with 'discordant and terrific yells',<sup>111</sup> 'screeching their war-cry'.<sup>112</sup> He again recounts the 'yelling' of the Xhosa at Smith and his wife's departure from Queen Adelaide province.<sup>113</sup> He later mentions the 'usual

---

<sup>99</sup> Liv. 7.23.7.

<sup>100</sup> Liv. 21.28.1.

<sup>101</sup> Liv. 21.20.5.

<sup>102</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 33.1.

<sup>103</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 5.17

<sup>104</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 3.2.

<sup>105</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 7.4.

<sup>106</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 2.22, *Ann.* 1.65

<sup>107</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 5.15

<sup>108</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.32

<sup>109</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.36

<sup>110</sup> Plut. *Mar.* 15.5, 16.2.

<sup>111</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>112</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 57. He also describes the noise made by the Mfengu fighting the Xhosa as 'screeching, yelling, hooting, Tower of Babel noise' (Smith, *Autobiography* p. 66).

<sup>113</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.101.

---

war cry' and 'demonstrations'.<sup>114</sup> He even uses the words 'howl', 'roar', and 'hissing' to describe the sounds the Xhosa made.<sup>115</sup> These images of the 'other' yelling, wailing, and making inarticulate noises function both to enhance the image of the 'other' as wild and animal-like, and also to emphasise a contrast with their own behaviour, ordered and disciplined. Adler notes the typical clamorous war cry as a further means of 'othering'.<sup>116</sup>

### 3.5 The 'Other' as Animal-like

Far more explicitly than simply alluding to animal-like noises, many Roman writers refer to the 'other' as animals. Livy likens fighting against Gauls as drawing the sword against wild beasts (*beluas*),<sup>117</sup> untamed (*indomitas*) as if they were animals.<sup>118</sup> He goes on later to describe them as terrified like animals (*pecorum*)<sup>119</sup> and, when cornered, charging at their own like wounded animals.<sup>120</sup> Tacitus makes similar comparisons between killing the 'other' to hunting animals.<sup>121</sup> Tacitus also draws attention to *ferarum imagines* on the standards of the 'other',<sup>122</sup> associating the 'other' with images of wild beasts. He describes some of the furthest German tribes as *feri*, with the furthest tribes, the Hellusii and Oxiones, as having the bodies and limbs of wild beasts.<sup>123</sup> Tacitus recounts fantastical tales of distant peoples described as half human half beastlike,<sup>124</sup> which (as discussed below) is connected with notions of 'monstrousness'. Plutarch portrays the 'other' as howling and bellowing with the strain of wild beasts in them.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 17 Mar 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>115</sup> Smith *Letter to Juana* 12 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Lehmann 1977: 180, 188.

<sup>116</sup> Adler 2008: 182.

<sup>117</sup> Liv. 7.24.5.

<sup>118</sup> Liv. 33.12.11.

<sup>119</sup> Liv. 38.17.6.

<sup>120</sup> Liv. 38.21.8.

<sup>121</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 34.2.

<sup>122</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.22.

<sup>123</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 46.6.

<sup>124</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.24.

<sup>125</sup> Plut. *Mar.* 20.2.

When writing of the Xhosa, Smith often uses animal imagery. He uses words such as ‘swarm’ and ‘infest[ation]’ to describe them and their places of abode as ‘dens’ and ‘nests’.<sup>126</sup> Words used to describe the movement of the Xhosa include ‘creeping’,<sup>127</sup> and ‘prowling’.<sup>128</sup> The Xhosa, he writes, have a ‘feline and predatory disposition’<sup>129</sup> and he often describes their intent and acts as ‘predatory’.<sup>130</sup> They are ‘beasts of prey’, and like an ‘animal’ or ‘wild beast’ would return to their ‘breeding places’ and ‘prowl in favourable covers’.<sup>131</sup> He writes to his wife that Xhosa chiefs and Hintsas are to be ‘hunt[ed]’<sup>132</sup> and that he looks upon the Xhosa as ‘a wild beast’ and would ‘hunt him as such’.<sup>133</sup> Later he again compares the Xhosa to a ‘wild beast’, this time a cornered ‘wolf, fox, hare, any *bête de chasse*’ which if cornered would change his plan of escape.<sup>134</sup> Thus he seems to emphasise both a predatory disposition as well as their role as the hunted. He refers to the Xhosa as ‘wolves’<sup>135</sup> and Kuba specifically is described as ‘wolf-like’,<sup>136</sup> and Mhala an old ‘fox’.<sup>137</sup> Yet in another instance he describes the Xhosa as ‘flocking’ to him:<sup>138</sup> one would assume as sheep to a shepherd. Another common description is of the Xhosa as his ‘dogs’.<sup>139</sup> He describes the Xhosa people’s sleeping habits as ‘lying all together like dogs in a kennel’<sup>140</sup> and specifically refers to Mani as a faithful ‘dog’.<sup>141</sup> Connotations arise from such

<sup>126</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 55, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 Mar, 7 Apr 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>127</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 12 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 27.

<sup>128</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 25 March 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>129</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 24 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>130</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 2 Feb, 25 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 71.

<sup>131</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 July 1835, reiterated in *Letter to D’Urban* 26 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*. Harington notes Smith’s view of the enemy as living like beasts of prey (Harington 1980: 206). Lehmann also notes Smith’s conclusion that fighting against the Xhosa was like hunting dangerous wild animals (Lehmann 1977: 151).

<sup>132</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 10 Apr 1835, 18 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, reiterated in Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library

<sup>133</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 12 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, reiterated in Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 16, 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>134</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 20 Apr 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>135</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 30 Aug 1851 in *Godlonton Corresp.* D’Urban was also accused of referring to the Xhosa as ‘wolves’ (Lehmann 1977: 195, Arndt 2010: 719).

<sup>136</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 33.

<sup>137</sup> Mostert 1992: 1078.

<sup>138</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10, 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p.58.

<sup>139</sup> Harington 1980: 101, Lehmann 1977: 321, Mostert 1992: 932. It was reported that those Mfengu living under the control of Xhosa chiefs were commonly referred to as Hintsas’ ‘dogs’ (Mostert 1992: 607).

<sup>140</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 19 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library.

<sup>141</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 103.

---

examples of loyalty and devotion, but inevitably inferiority. However, his threat at one point, to hang them up like dogs<sup>142</sup> puts a cruel twist on the image. Smith goes as far as to refer to the Xhosa as ‘baboons’,<sup>143</sup> and describes Pato and his captain as ‘monkey-faced’.<sup>144</sup> Although the image of apes calls to mind racist attitudes, I would argue that his animal imagery is used for its metaphoric value, such as when he likens Maqoma in a state of ‘excitement’ to an ‘unbroken colt’ which was let loose but told not to run away.<sup>145</sup> He describes some chiefs as shaking ‘like a horse after two hours fox hunt’.<sup>146</sup> Hunting and horses were familiar pastimes for Smith<sup>147</sup> so the analogies would have come naturally. He also likens the ‘volatile’ Xhosa, if upset, to ‘a disturbed hive of bees’.<sup>148</sup> On the news that the province is to be abandoned, he writes of how they would ‘chafe and fret like the caged hyena’.<sup>149</sup> Smith even refers to himself at one point as an animal, like a hawk attacking its prey.<sup>150</sup>

In an early letter Smith describes the Xhosa as ‘possessing little of the human’,<sup>151</sup> and often refers to them as ‘creatures’.<sup>152</sup> He even calls them ‘brutes’,<sup>153</sup> – ‘brute’ according to Barclay refers an ‘animal’<sup>154</sup> – yet I would argue that, considering his love of metaphor, it is the more ‘figurative’ meaning noted by Barclay ‘as a term of the most mortifying reproach, and implying a person void of humanity, and an enemy to reason’, ‘rough’ and ‘uncivilised’,<sup>155</sup> that is the intended one

---

<sup>142</sup> Harington 1980: 107.

<sup>143</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 20 Apr 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>144</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 16 Apr 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>145</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>146</sup> Smith, H., *Report on Frontier Conditions* 27 Oct 1850 [MS 611] Cory Library.

<sup>147</sup> Mostert 1992: 658.

<sup>148</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 29 June 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>149</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>150</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>151</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 16 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>152</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 30 April 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p.88, 90, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>153</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 20 April 1835, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>154</sup> Barclay 1811: 128.

<sup>155</sup> Barclay 1811: 128.

---

here. Frequently he refers to the Xhosa as ‘human beings’<sup>156</sup> and despite his emphasis on the ‘other’ as animal-like, he seems to have deplored the general tendency among the settlers to view and treat the Xhosa as beasts.<sup>157</sup>

Both Roman writers and Smith use animal imagery to portray the ‘other’ at various times, which is not surprising considering that descriptions of ‘beastliness’ and ‘animality’ of the ‘other’ were common from antiquity to the nineteenth century.<sup>158</sup> I would argue that neither Roman writers nor Smith literally thought of the ‘other’ they described as animals – or primates as some racial theorists did<sup>159</sup> – but that the imagery was used to distance themselves from the ‘other’. Animality was associated with repulsiveness, nakedness, immorality, sin, licentiousness<sup>160</sup> and a lack of restraint,<sup>161</sup> reason<sup>162</sup> or a soul,<sup>163</sup> much like child-likeness, while also being associated with a closeness to nature and wildness.<sup>164</sup> So the ‘other’ was again given a largely negative representation. One scholar argues that in Caesar a comparison with wild animals highlights the intractability or lack of tameability of the ‘other’,<sup>165</sup> in this case giving an explanation of why the incorporation of Germans into the Roman world, and hence their conquest would be undesirable,

---

<sup>156</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 6 Oct, 25 Nov, 17 Dec 1835, 10 Apr, 17 Apr, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*. D’Urban also seems to have thought of the Xhosa as belonging to the ‘human race’ albeit the ‘worst specimen’ thereof (Mostert 1992: 728).

<sup>157</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 55.

<sup>158</sup> The representation of the ‘other’ as animal-like dates from antiquity (Jahoda 1999: 214), with ‘beastly’ used as a common epithet for the generic ‘savage’ (Jahoda 1999: p. 7, 45, 215). Ape-likeness particularly became increasingly prominent as a sub-division of animality from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century (Jahoda 1999: 7, 9, 215). Indigenous Americans, South Sea Islanders and Africans were commonly described as wild beasts (Jahoda 1999: 8, 11, 18, 19, 23-25, 27, 29, 30, 54, 56, 67, 69, 70). According to Isaac, there was a current theme of the Germans as represented as ‘wild beasts’, for example in Manilius, Seneca and Josephus (Isaac 2004: 430).

<sup>159</sup> During the eighteenth century, ape-likeness of humans became a topic for scientific debate, notably among anatomists, and by the mid nineteenth century the supposed apishness of savages became extensively adopted as a pseudo-scientific fact (Jahoda 1999: 216). Long, in the eighteenth century, developed a thesis that Africans constituted a species intermediate between humans and apes but closer to the latter (Jahoda 1999: 55). Other pseudo-scientific theories attempting to prove the closeness of Africans to Apes were common (Jahoda 1999: 58-60, 82 - 83), with Cuvier relating the size of the skull, face, facial angles, and organisation of the nervous system as signs of ‘animality’ (Jahoda 1999: 76 - 79).

<sup>160</sup> Jahoda 1999: 7-9.

<sup>161</sup> Jahoda 1999: 90.

<sup>162</sup> Jahoda 1999: 8-9, 30.

<sup>163</sup> Jahoda 1999: 18.

<sup>164</sup> Jahoda 1999: 6-7, 9, 30.

<sup>165</sup> Allen-Hornblower 2014: 690, 692.

---

whereas Smith views himself as having the ability to ‘tame’ the Xhosa.<sup>166</sup> The concept of the ‘Great Chain of Being’, which held sway from antiquity to at least the nineteenth century, classified animals and those deemed animal-like, monstrous or strange, in a hierarchy beneath ‘rational humans’,<sup>167</sup> which increased an idea of inferiority<sup>168</sup> to any attribute of animality, whether literal or figurative,<sup>169</sup> given to the ‘other’.

### 3.5.1 Monstrousness

Even more inhuman than the attribute of animal-likeness, is that of monstrousness. Caesar describes the ‘other’ as possessing ‘bodies of monstrous size’ (*immani*<sup>170</sup> *corporum magnitudine*).<sup>171</sup> Many of Cicero’s comments on the ‘other’, assaults, practice of sacrifice, tribes, groups, are associated with the word *immanis*.<sup>172</sup> The same word is used by Horace to describe the Rhaetians,<sup>173</sup> by Frontinus to describe the German tribes<sup>174</sup> and by Suetonius to describe the religion of the Druids.<sup>175</sup> I did not encounter any reference to ‘monstrousness’ in the sources of

---

<sup>166</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 13 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*. Harington describes the Smith’s attitudes towards the chiefs as something like that towards a dangerous pet (Harington 1980: 40), although he did apparently however at one point question the tameability of the Xhosa (Harington 1980: 197).

<sup>167</sup> The Great Chain of Being originated from the concept of a comprehensive ordering principle of nature, called in antiquity by neo-Platonism *scala naturae* and was taken over, incorporated and modified by Christian philosophy mainly through Saint Augustine (Jahoda 1999: 32). The concept dominated European thinking about humanity’s place in nature until the turn of the nineteenth century and persisted in the writings of some theorists even later (Jahoda 1999: 32). The Chain of being was conceived as a comprehensive hierarchical order, instituted by the Creator, in which the objects of creation were arranged in small gradations from minerals, plants, animals, humans to the angels in increasing degrees of perfection (Jahoda 1999: 32). Promoting the principle of continuity and inter-connectedness of all things, humans were linked with angels by the possession of intelligence, animals in the possession of sensibility and even rocks in their property of just ‘being’ (Jahoda 1999: 32). It was regarded the tasks of scholars and later science, to place any particular organism into its right place within the scale (Jahoda 1999: 32). The criteria of the possession of reason and similarities of physical and mental aspects were used as measures of how animal-like or ‘human’ beings were (Jahoda 1999: 32-33). Albertus Magnus put forward a scale based on psychological functioning, where beings capable of only sensory impressions constituted the lowest level of animals, the next level was those able to store such impressions in memory and the next able to combine memory and what one might call elementary cognitive skills, the next higher levels distinguished by the ability to profit from experience, but not form concepts and so on, essentially breaking down levels of mental capability the highest of which being ‘reason’ (Jahoda 1999: 33-34). There was substantial debate and confusion over the placement of beings (whether fictional or real) which were perceived as similar but not identical to Europeans, such as monstrous races, pygmies, large apes (Jahoda 1999: 32-35) and newly encountered peoples such as black Africans (Jahoda 1999: 53) whose behaviour and appearance was often associated with that of animals, particularly apes (as previously discussed in footnote 159).

<sup>168</sup> Jahoda 1999: 97.

<sup>169</sup> Jahoda 1999: 46.

<sup>170</sup> Although *immanis* can mean ‘monstrous in size, enormous, immense, huge, vast’, it can also mean ‘monstrous in character, frightful, inhuman, fierce, savage, wild’ (Lewis and Short 1879: 891).

<sup>171</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 4.1.9.

<sup>172</sup> Cic. *Font.* 31, 33, 44, *Prov. Cons.* 33, 34, *Q.Fr.* 1.1.27.

<sup>173</sup> Hor. *Carm.* 4.14.15.

<sup>174</sup> Front. *Strat.* 1.1.8.

<sup>175</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 25.5.

---

Smith or his contemporaries, but it was an image of the ‘other’ which persisted from the time of the Greeks until at least the fifteenth century.<sup>176</sup>

### 3.5.2 Wildness

Closely connected to the representation of the ‘other’ as animal-like is the image of ‘wildness’. Strabo comments on the Germans as ‘wild’.<sup>177</sup> Tacitus describes the marshy, muddy and forested terrain of the Germans<sup>178</sup> and even makes the connection between the raw, harsh, bleak land to a ‘bleakness’ or ‘harshness’ of their culture.<sup>179</sup> In a similar way, it has been argued that Caesar’s portrayal of the Herculanian forest serves to mirror the ‘wildness’ of the Germans.<sup>180</sup>

Caesar describes the Germans as wild (*feros*).<sup>181</sup> He also describes the Nervii as the ‘most wild’ (*maxime feri*)<sup>182</sup> although this is not necessarily a negative attribute as it is part of a general comment on the Nervii as courageous.<sup>183</sup> Horace describes Britons and Germans as *feri*.<sup>184</sup> Tacitus uses the word *feritas* of various Germans.<sup>185</sup> Livy also describes the Gauls as a ‘wild race’ (*gente efferata*).<sup>186</sup> The adjective *ferus* particularly carries connotations of savagery and an uncivilized, untamed, fierce, warlike or even cruel<sup>187</sup> ‘other’ and is often used of wild animals.<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> Descriptions of monstrous races were made by Herodotus and Pliny the Elder (Sardar et al 1993, Jahoda 1999: 1), and similar accounts were found in the eleventh and fourteenth century (Jahoda 1999: 1-2). In the fifteenth century travel accounts were rife with tales of monstrous races, including that of Columbus (Jahoda 1999: 15, 98-99).

<sup>177</sup> Strab. 7.1.2.

<sup>178</sup> For example, Tac. *Ann.* 1.63-67. Seeger comments on Tacitus’ reference to ‘uneven and thicketed terrain in the narratives describing combat with the northern barbarians’ in opposition to the plain or firm and even ground associated with the Romans (Seeger 2002: 14).

<sup>179</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 2.2.

<sup>180</sup> Allen-Hornblower 2014: 687-688.

<sup>181</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.33.4. cf. 1.47.4.

<sup>182</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.4.8, 2.15.5.

<sup>183</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.15.5

<sup>184</sup> Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.33, *Epod.* 16.7.

<sup>185</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 43.5, 46.3.

<sup>186</sup> Liv. 8.14.9. cf. 10.10.12.

<sup>187</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 741.

<sup>188</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 741.

---

Murphey notes the link between *ferus* and *furor*,<sup>189</sup> the attribute of madness or passion discussed in the previous chapter.

Other words also used, derived from *ferox*, meaning wildness, and ferocity, still carried an association with the word *ferus* and the image of the wild animal.<sup>190</sup> Livy describes a Gallic leader as charging at the Etruscans fiercely (*ferociter*).<sup>191</sup> He later remarks on the Gauls as a fierce people (*gens ferox*), which he associates with an eagerness for war.<sup>192</sup> He also refers to the Gauls' 'ferocity and untamed nature' (*ferocia atque indomita ingenia*), linking the idea of wildness or ferocity with the untamed or undominated<sup>193</sup> which he repeats later, this time using the word *ferus* in place of *ferox*.<sup>194</sup> He describes the Gauls inevitably as *ferocissimas gentium*.<sup>195</sup> When Frontinus describes the Germans he associates fierceness with monstrosity (*immanium ferocia nationum*).<sup>196</sup> Tacitus applies *ferocia* to the Britons<sup>197</sup> and *ferox* to the Batavians.<sup>198</sup> He also describes Civilis and a delegate of the Tencteri as *ferox*.<sup>199</sup> He also uses the term *ferocia* to describe Britons and Germans.<sup>200</sup> Tacitus describes the Britons as particularly wild or fierce (*praeferoces*).<sup>201</sup>

Smith describes the Xhosa as 'wild',<sup>202</sup> repeated again supposedly in Maqoma's own words in reference to his own people.<sup>203</sup> Later, in addressing the chiefs, he asks if they wish to be

---

<sup>189</sup> Murphey 1977: 236.

<sup>190</sup> Lewis & Short, *A Latin Dictionary* p.739

<sup>191</sup> Liv. 5.36.7.

<sup>192</sup> Liv. 7.23.6.

<sup>193</sup> Liv. 21.20.8.

<sup>194</sup> Liv. 33.12.11.

<sup>195</sup> Liv. 42.52.11.

<sup>196</sup> Front. *Strat.* 1.1.8.

<sup>197</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 11.5.

<sup>198</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.59

<sup>199</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.28, 4.64

<sup>200</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 5.18, *Ann.* 2.17, 12.33

<sup>201</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.38

<sup>202</sup> Smith, *Letters to Juana* 12, 19 Apr 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 13 Dec 1835, 16 June 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>203</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 27 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

---

Englishmen or rather ‘almost wild men’<sup>204</sup> and describes them like ‘man in a wild state of nature’.<sup>205</sup> The word ‘wild’ was associated at the time with that which was ‘not tame’, ‘ungovernable’, ‘inconstant’, ‘strange’, ‘uncivilized’ and ‘savage’.<sup>206</sup> Smith also mentions the Xhosa attacking the Colony with ‘ferocity’,<sup>207</sup> and as potentially ferocious,<sup>208</sup> indicating a wild, untamed ‘savage’.<sup>209</sup> Smith at one point describes the Xhosa as ‘unrestrained Children of Nature’ before the system designed by himself and D’Urban was put into place.<sup>210</sup>

Roman writers and Smith both associate the ‘other’ with the ‘wild’, either by association with the wild terrain<sup>211</sup> or described as ‘wild’ themselves, which in Roman sources also carried connotations of savagery and fierceness. In ancient sources, the image of the wild ‘other’ became a way of separating nature from culture and ‘civilisation’.<sup>212</sup> This was particularly expressed in the myth of the negatively portrayed ‘wild man’, which emerged in the Middle Ages, persisted into the eighteenth century<sup>213</sup> and was associated with many familiar negative stereotypes, such as a lack of reason, brute-strength, animal-like traits, immorality and sexual licentiousness.<sup>214</sup> During the Renaissance and Enlightenment, the prevalent and more positive image of the idealized ‘noble savage’ sometimes portrayed wildness as an idyllic release from the restraints of civilisation and represented simplicity, freedom and health – as opposed to what was felt by some to be the evils of corrupt civilisation and a lack of liberty,<sup>215</sup> seemingly reminiscent of

---

<sup>204</sup> Smith, *Address to the Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*. The description of the Xhosa as ‘wild’ human beings is reiterated in Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>205</sup> Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 Jun 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>206</sup> Barclay 1811: 973.

<sup>207</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>208</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 24 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>209</sup> Barclay 1811: 374.

<sup>210</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>211</sup> See also Gidley 1992: 47-8.

<sup>212</sup> Jahoda 1999: 103, 235.

<sup>213</sup> The Myth of the ‘wild man’ became common in European folklore from the Middle Ages was portrayed as a creature of the woods acquainted with nature’s secrets (Jahoda 1999: 5, See also Sardar et al 1993: 27,30). Native Americans were at first depicted as ‘wild men’ (Jahoda 1999: 15) and Linnaeus even went as far as providing for a *homo ferus* in his divisions of the genus of *homo sapiens* in 1758 (Jahoda 1999: 41).

<sup>214</sup> Jahoda 1999: 5.

<sup>215</sup> Jahoda 1999: 6, 11, 20, 49, 54.

---

some of Tacitus' arguments. Closeness to nature then, both portrayed as either a good or bad thing, was ultimately in opposition to a view of themselves as 'civilized', inevitably associating wildness with barbarism.

### 3.6 The 'Other' as Barbaric, Savage or Uncivilised

The Romans were prone to use the noun *barbarus* interchangeably with the labels 'Briton', 'Gaul' and 'German',<sup>216</sup> while as an adjective *barbarus* was sometimes used to describe their behaviour and practices. This is how Caesar describes two Gauls' arrogant behaviour,<sup>217</sup> and how Cicero describes the Gallic practice of human sacrifice, their speech and the assault on the Romans.<sup>218</sup> Cicero refers to the Gallic nations as barbarous.<sup>219</sup> Tacitus uses the same word to describe the rites of the Germans<sup>220</sup> and also their altars.<sup>221</sup> Tacitus uses the word *saevitia* often to describe the 'other',<sup>222</sup> meaning anything from ferocity, rage and violence to barbarity.<sup>223</sup> He describes the attack by the Britons on the colony as involving every kind of savagery to be found in barbarians (*nec ullum in barbaris ingeniis saevitiae genus omisit*).<sup>224</sup> Similarly he uses the word *saevitia* in conjunction with words such as plunder and destruction, favoured by the Germans in their success.<sup>225</sup> Tacitus also describes Cartimandua<sup>226</sup> and the Germans as possessing *saevitia*<sup>227</sup> and later the term is associated with human sacrifice and other religious

---

<sup>216</sup> Many instances of this occur, some examples being Caes. *B.G.* 3.23.2, 4.25.1, 6.40.8, Cic. *Balb.* 32.3, Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.5, Liv. 5.36.9, Plin. *H.N.* 4.97, Front. *Strat.* 2.5.8, Tac. *Ann.* 14.32. The number of possible examples is proof to the statement by Gruen that Romans tended to describe the west in terms of barbarism (Gruen 2006: 460).

<sup>217</sup> Caes. *B.C.* 3.59.3.

<sup>218</sup> Cic. *Font.* 31, 33, 44.

<sup>219</sup> Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 13, *Q.Fr.* 1.1.27.

<sup>220</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 39.2, *Hist.* 4.15

<sup>221</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.61

<sup>222</sup> He also uses the same word to describe the Emperor Tiberius (Tac. *Ann.* 4.1.1, quoted in Woodman 1988: 180).

<sup>223</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 1615-6

<sup>224</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 16.1.

<sup>225</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.63.

<sup>226</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 3.45.

<sup>227</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.67.

---

practices.<sup>228</sup> Balsdon writes of the unromanised world portrayed by Roman writers as shrouded in barbarism, and that of northerners particularly so.<sup>229</sup>

On numerous occasions Smith uses the word ‘barbarian’ to label the Xhosa,<sup>230</sup> and generally portrayed them as barbarous peoples.<sup>231</sup> Smith refers to the Xhosa and to their practices of ‘witchcraft’ and others as ‘barbarous’.<sup>232</sup> He also often refers to the Xhosa as ‘savages’.<sup>233</sup> Terms such as savages and barbarians were at the time used by most colonial voices, particularly those of the conservative settlers on the frontier<sup>234</sup> and the military forces.<sup>235</sup> It is interesting to note that Smith was himself accused of savage and barbaric behaviour in his treatment of the Xhosa, and Hintsa in particular, by his humanitarian critics.<sup>236</sup>

The words ‘savage’ and ‘barbarian’ are used by both Roman writers and Smith a great deal in their descriptions of the ‘other’. The idea of savagery was in ancient sources associated with various negative attributes as well as the idea of ‘barbarism’. The term ‘savage’ used in British contexts was invariably a negative attribute, meaning ‘wild’, ‘uncultivated’, ‘untamed’, ‘cruel’ and ‘uncivilised’,<sup>237</sup> used interchangeably with the terms ‘barbarian’ or ‘barbarism’. In the nineteenth century, the term ‘savage’ was also associated with wild nature<sup>238</sup> and was commonly

---

<sup>228</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.30.

<sup>229</sup> Balsdon 1979: 63–4.

<sup>230</sup> Smith *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 10 Feb 1837, 22 Dec 1850, 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*, Smith, H., *Letter to Lord Glenelg* 15 Dec 1837 [MS 501] Cory Library, Smith, H., *Letter to Sir G. Napier* 28 Jan 1838 [MS 488] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 66, 67, 77, 90, 91, 94, 98, 100, 101, 102, Smith, *Letter to Bowker* 3 Nov 1848, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850), *Letter to Grey* 7 Apr 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also Harington 1980: 75, 102, 104, Mostert 1992: 1071, Strobel 2008: 73.

<sup>231</sup> Harington 1980: 54, Lehmann 1977: 325.

<sup>232</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.74, 76, 77, 102, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>233</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* 26, 28, 35, 37, 57, 58, 63, 70, 80, Smith, *Letters to Juana* 15 Apr, 23 Apr, 4 May, 7 May, 18 May 1835, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan, 20 Feb, 17 Mar, 7 Apr 1852, *Arrangements of Movements* 21 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>234</sup> Crais 2001: 95, Lester 1998: 5, 9–10.

<sup>235</sup> Arndt 2010: 710, 734–5.

<sup>236</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 68, Lehmann 1977: 201.

<sup>237</sup> Barclay 1811: 833.

<sup>238</sup> Jahoda 1999: 16.

---

identified with the ‘other’.<sup>239</sup> Iselin, a Swiss philosopher of history and politics in the 1700s, wrote of savagery, barbarism and civilisation as paralleled with various life-stages, as if mankind was in a state of childhood ‘savagry’ associated with sensuousness, adolescence ‘barbarism’ associated with a degree of imagination, and adulthood ‘civilisation’ which was associated with reason.<sup>240</sup>

### 3.6.1 Concepts of ‘Barbarism’ and ‘Civilisation’

The Greek root of the word *barbaros* essentially means a ‘non-Greek’, an ‘outsider’, a ‘foreigner’,<sup>241</sup> arising onomatopoeically from the incomprehensible ‘babbling’ sound foreigners were perceived as making.<sup>242</sup> While some may argue that the term retained this sense of neutrality in some contexts, there were less negative alternatives that could have been used for foreigners<sup>243</sup> and as will be seen the concept of ‘barbarism’ in the Roman world became far more complex and loaded with heavily negative connotations and associations.<sup>244</sup> Roman writers associate barbarism with ideas of stupidity, foolishness and ignorance,<sup>245</sup> a lack of skill or education<sup>246</sup> and Plautus even associates *barbarus* with the idea of the ‘child’,<sup>247</sup> attributes referred to in the first chapter. It is associated with a lack of restraint, passion and lust,<sup>248</sup> with drunkenness,<sup>249</sup> arrogance, boldness,<sup>250</sup> as well as fickleness and disloyalty.<sup>251</sup> It is associated

---

<sup>239</sup> The image of the ‘savage’ and the long lasting grand stereotype of a savage horde overturning the civilized world was provided by the narration of the fall of the Roman Empire (Miller and Savage 1977: 122). See also Gidley 1992: 39.

<sup>240</sup> Jahoda 1999: 133. Later writers such as Schultz proposed similar classifications (Jahoda 1999: 88).

<sup>241</sup> Lewis and Short 1879: 222. See also Cic. *Rep.* 1.37.58

<sup>242</sup> Pagden 1986: 16. Much classical scholarship has been written on this subject, for example: Hall 1991.

<sup>243</sup> For example *peregrinus* (Liv 5.36.6) *exterus* (Caes. *B.C.* 3.43.3, Cic. *Sull.* 37, *Verr.* 2.5.149), and *alienigenus* (Cic. *Font.* 32). However, Tacitus associates even the word *externus* with words like *saevitia*, *libido*, *raptus* (Tac. *Hist.* 2.73).

<sup>244</sup> Veyne 1993: 359.

<sup>245</sup> Plaut. *Bacch.* 123, Caes. *B.G.* 8.10.4, *B.C.* 3.59.3, Vell. 2.18.2, Tac. *Germ.* 45.5, *Ann.* 12.45.

<sup>246</sup> Plaut. *Bacch.* 124, Caes. *B.G.* 6.10.2, Cic. *Div.* 1.2.

<sup>247</sup> Plaut. *Bacch.* 123-4.

<sup>248</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.13, 8.8.1, Caes. *Sull.* 75-6, Liv. 29.23.4, Tac. *Germ.* 18.1, *Ann.* 11.16.

<sup>249</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.16.

<sup>250</sup> Caes. *B.C.* 3.59.3, Cic. *Sull.* 76, *Verr.* 2.3.24.

<sup>251</sup> Liv. 22.22.7, 25.33.2, 28.17.6, 29.23.6, Tac. *Ann.* 12.14, *Hist.* 3.48.

---

with descriptions of cruelty,<sup>252</sup> violence and warlike-ness<sup>253</sup> and with disgrace, immorality, impiety<sup>254</sup> and criminal behaviour,<sup>255</sup> as referred to in the second chapter. It is associated with ideas of ‘beast-like’,<sup>256</sup> monstrousness<sup>257</sup> and the in-human<sup>258</sup> and with portrayals of ‘wildness’, ‘fierceness’,<sup>259</sup> and nudity,<sup>260</sup> previously discussed in this chapter. Essentially, barbarity combines most of the negative stereotypes we have encountered previously into one neatly packaged term.

Smith’s use of the word ‘barbarous’ or ‘barbarian’, a common description of the ‘other’ during his time,<sup>261</sup> cannot be understood in anything but heavily negative terms. According to Barclay it denoted an ignorance of learning, cruelty, inhumanity and a want of kindness, pity, manners and civility.<sup>262</sup> The associations and context of the word ‘barbarian’ which Smith alludes to, cover everything from ferocity, aggression, violence,<sup>263</sup> agitation, restlessness,<sup>264</sup> degradation,<sup>265</sup> ‘despotism’, thievery, sin, crime and wickedness.<sup>266</sup>

The term ‘barbarism’ was, however, not arbitrarily negative, but was used to oppose one’s own view of oneself as ‘civilised’. As a foil to images of barbarism, the Romans used the word *humanitas*, which they identified with being Roman.<sup>267</sup> Loosely translated as or corresponding to

---

<sup>252</sup> Cic. *Flac.* 24, *Planc.* 71, *Rosc. Am.* 146-7, *Sull.* 76, *Verr.* 2.3.24, *Phil.* 13.18, *Sall. Ad. Caes.* 1.4.2, *Vitr.* 2.8.12, *Quint. Inst.* 1.5.9, *Hor. Carm.* 3.5.49-50.

<sup>253</sup> Cic. *Sull.* 76, *Phil.* 13.18, *Prov. Cons.* 33.

<sup>254</sup> Cic. *Sull.* 76, *Verr.* 2.3.24, 2.4.112, 2.4.122, *Dom.* 140.

<sup>255</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 8.24.3, Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 146, *Verr.* 2.4.122, *Tusc.* 5.63, *Dom.* 140, *Vitr.* 2.8.12.

<sup>256</sup> Cic. *Sull.* 76, *Inv.* 1.103, *Liv.* 34.24.4.

<sup>257</sup> Cic. *Font.* 31, 33, 44, *Lig.* 11, *Planc.* 71 *Rosc. Am.* 146, *Sull.* 75-6, *Verr.* 2.4.25, *Tusc.* 2.65, *Div.* 1.2, *Dom.* 140, *Inv.* 1.103, *Prov. Cons.* 33, *Q.Fr.* 1.1.27, *Liv.* 34.24.4, 38.37.3, *Val. Max.* 9.11.4.

<sup>258</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.23.

<sup>259</sup> *Caes. B.G.* 1.31.5, 1.33.4, 4.10.5, Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 146, *Sull.* 76, *Tusc.* 2.65, *Inv.* 1.103, *Hor. Carm.* 1.35.10-11, *Epod.* 16.7-11, *Liv.* 21.23.4-6, 38.37.3

<sup>260</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.23.

<sup>261</sup> Arndt 2010.

<sup>262</sup> Barclay 1811: 181.

<sup>263</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to Lord Palmerston* 1 Sept 1857 [MS 694] Cory Library.

<sup>264</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>265</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>266</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>267</sup> Cicero writes of a rustic way of life as opposite *humanitas atque leges* (Cic. *Cael.* 26). ‘Law’ (*ius*) and *humanitas* are opposed to the way of life that is barbaric (Cic. *Sest.* 92 cf. *Rep.* 2.27, 2.48). For a similar contrast see Cic. *Leg.* 2.36: *ex agresti immanique vita exculi ad humanitatem* (cf. *De Or.* 1.32-3). Cicero describes mankind as falling into two classes: one ‘uneducated and rustic’ (*indoctum et agresti*) and the other ‘humane

‘civilisation’,<sup>268</sup> the concept embraces two ideas. On the one hand it means ‘culture’,<sup>269</sup> inevitably a Greco-Roman culture, often associated with Roman wealth, commodities, fashion,<sup>270</sup> land cultivation, agriculture,<sup>271</sup> urbanization,<sup>272</sup> law,<sup>273</sup> religion,<sup>274</sup> education, literacy, and language.<sup>275</sup> On the other hand it stands for a general regard for human worth,<sup>276</sup> associated with ideas of manners, kindness,<sup>277</sup> virtue, nobility,<sup>278</sup> rational thought and intelligence.<sup>279</sup> It is significant to note that the Romans, in the way they used this single word *humanitas*, equated their own culture and ways of life with good morality. Veyne argues that *humanitas* was both an internal modification of an individual person – that by Cicero’s time had become a popular attitude, a kind of politeness and manner<sup>280</sup> – and an indication of human ascendancy over the external world, through cities, and agriculture.<sup>281</sup>

As with the Roman idea of *humanitas*, Smith equated his idea of ‘civilisation’ with English commerce, clothing,<sup>282</sup> agriculture,<sup>283</sup> education and knowledge,<sup>284</sup> as well as virtues of honesty

---

and cultivated’ (*humanum et politum*). He uses the superlative form *immanissimus* of those who belong to the former class (Cic. *Part. Or.* 90). Vitruvius makes a similar contrast: *e fera agrestique vita ad mansuetudinem... humanitatem* (Vitr. 2.1.6). cf. Vitr. 2.8.12: *humanitatis dulcedine mollitis animis barbarorum*. Valerius Maximus makes the same point in very similar words: *humanitatis dulcedo etiam in efferata barbarorum ingenia penetrat* (Val. Max. 5.1.6). See also Miller and Savage 1977: 118.

<sup>268</sup> Veyne 1993: 343.

<sup>269</sup> Woolf defines *humanitas* as embracing other Roman concepts such as *benevolentia*, *observantia*, *mansuetudo*, *facilitas*, *severitas*, *dignitas*, and *gravitas* while connected with concepts such as *religio*, *fides* and *mores*. He also relates it to Greek concepts of *philanthropia* and *paideia*, a general regard for human worth and culture as intellectual property of an educated and cultivated person (Woolf 1998: 55). Similarly, Wilkinson defines Cicero’s *humanus* as a word embracing both culture and human kindness, meaning something like our ‘civilised’ as applied to people (Wilkinson 1982: 231). Veyne defines *humanitas* as the designation of a person worthy of being ‘human’, denoting culture, the virtue of humanity and state of civilisation, with the Greek equivalents as *Paideia* and *philantropia* (Veyne 1993: 342).

<sup>270</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.3, cf. 4.3.3-4.

<sup>271</sup> Cic. *Flac.* 62, *Red. Quir.* 4, Plin. *Ep.* 8.24.2.

<sup>272</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 91, *Red. Quir.* 4, *De Or.* 1.33. The English word ‘civilisation’ has its roots in the Latin *civis* / *civilis* which refers to an urbanized community (Ayto 2002: 393). Although the Romans made the connection between urbanization and *humanitas*, Smith, in the rural frontier of the Cape Colony, speaks more of cottage rural living as civilized and not necessarily urbanized towns (See footnote 365).

<sup>273</sup> Cic. *Cael.* 26, *Flac.* 62, *Sest.* 91, *Verr.* 2.4.98, 2.5.187, *De Or.* 1.33, *Part. Or.* 90, Vitr. 9.pr.2.

<sup>274</sup> Cic. *Flac.* 62.

<sup>275</sup> Cic. *Cael.* 54, *Flac.* 62, *Lig.* 12, *Verr.* 2.4.98, *Div.* 1.2, *Leg.* 2.36, *De Or.* 1.32, Plin. *H.N.* 5.45, Plin. *Ep.* 8.24.2.

<sup>276</sup> Woolf 1998: 55, Wilkinson 1982: 231.

<sup>277</sup> Cic. *Cael.* 25, *Verr.* 2.5.187, *Leg.* 2.36, *Rep.* 2.27, Vitr. 9.pr.2.

<sup>278</sup> Cic. *Lig.* 12, *Off.* 1.62, *Planc.* 58, *Part. Or.* 90

<sup>279</sup> Cic. *Planc.* 58, *Verr.* 2.4.98, *Sen.* 1, Vitr. 9.pr.2.

<sup>280</sup> Veyne 1993: 352.

<sup>281</sup> Veyne 1993: 343.

<sup>282</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 89, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>283</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90.

<sup>284</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 17 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1853).

---

and goodwill<sup>285</sup> – which he viewed as an antithesis to the culture of the ‘other’: the latter which he labeled barbarous, savage and cruel.<sup>286</sup> The construct of ‘civilisation’ was used to place different cultures in a hierarchy, making one culture, their own, seem more ‘right’ than another. The added element of Christian religion to the idea of civilisation<sup>287</sup> greatly enhanced its moral implications in the nineteenth century.

Roman views on the nature of ‘barbarism’ and ‘civilisation’ are illuminating. In his speech against the exploitation of provincials by Verres, governor in Sicily, Cicero describes Verres as barbaric by association and in character.<sup>288</sup> In his defence of Sulla, Cicero refers to Catiline and other Romans as being more *barbarus* than ‘barbarous’ nations.<sup>289</sup> Here Cicero is attributing barbarous, uncivilised traits to *Romans*, as he does again when he comments on civilised conduct as a behaviour which he intimates Marc Antony lacks.<sup>290</sup> As much as these were rhetorical means by which he could further discredit his opponents in judicial cases and speeches, by the use of what were obviously widely accepted understandings of civilisation and barbarism,<sup>291</sup> I would argue that Cicero viewed any individual as capable of being or behaving in a barbaric or civilised way, and he states more than once that barbarism and civilisation were based on manners and character rather than on language or nationality.<sup>292</sup> Unlike the view of the ancient Greeks who defined a ‘barbarian’ as a non-Greek in speech, ethnicity or descent, the ancient

---

<sup>285</sup> Smith *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>286</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Letters to Godlonton* 10 Feb 1837, 22 Dec 1850, 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*, Smith, H., *Letter to Lord Glenelg* 15 Dec 1837 [MS 501] Cory Library, Smith, H., *Letter to Sir G. Napier* 28 Jan 1838 [MS 488] Cory Library. Smith refers to the Xhosa and to their practices of ‘witchcraft’ and others as ‘barbarous’ (Smith, *Autobiography* p.74, 76, 77, 102, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>287</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.90, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>288</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.23, 2.4.112.

<sup>289</sup> Cic. *Sull.* 75-76.

<sup>290</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 2.7-8.

<sup>291</sup> Woolf 1998: 60.

<sup>292</sup> Cic. *Rep.* 1.58, Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.112.

---

Romans were more inclined to view civilisation in terms of culture and customs<sup>293</sup> – that which could be ‘learnt’, rather than was innate. Veyne notes that *humanitas* was viewed by Romans as a merit, rather than a universal trait and that, like plants, humans were either wild or ‘cultivated’.<sup>294</sup>

The essential capability of man to *learn* how to be civilised<sup>295</sup> was affirmed by Roman writers in the explanation of their own history. Cicero writes of civilisation as being born in Greece and spreading to Rome, through all the earth to all other peoples<sup>296</sup> - what he perceived to be ‘the natural course of human history’. He writes of ‘wolf-men’ who lived together in packs before the time of civilisation or laws, who lived by strength and violence before those most wise among them perceived the ‘teachableness of human nature’ and brought themselves from a state of wildness and savagery, into one of justice, civilisation and urbanisation.<sup>297</sup> Cicero ultimately acknowledged the Romans as having lived a barbarous life before being educated to a refined state of civilisation by the divine institutions of Athens.<sup>298</sup> Civilisation was presented as a ‘state of society’ that applied to the whole of mankind.<sup>299</sup>

---

<sup>293</sup> Woolf argues that in conquering Greece and appropriating much of its culture, in order to negotiate Roman identity as ‘civilised’, in the face of being ‘barbarian’ by Greek definition, the Romans redefined the concept to something that could be ‘learnt’ and ‘adopted’ (Woolf 1998: 58-60). It is possible that this definition also appealed to the English as their identity as ‘civilised’ was threatened by the description of Britons as ‘barbarians’ by the Romans unless they too viewed civilisation as something that ‘progressive’ societies adopted. By contrast, Veyne argues that the Romans needed to adopt Hellenistic traditions and language to prove they knew the manners of the great international civilisation that Hellenism represented (Veyne 1993: 356). I do not agree with this, as it assumes one culture is more alluring than another and it does not explain the British situation as well as the previous explanation, which fits both.

<sup>294</sup> Veyne 1993: 343.

<sup>295</sup> Veyne argues that this could be related to the individual and society (Veyne 1993: 343).

<sup>296</sup> Cic. *Flac.* 62, *Verr.* 2.5.187, *Sen.* 1, *Q. Fr.* 1.1.27-9. As does Pliny in *Ep.* 8.24.2

<sup>297</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 91. Vitruvius also writes of the natural progression from barbarism to civilisation if in the proximity of civilized society, and the desire of men to do so (*Vitr.* 2.8.12). Similarly, Vitruvius describes at length how mankind equipped with ideas and purposes, constructed buildings and progressed by degrees to crafts and disciplines that led from a savage and rustic life to a state of civilisation (*Vitr.* 2.1.6-7).

<sup>298</sup> Cic. *Leg.* 2.36, *De Or.* 1.33.

<sup>299</sup> Interestingly, both Cicero and Tacitus mention how the process can operate in reverse, and that people can be corrupted into being savage and wild (Cic. *Rep.* 2.27, Tac. *Ann.* 6.42), just as *humanitas* can be used to bring mankind out of that state (Cic. *Rep.* 2.27).

---

For the most part, Smith, like the Romans, believed that ‘civilisation’ was something that could be progressed towards and ‘learnt’.<sup>300</sup> He viewed humanity as balanced between ‘savagery’ and the ‘educated Christian’.<sup>301</sup> He remarks on ‘barbarism’ as a ‘state of human nature’<sup>302</sup> and, similarly to Cicero’s description of the Romans, describes the English as once naked, ignorant and cruel before they discovered Christianity and advanced towards civilisation.<sup>303</sup> Smith remarks on uncivilized conduct as a ‘habit’, one that was thrown off by the English a long time ago,<sup>304</sup> although he describes the pillage and rape by the British military in Badajoz as ‘civilized man let loose of morals, a far greater beast than the savage, more *refined* in cruelty’<sup>305</sup> – as if although they still had the capacity to act barbarously they did so in a more ‘refined’ way.

Despite these assertions, Smith seems inconsistent in his belief in the Xhosa’s ability to leave behind what he conceived as barbarous living. During the campaign against the Xhosa in 1835, in contrast to missionary and humanitarian views,<sup>306</sup> Smith initially proclaims the Xhosa people ‘irreclaimable’ from barbarism,<sup>307</sup> but then changed his attitude substantially when it was evident the British were unable to expel the Xhosa from the Colony.<sup>308</sup> Smith began to write of the possibility of the Xhosa people progressing and striding toward civilisation,<sup>309</sup> and by the time he was being recalled from the Cape in 1836 he was asserting that they could be reclaimed.<sup>310</sup> This

---

<sup>300</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 95.

<sup>301</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 23 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>302</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p.102, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>303</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>304</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*. Smith also refers to civilised ‘habits’ in Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>305</sup> Mostert 1992: 662.

<sup>306</sup> Lester 1998: 4.

<sup>307</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 21 July 1835, 16 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*. According to Mostert, the word ‘irreclaimable’ was used several times by D’Urban and Smith to describe Xhosa to justify the treatment of them by the British, from Hintza’s death to the annexation of more land, and the phrase enraged the humanitarian party and missionary movements in London and the Cape for its implications on the futility of missionary endeavours. (Mostert 1992: 727, 736, Crais 2001: 119). Lester argues that the discourse of the Xhosa as too savage to be reclaimed was common among the frontier settlers and many administrators, Harry Smith and D’Urban particularly in agreement (Lester 1998: 8-10).

<sup>308</sup> Mostert 1992: 731, Lester 1998: 228, Lester 1998: 10.

<sup>309</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4 Aug, 1 Sept, 22 Sept, 6 Oct, 12 Oct, 17 Nov, 28 Nov, 8 Dec, 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>310</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*. But in his mind, only his system, if pursued, would rescue the Xhosa from their perceived state of barbarism (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 April in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library). He believed he had made progress and was convinced that given another ten years he would have ‘brought the Gospel of Christ and all

---

overwhelming image of ‘progress’ towards civilisation, is sometimes countered by examples of some ‘retrograding’ back into barbarism.<sup>311</sup>

On his return to the Cape he seems to have believed more than ever in the ‘civilisation’ of the Xhosa,<sup>312</sup> a conviction that faltered in the conflict to come, after his shock at his ‘subjects’ rejection of his system. Harington states that although Smith put on a brave public face<sup>313</sup> insisting that there had been real progress during the previous three years (1848-1850) and that he had been led to hope that ‘just and liberal treatment [would] develop the nature of man, and prove that he is created for civilized, not savage life’, he privately admitted that he had been completely misled and that his ‘faith in the civilisation of the native populations [had been] awfully shaken’.<sup>314</sup> Dwelling on what he regarded as one of the great questions of ‘natural history’, he questioned whether or not the Xhosa were, like some animals, untameable.<sup>315</sup> Eventually he would ‘candidly admit’ that he had quite changed his mind concerning the possibility of civilising them and that they were not to be abruptly reclaimed from their savage state.<sup>316</sup> In a letter to Grey he stated that the value of civilisation could only be felt by the people eventually after the imposition of strict control and border systems, tight laws and military control.<sup>317</sup> Despite his occasional outbursts in various situations, Smith ultimately believed the Xhosa reclaimable at some point under certain conditions.<sup>318</sup>

---

the blessings of civilisation’ to the Eastern districts (Smith, *Autobiography* p.98). He lamented that he had not remained long enough build churches and schools (Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90).

<sup>311</sup> In this particular instance Smith relates to D’Urban a Xhosa field commandant who had ‘left the house given him, gone into a hut, and that is retrograding into barbarism’ (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 15 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*).

<sup>312</sup> Harington 1980: 170.

<sup>313</sup> This optimism may also have been to appease Grey, as after making various outbursts that the Xhosa should just be expelled across the boundary on the outbreak of war in 1850, he was chastised by the Colonial Secretary who reminded him that it was his duty to reclaim and civilise the Xhosa (Lehmann 1977: 325).

<sup>314</sup> Harington 1980: 188.

<sup>315</sup> Harington 1980: 197.

<sup>316</sup> Harington 1980: 197.

<sup>317</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 16 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>318</sup> Crais notes that even ‘the settler elite, conservative missionaries and officials did not suggest that the innate flaws in the character of the African were incapable of some correction, an argument which some pseudo-scientists would later make’ (Crais 2001: 132).

---

In describing the ‘other’ as ‘savage’, ‘barbarous’ or uncivilised, both Roman writers and Smith present the ‘other’ as the opposite of how they view themselves or wish themselves to be seen, as ‘civilised’. For the most part Romans and Smith viewed barbarism and civilisation as states of society, that the former was not innate or inborn and that the latter could and should be taught to the ‘other’. This was inevitably viewed as a positive thing as ‘civilisation’ was thought of as better and superior to an inferior and undesirable state of ‘barbarism’.

### 3.6.2 Implications for a ‘Civilising Mission’

How ‘civilisation’ was imagined to be ‘learnt’ or adopted is another question. Valerius Maximus comments on the charm of *humanitas* as being able to ‘find its way into the savage nature of barbarians softening the grim fierce eyes’ of Rome’s enemies.<sup>319</sup> Roman writers often describe Germans, Gauls or Britons as being more or less barbarous or civilized than others depending on their proximity to and contact with Roman goods, customs and culture.<sup>320</sup> Cicero alludes to the geographical ‘spread’ of civilisation’.<sup>321</sup> Strabo writes of the Gauls as turning to civilized life, farming, and Roman lifestyles due to the dominance of the Romans.<sup>322</sup> But this ‘spread’ of civilisation was viewed as much more than a circumstantial outcome of expansion.

---

<sup>319</sup> Val. Max. 5.1.6.

<sup>320</sup> Caesar describes the Belgae as far removed from the *humanitas* of provincial Gaul (*humanitate provinciae longissime absunt*) and so unaffected by it (Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.3), intimating that if they lived in closer proximity they could have changed and become more like those in Provincial Gaul. Caesar comments on a tribe of Germans as being more civilized than the other because their borders touched the Rhine and due to trade were more accustomed to Gallic fashions (Caes. *B.G.* 4.3.3-4). Caesar describes the inhabitants of Kent as *humanissimi* of all the Britons, as a maritime people and similar to the Gauls (Caes. *B.G.* 5.14.1). Caesar also recounts how the Romans adopted barbarian ways of fighting because of their contact with and proximity to barbarians (Caes. *B.C.* 1.44). Hirtius comments that the Treveri, by reason of their proximity to Germany, differed little from the Germans in *cultu et feritate* (Caes. *B.G.* 8.25.2). Vitruvius advocates the natural progression of men from barbarism to civilisation if in the proximity of civilized society, and the desire of men to do so (Vitr. 2.8.12). Cicero also writes an interesting passage about a colony, far removed from the civilisation of Greece, and threatened by waves of barbarism from surrounding Gaul, and which in spite of this retained its civilized ways (Cic. *Flac.* 63), but there was evidently a danger of becoming barbaric perceived in living far removed from civilisation, in close proximity to barbarous peoples. Suetonius and Strabo also contain allusion to ‘degrees’ of barbarity. Suetonius comments on some Gauls as *semibarbari* (Suet. *Jul.* 76.3). Strabo comments on the habits of the Britons as more barbaric than others (Strab. 4.5.2). This concept is also discussed in Schadee 2008: 167-168, Rawlings 1998: 172, Balsdon 1979: 65. Riggsby makes an interesting point of how Caesar portrays Gaul as a place of ‘bad civilisation’ but further Germany as a place of ‘no civilisation’ (Riggsby 2006: 122).

<sup>321</sup> See footnote 296.

<sup>322</sup> Strab. 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.11, 4.1.12.

---

Many Romans subscribed to an imperial vocation<sup>323</sup> and seem to have seen themselves playing a role in the civilising of the ‘other’.<sup>324</sup> In a letter to his brother Quintus, Cicero outlines the duty of the Romans to bestow upon other nations that which was given to the Romans themselves by the Greeks, civilisation, and that it was incumbent upon a man to study the ‘other’, consider their welfare and security, and to teach them the lessons of arts and studies.<sup>325</sup> Pliny the Elder describes Rome as the nursling and mother of all other lands, chosen by the gods to unite scattered peoples, bring them together with language and to give to mankind *humanitas*.<sup>326</sup>

Tacitus describes Agricola in Britain as giving encouragement to individuals and assistance to communities in the construction of temples, markets and private houses... having the sons of the chieftains educated in the liberal arts.<sup>327</sup> Scholars argue that a provincial governor’s role would have been to promote, guide and perhaps provide models for ‘civilising projects’.<sup>328</sup> The interaction between the local elite and the governors’ entourage was seen as important in influencing local cultural change.<sup>329</sup> Although the provinces were to a large extent administered by the provincial aristocracy,<sup>330</sup> it was to this local elite, whom Rome bolstered up as local magistrates,<sup>331</sup> that most encouragement was given to become like the Romans, encouraged by ideology that was promoted by a provincial governor and his entourage.<sup>332</sup> Roman conceptions of civilisation offered a belief system that would convince an educated elite to a shared identity

---

<sup>323</sup> This is reflected in Verg. *Aen.* 6.851-3 (*tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento (hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem, parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*). Woolf also sees this ‘sense of duty’ as echoed in Virgil’s Jupiter when he speaks of Rome’s skill to rule over peoples and to impose morality (Woolf 1998: 57). See also Tac. *Agr.* 13.3.

<sup>324</sup> Woolf 1998: 48-50.

<sup>325</sup> Cic. *Q. Fr.* 1.1.27.

<sup>326</sup> Plin. *H.N.* 3.39-40. Woolf sees this echoed in the image of the transformative power of Rome found in accounts of Gaul by Caesar and Strabo, in which Rome is presented as providing conditions for others to become civilized, such as the provision of education (Woolf 1998: 57).

<sup>327</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 21.1-2.

<sup>328</sup> Woolf 1998: 68-69, 71, Laurence 2001: 3

<sup>329</sup> Laurence 2001: 4.

<sup>330</sup> Goodman 1997: 107.

<sup>331</sup> Goodman 1997: 138.

<sup>332</sup> Goodman 1997: 207-8.

---

and mission<sup>333</sup> which then would ultimately influence larger groups of native peoples.<sup>334</sup> Councils, magistrates and constitutions were imposed upon the society of the ‘other’.<sup>335</sup> Roman generals everywhere were regularly described as setting up and correcting political institutions and laws.<sup>336</sup> Roman currency was circulated through officials and soldiers and was required by taxation.<sup>337</sup> By instituting Roman style political institutions, laws, currency and a magistracy amenable to the process, the Romans attempted to ‘civilise’ the ‘other’ while overtly encouraging urbanisation,<sup>338</sup> and the adoption and emulation of Roman education, values and behaviour.<sup>339</sup>

Smith was to take on a seemingly similar ‘civilising mission’ due to a radical modification in policy initiated by D’Urban, who, instead of driving the Xhosa over the Kei river, which proved an impossible task,<sup>340</sup> decided to follow the advice first given to him by Dr John Philip, an influential missionary at the Cape and supporter of the humanitarian movement in London.<sup>341</sup> Philip had advised D’Urban that he would not object to the annexation of more land from the Xhosa, provided that he civilise them on their land, ‘on the plan adopted by the ancient Romans’.<sup>342</sup> Following on D’Urban’s hoping to ‘civilise’ the Xhosa ‘by the power of legal coercion... humane persuasion and example’,<sup>343</sup> Smith soon took on the task wholeheartedly. As Lester puts it, ‘as if intended all along, a discourse of their experimental ‘civilisation’ was

---

<sup>333</sup> Woolf 1998: 74-5.

<sup>334</sup> Millett 1990: 2.

<sup>335</sup> *Tac. Ann.* 11.19.

<sup>336</sup> Woolf 1998: 71.

<sup>337</sup> Goodman 1997: 142-46.

<sup>338</sup> Goodman 1997: 137.

<sup>339</sup> Woolf 1998: 71-2.

<sup>340</sup> Peires 1982: 112, Mostert 1992: 735, Lester 1998: 227.

<sup>341</sup> Walker 1957:191. For more information on the humanitarian movement in London see Galbraith 1963: 4-5, 73-76, and on the philanthropic influence at the Cape see van Aswegen 1993): 217, Mostert 1992: 736, Lester 1998: 4-6, Strobel 2008: 73.

<sup>342</sup> *Report of Aborigines Committee* 1836, quoted in Walker 1957: 190.

<sup>343</sup> Walker 1957: 186.

---

developed'.<sup>344</sup> Taking D'Urban's policy further, Smith envisaged a 'new era... opening to the world in respect to civilisation.'<sup>345</sup> Smith hoped that Christianity and civilisation would in time be established from Queen Adelaide province to Natal,<sup>346</sup> as neighbouring nations would by imitation and example adopt civilisation.<sup>347</sup> In these broad visions we see Smith adhering to the idea that civilisation spreads by proximity, whereas when he wrote more specifically about his plans he very forcefully emphasised his intention to actively civilise the Xhosa<sup>348</sup> rather than the circumstantial implications of the 'spread' of 'civilisation'. Smith believed the Xhosa capable of advancing in civilisation only *if* they followed his rules<sup>349</sup> and, according to Mostert, he viewed it his duty and divine calling to bring about that change.<sup>350</sup>

Smith writes of promoting the pleasures and desire of wealth brought about by civilisation and commerce,<sup>351</sup> of leading by quiet and impressive persuasion, urging and inspiring the Xhosa by example and right conduct, by instilling respect, restraint, industry, religion and an admiration of Englishmen.<sup>352</sup> He believed it imperative that British leaders act with decision, judgement and equity<sup>353</sup> and that good conduct, character and manners be impressed upon the 'other' by example in this new system.<sup>354</sup> He spent hours a day, he claims, with chiefs on the subjects of trade and improvement,<sup>355</sup> and writes of holding great meetings where he expounded the

---

<sup>344</sup> Lester 1998: 228.

<sup>345</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 1 Nov, 30 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>346</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 8 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>347</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 8 Dec, 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>348</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 Nov, 22 Nov, 25 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>349</sup> Smith, *Address to Caffre Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>350</sup> Mostert 1992: 763, 950. This can be compared to the role the idea of divine will played in the Roman conception of an imperial vocation (Woolf 1998: 48).

<sup>351</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>352</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 6 Oct 1835, 1, 17, 23, 25 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>353</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 30 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>354</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 19 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>355</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 12 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

---

principles of honesty and religion,<sup>356</sup> convinced he was exciting and inspiring them with the power and regularity of all that was English by shows of pomp and ceremony.<sup>357</sup>

Smith's efforts to 'civilise' went far further than attempting to inspire emulation for all that was English. He sought to introduce British law<sup>358</sup> and a new magistracy system whereby chiefs were appointed as native magistrates and field commandants.<sup>359</sup> According to Walker, D'Urban hoped to substitute colonial law for tribal custom.<sup>360</sup> He sought to oblige the chiefs and councillors to wear European clothing.<sup>361</sup> Lester argues that the adoption of European clothing was held as one of the most important indicators of transformation as it was the most visible and politically potent.<sup>362</sup> He tried to encourage European methods of agriculture and horticulture by introducing schools of industry, teaching the use of implements and making presents to the chiefs of ploughs, harrows and implements of husbandry.<sup>363</sup> According to Lester, the use of ploughs in agriculture was part of a wider vision of the transformation of gender roles, where men were expected to work in the fields, not woman.<sup>364</sup> He wrote to his wife about how he hoped to see the Xhosa taught how to build cottages and how nothing would tend to their civilisation more than cottage living.<sup>365</sup> He later described how his wife would spend hours with the Xhosa chiefs' wives teaching them needlework and Christian morals.<sup>366</sup> He actively sought to control trade and introduce the use and circulation of money, going so far as to prohibit barter.<sup>367</sup> When he

---

<sup>356</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>357</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>358</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 1, 17 Nov, 8 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>359</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 17 Nov, 19 Dec 1835, 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>360</sup> Walker 1957:193.

<sup>361</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 1, 22, 27 Sept, 30 Nov 1835, 10 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>362</sup> Lester 1998: 229-230.

<sup>363</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 5, 6, 26 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>364</sup> Lester 1998: 229.

<sup>365</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 19 April 1835 in *Autobiography*. Crais notes the association of huts with 'savagry' (Crais 2001: 138).

<sup>366</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 90-91.

<sup>367</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 6 Oct 1835, 17 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*. See also Mostert 1992: 766.

---

returned in 1847, now as Governor of the Cape, he attempted to renew his previous system.<sup>368</sup> He divided Xhosa land into ‘counties’ with English names, he sought to teach them to plough and to trade and once again he envisaged establishing schools where the Xhosa were to learn to speak English.<sup>369</sup> After the outbreak of war in December 1850 Smith commented on how the Xhosa had ‘progressed in three years beyond all belief’.<sup>370</sup>

The overall tone of Smith’s discourse and self-image recalls the description of Tacitus’ Agricola in Britain praising ‘progress’, rebuking those who did not adopt Roman ways, and spurring on rivalry for his esteem.<sup>371</sup> The image of a leader inspiring by ‘example’ and encouraging emulation for all that was ‘civilised’, was evidently something that Smith saw himself doing among the Xhosa. Many of Smith’s methods echo the image of Roman practice, such as the appointment of chiefs as magistrates, introduction of laws and currency. The degree to which these ‘civilising’ missions were actually actively carried out is debateable, and a question too large to contemplate in depth in this thesis. In Roman times, although acculturation seems evident,<sup>372</sup> it is difficult to know how far the Roman government went to in order to induce the ‘other’ to become civilised.<sup>373</sup> Despite Smith’s various aims and methods by which he attempted to civilise the ‘other’, these were never completely carried out, not particularly successful nor supported by the resources of the British government in his time.<sup>374</sup> Whether or not the ‘other’

---

<sup>368</sup> Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 Mar 1849, *Letters to Grey* 15 Mar 1849, 7 Jan 1850, *Speech to Xhosa chief* 7 Jan 1848 in *Correspondence* (1850). See also Peires 1982: 165, Mostert 1992: 933.

<sup>369</sup> Peires 1982: 166-7, Mostert 1992: 939.

<sup>370</sup> Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>371</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 21.1. See Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 17, 25 Nov 1835, 28 Jan, 12 Feb, 25 Mar, 16 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>372</sup> See for example in Millett (1990) and Woolf (1998). For discussion on the debate around the ideas of ‘romanisation’, ‘acculturation’, or ‘cultural change’ specifically see Millett 1998: 1-2, Jones 1991: 115, Hingley 1996: 39-45, Woolf 1997, Levick 2000: 162. For a similar argument for the negotiation of British identity and culture in the Cape Colony, see Bickford-Smith 2003.

<sup>373</sup> There is general agreement among scholars that there is little evidence for substantial imperial investment of funds in the any civilising process (Woolf 1998: 68-69, 71, Laurence 2001: 3). For different arguments on whether or not it was Roman policy to actively civilise the ‘other’ see Woolf 1998: 60 – 67, Haverfield 1915: 14, 16, Hingley 1996: 41.) Veyne argues that the Roman government never sought to civilise the ‘other’ but that the provincials spontaneously civilised themselves (Veyne 1993: 365).

<sup>374</sup> During Smith’s time civilising efforts remained largely ‘ideas’ as very limited financial assistance for such programmes was provided by the British government (Strobel 2008: 85). Smith’s efforts, for what they were worth, largely failed. After the dissolution of the province of Queen

---

actually became ‘civilised’ in the eyes of their conquerors, is of even less relevance here,<sup>375</sup> than the fact that the discourse and visions ascribed to by both Romans and Smith were similar. One distinguishing difference between Roman and Smith’s ideas of ‘civilising’ was Smith’s connection of Civilisation with Christianity.<sup>376</sup> In any Roman endeavour during the period being studied there was never any imposition of religious morality, and the Romans were indifferent to the ‘eternal salvation’ of their subjects,<sup>377</sup> unlike the European missionaries. At the Cape and elsewhere in the British Empire, Christian missionaries as well as many colonial administrators sought to both convert and ‘civilise’ the ‘other’ and saw these two as interrelated processes.<sup>378</sup> Another unique aspect of Smith’s and other British colonials’ vision of civilising the ‘other’ was the emphasis on ‘industry’ and the work ethic as an aspect of civilisation, which is possibly connected with the role of ‘labour’ which the British saw the ‘other’ as fulfilling within their economic system.<sup>379</sup>

---

Adelaide and his recall in April of 1836, Sir Harry Smith felt frustrated at not being able to complete what he had started, commenting on how ‘rapidly progressing civilisation’ was undone by his removal (Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 95). He recounts his efforts (Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p.71, 73, 76, 89, 92–93), blaming the Imperial government for having thwarted his attempt (Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library). Peires argues that had the system been maintained for much longer, the chiefs would have staged an uprising against the Colony (Peires 1982: 114-115). In 1852, faced with another fierce resistance campaign against British rule and the desertion of his most ‘loyal’ Xhosa police (Mostert 1992: 1040 - 1112), he acknowledged that his efforts had failed and that the Xhosa people should live according to their own laws and customs (Mostert 1992: 1073-4). Regarding the Xhosa tribes under British protection, he wrote ‘let them alone, we have seized British Kaffraria for no other purpose than to provide a frontier for the Colony’ (Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 10 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*).

<sup>375</sup> For the Xhosa see van Aswegen (1993: 201-211), Mostert (1992: 988) and Lester (1998: 240-241). For the Roman ‘other’ see Goodman (1997: 214-215).

<sup>376</sup> Smith often emphasized Christianity and the missionaries as connected to his ‘civilising mission’ (Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4 Aug, 6 Oct, 15 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*). He saw clergymen, magistrates, religious institutions, schools of industry and the military, all playing vital roles in the successful fulfilment of his goal (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 27 Sept, 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*). According to Mostert civilisation depended upon the adoption of Christianity by the Xhosa, which led to Smith’s dependence on missionaries for education and conversion (Mostert 1992: 766-7). Although he initially held missionaries in very low regard, he was by 1848 sending them a circular requesting their opinions on the best methods of civilising and Christianizing the Xhosa (Mostert 1992: 949).

<sup>377</sup> Veyne 1993: 367.

<sup>378</sup> For further information on Christian missionary activities in the Eastern Cape see Wilson (1969: 238, 264 -268), Galbraith (1963: 79-97), Davenport (1991: 160-163), Crais (2001: 100-101), Lester (1998: 238 – 241). Governors such as Shepstone and Grey were later to advocate and implement the idea of civilizing the ‘other’ even more strongly than Sir Harry Smith. For Grey’s policies see Wilson (1969: 260 – 264), Peires (1989: 45-73), Davenport (1991: 121-122), Thompson (1990: 77). For Shepstone’s policies see McClendon (2004: 339 -358) and Thompson (1990: 98).

<sup>379</sup> Smith viewed the ploughing, cultivating and habits of industry as the first step to civilisation (Mostert 1992: 945). The link between Christian conversion, the ‘gospel of work’ and industry; and the adoption of ‘civilised’ European ways of life, is evident from the early missionary endeavors in the Eastern Cape (Wilson 1969: 239, 265-267, Davenport 1991: 160-163, Mostert 1992: 947; Crais 2001: 102-103). The more dubious connection of ‘civilising’ endeavours with ideas of industry and work ethic come to light at a later stage when Smith’s government sought to alleviate the labour shortage in the Colony by a scheme of indenturing Xhosa, particularly children, as labour (Peires 1982: 167-8). Van Aswegen notes that under Smith’s governorship the Xhosa were taught the ‘value of labour’ as he endeavoured to integrate the Xhosa into the white capitalistic system (van Aswegen 1993: 218), largely as a labour supply. See also Mostert 1992: 948. See also chapter 4, footnote 77.

---

### 3.7 The 'Other' in Familiar Terms

If the Romans were not imposing actual cultural systems upon the 'other', they did often project their own understandings and familiar terms onto that which they encountered. In order to make foreign customs understandable and intelligible to their audiences,<sup>380</sup> some Roman writers employed what scholars term *Interpretatio Romana*, the imposition of Roman equivalents of figures, concepts or gods onto those of the 'other', invoking familiar Roman contexts.<sup>381</sup> Caesar refers to the Aedui as having a senate and equites and the Nervii as having senators and magistrates.<sup>382</sup> Barlow also notes Caesar's use of Roman political terminology to describe the Gauls, such as the word *rex*.<sup>383</sup> Plutarch also refers to the Nervii as having 'senators' – interestingly so as he describes the same a few lines earlier as 'savage'.<sup>384</sup> Caesar describes the Gauls as worshipping 'Mercury', 'Apollo', 'Mars', 'Jupiter', 'Minerva', essentially assigning Gallic gods Roman names.<sup>385</sup> Gruen argues that in discussing Gallic gods within the context of Roman beliefs, he is underscoring their similarities.<sup>386</sup> Tacitus records the Germans as singing of familiar Greek heroes<sup>387</sup> and their consideration of the leaving of one's shield behind in battle as a sign of ignominy, a common cliché in Greek and Latin literature.<sup>388</sup> He notes their practice of divination and augury.<sup>389</sup> He highlights religious parallels between the Romans and Germans in the *Germania*,<sup>390</sup> and even uses the image of 'furies' to describe the frantic behaviour of British women in battle.<sup>391</sup> In a more subtle way he portrays Boudica as a kind of outraged Roman

---

<sup>380</sup> Rawlings 1998: 173, Benario 1999: 108-9.

<sup>381</sup> Benario 1999: 66, 108-9.

<sup>382</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.6, 2.28.2, 7.33.2, 7.55.6. Burns notes that to Caesar Celtic community assemblies were local equivalents to the Senate in Rome and that the use of Roman terminology was 'natural' (Burns 2003: 99).

<sup>383</sup> Barlow 1998: 141

<sup>384</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 20.4-5.

<sup>385</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 6.17.

<sup>386</sup> Gruen 2010: 158.

<sup>387</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 3.1. See also Benario 1999: 66.

<sup>388</sup> Benario 1999: 71, Gruen 2010: 167-8.

<sup>389</sup> Tac. *Germ.* 10.

<sup>390</sup> Gruen 2010: 174-5. Gruen argues, however, that Tacitus also keeps his readers aware of the distinctions, that there is often no Roman equivalent given and that similarities and differences are weaved in intricate ways (Gruen 2010: 174-5, 177).

<sup>391</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.30.

---

matron.<sup>392</sup> Valerius Maximus acknowledges the similarity between old Gallic customs and beliefs and those of the Greeks.<sup>393</sup> Livy describes the migration of the Gauls as divined by gods and auguries and their movement as ‘marches’ with ‘infantry and ‘cavalry’, using many Roman terms and contexts to explain the early movement of another group of people<sup>394</sup> and even describes the generalship and strategy of a Gallic chief as qualities he implies the Roman army should have had.<sup>395</sup>

Similarly, Smith describes Kuba as Hintsas’s ‘prime minister’<sup>396</sup> and another councilor as Gaika’s ‘prime minister’ and ‘lord chancellor’ and describes some as ‘lawyers’.<sup>397</sup> Some remarkable comments by Smith include his description of Hintsas as ‘the very image of poor dear George IV’<sup>398</sup> and Nonube ‘resembling Catherine of Russia’.<sup>399</sup> But much more frequently than assigning British terms to the ‘other’, Smith more obsessively refers to himself in the terms of the ‘other’. He frequently refers to himself as *inkosinkulu* (Great Chief) at his ‘Great Kraal’<sup>400</sup> in King Williams Town, where he wrote of how he used a stick as a sign of office – a supposed Xhosa custom<sup>401</sup> and was constantly threatening to ‘eat up’ any chief who disobeyed him.<sup>402</sup>

Both Romans and Smith at times make these strange attempts to make the ‘other’ seem more familiar by categorising and labelling their ways to fit within their own understanding. However,

---

<sup>392</sup> Adler 2008: 181.

<sup>393</sup> Val. Max. 2.6.10.

<sup>394</sup> Liv. 5.34.5.

<sup>395</sup> Liv. 5.38.4-5.

<sup>396</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p.33.

<sup>397</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 74.

<sup>398</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* p. 30 Apr 1835 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>399</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 13 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>400</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 1, 17, 28, 30 Nov 1835, 15 Feb, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 73, 81, 96, 99. See also Harington 1980: 103, 106, 170, Mostert 1992: 765, 933, Peires 1982: 114.

<sup>401</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 21 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 58, 170, Lehmann 1977: 190, Lester 1998: 229. Peires refers to this as Smith ‘play[ing] childish games with his gold-knobbed stick’ (Peires 1982: 114).

<sup>402</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 5 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 85-6, 100. See also Harington 1980: 107, 173, Lehmann 1977: 191-2, Peires 1982: 114.

---

sometimes the description of the ‘other’ in Roman or British terms could be less of an effort at familiarization and more of an indication of the processes of acculturation, linked to our previous discussion on ‘civilising’. Caesar does occasionally describe the Gauls, particularly those closer to Rome, as civilized, or more so than others,<sup>403</sup> coinciding with geographical areas in closer proximity to Rome. Further, Smith’s relative lack of comment on the ‘other’ as ‘civilised’ corresponds to his lack of success in his civilizing endeavours.<sup>404</sup> Smith’s descriptions of himself in terms of the ‘other’ is peculiar to himself and was a symptom of his self delusion of power and intimate influence among the Xhosa.

### 3.8 Conclusion

In spite of very minimal efforts by both Roman writers and Smith to familiarize the ‘other’, the overwhelming image is of a different, wild, barbaric ‘other’. This image of the ‘other’ is remarkably similar, even though nineteenth and twentieth century pseudo-scientific racism<sup>405</sup> finds no real parallel in ancient thinking. Although I would argue that both Roman writers and Smith acknowledged all mankind as belonging to the human race, some were evidently considered as more ‘cultured’ than others.<sup>406</sup> Both use attributes of animal-likeness, savagery and barbarism to describe the ‘other’, effectively distancing the ‘other’ from how they defined and saw themselves, which was invariably in terms of a similar notion of ‘civility’. Much more effort was made to identify the ‘other’ as ethnographically different and far removed than familiar. Imagining the ‘other’ as unlike themselves, particularly as inhuman, animal-like, or inferior,

---

<sup>403</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.3, 1.31.5, 4.3.3. Riggsby notes that Vercingetorix in Caesar’s last book is presented as ‘romanised’, that the Gauls in general are made to appear more ‘civilised’ and that by the last book there is no mention of ‘barbarians’ (Riggsby 2006: 98-122). See also Schadee 2008: 177-8.

<sup>404</sup> See footnote 374.

<sup>405</sup> Berndt and Berndt 1971: 20, Isaac 2004: 1. Although not subscribed to by Smith, it has been argued that pseudo scientific racial thinking, particularly theories of ‘phrenology’ was disseminating in the Cape Colony by the early nineteenth century (Bank 1996, Lester 1998: 9).

<sup>406</sup> Veyne 1993: 343.

---

served to justify imperialism<sup>407</sup> and especially the ill treatment of the ‘other’.<sup>408</sup> Particularly if viewed as subhuman, the ‘other’ was ‘beyond the protection of any human convention.’<sup>409</sup> Horace describes fierceness as only justified against ‘other’ kinds in nature, arguing that it is not acceptable in civil war for Romans to treat other Romans fiercely.<sup>410</sup> For a conquering people, whether Imperial Rome or the British Empire, the image of an inferior or uncivilized ‘other’ in opposition to their own supposedly ‘elevated state of society’ provided justification for warfare against and domination of other peoples,<sup>411</sup> as they viewed themselves destined to rule as ‘superior’ beings.<sup>412</sup> It also provided justification for coercing the ‘other’ to adopt the ways of the conqueror as they were supposedly ‘rescuing’ the ‘other’ from an undesirable state. As control and rule was the objective,<sup>413</sup> this could also possibly have seemed easier if the ‘other’ subscribed to their laws and ways of life. Particularly in the case of the British, descriptions and visions of ‘civilising’ the ‘other’ were only entertained when they were attempting to bring them under direct rule.<sup>414</sup>

---

<sup>407</sup> Adler 2008: 174.

<sup>408</sup> Jahoda 1999: 11, 19.

<sup>409</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 111-112.

<sup>410</sup> Hor. *Epod.* 7.12.

<sup>411</sup> Jahoda 1999: 11, 16, 148, 217, Woolf 1998: 56-7, Lester 1998: 10-12, Mostert 1992: 738, Arndt 2010: 710-11, 734-5, Webster 1996: 117.

<sup>412</sup> Woolf 1998: 48, Miller and Savage 1977: 120, Harington 1980: 171.

<sup>413</sup> Smith’s primary objective was to curb the power of the chiefs (Wilson 1969: 243-244, Peires 1982: 113).

<sup>414</sup> D’Urban and Smith only made use of such ideas when they attempted to expand British territory and annexed the area between the Fish and Kei rivers (Mostert 1992: 933). After Smith was first recalled from the Cape, D’Urban’s system was disbanded and the province and its land given back to the Xhosa in 1836, there was no further move towards ‘civilising’ the ‘other’ by the British government until Smith returned to once again annex the land from the Xhosa. After the abandonment of Queen Adelaide province, the colonial boundary was withdrawn to that of 1829, Stockenström released the Xhosa chiefs from their allegiance to Britain, they were to be sovereign rulers with whom he made treaties (Walker 1957: 192-3, Peires 1982: 119, Davenport 1991: 118, van Aswegen 1993: 216, Mostert 1992: 795).

---

## CHAPTER 4

### *ROMAN AND HARRY SMITH'S DESCRIPTIONS OF THE 'OTHER' AS SUFFERING OR BENEFITTING FROM 'EMPIRE'*

'The opposite of war is not peace but civilisation, and civilisation is purchased with violence and cold-blooded murder' – Nadeem Aslam, *The Blind Man's Garden*

---

#### 4.1 Introduction

Roman writers often commented on the effects that imperial conquest and rule had on Germans, Gauls and Britons. In this chapter I will be comparing relevant Roman writings with those of Sir Harry Smith, with some reference to other British colonial writers. The context and agenda of the writers of these extracts will be taken into consideration and discussed, in an analysis of the possible reasons why such descriptions were made. I will also be commenting on the extent to which these portrayals may reflect the situations the 'other' found themselves in under imperial rule and how they were treated within an imperial or colonial structure.

#### 4.2 Sympathetic Portrayals

Caesar to an extent acknowledges the 'other' as desiring freedom and includes sympathetic arguments into some of his speeches. In his account, Diviciacus, who had earlier been described as expressing a fear of the Aedui and the rest of Gaul being deprived of liberty,<sup>1</sup> pleads to Caesar for mercy for the Aedui after a defeat, describing the Aedui as reduced to slavery and suffering all manner of indignity and insult.<sup>2</sup> However, this is recounted as being a pretext used by leaders

---

<sup>1</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.17.5.

<sup>2</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.14.3.

---

of a plot who had recently fled to Britain, thereby undermining any weight the comment might have had. Caesar also makes a comment on reckless Gauls determined to revolt, yet he acknowledges that all humanity is naturally bent on liberty and disinclined towards slavery,<sup>3</sup> not only admitting the loss of liberty that comes with conquest but that all mankind is understandably averse to it. Caesar admits that submitting the children and wives of the defeated to slavery and slaughtering the men was an unavoidable situation for the defeated (*necesse accidere victis*).<sup>4</sup> Caesar describes the Gauls as fighting for liberty (*libertatis*),<sup>5</sup> but in a speech attributed to Critognatus he undermines the man's complaints about being enslaved and losing rights and property by commenting that he was exceptionally cruel (*singularem et nefariam crudelitatem*).<sup>6</sup> He acknowledges that the Gauls were fighting for freedom and that subjection to Rome meant servitude.<sup>7</sup> Gruen writes of Caesar's admiration of the Gauls' commitment for freedom but denies this as an example of Roman self criticism.<sup>8</sup> Murphey, however, comments on how the desire for freedom is almost always matched with instances of 'barbarity', except in the case of Vercingetorix.<sup>9</sup>

Other Roman writers also occasionally portray the 'other' in a sympathetic light, most notably Livy, who even recounts incidents of grievances presented and acknowledged by the Roman senate. Both Polybius and Livy recount the rape and abuse of Chiomara, the wife of Ortiagon, a Gaul defeated by the Romans.<sup>10</sup> Livy portrays as just and righteous the demands of land made by the Gauls to the Romans.<sup>11</sup> He writes of the Gauls, in response to a Roman envoy appealing for

---

<sup>3</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.10.3.

<sup>4</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.14.10. cf. Caes. *B.G.* 2.35.1.

<sup>5</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.1.6, 7.76.2.

<sup>6</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.77.

<sup>7</sup> Isaac 2004: 414. See Caes. *B.G.* 7.89.

<sup>8</sup> Gruen 2010: 153.

<sup>9</sup> Murphey 1977: 241-2.

<sup>10</sup> Plb. 21.38, Liv. 38.24.

<sup>11</sup> Liv. 5.36.9.

---

help against the Carthaginians, as ‘ow[ing] the Romans no kindness’ as they had heard that Gauls were being ‘driven from their land’, paying tribute and suffering undeservedly (*indigna*) at the hands of the Romans.<sup>12</sup> He later describes the Cenomani as laying a complaint to the Senate against a Roman praetor for having been ordered to disarm when they had given no provocation, and recounts how the praetor was ordered to restore their arms.<sup>13</sup> This is an interesting comment as it also recounts the Roman Senate as acknowledging the unjust treatment of the ‘other’ by their own, a theme which is repeated when Livy describes a peaceful Gallic group in Italy which was driven from their newly settled town and unjustly disarmed, after giving no provocation.<sup>14</sup> To the string of complaints about Roman treatment brought to the Senate by Gauls is added another account of a Roman, Gaius Cassius having ravaged land of the Alpine tribes, their allies, and taken many of their people into slavery.<sup>15</sup> Sallust refers to the sufferings including the debt, of the Allobroges under the Romans.<sup>16</sup> Horace imagines a Briton as descending the Sacred Way chained (*catenatus*), and acknowledges this as more acceptable, that the Romans fight and turn against ‘other beasts of other kinds’ as opposed to fighting one’s own people in civil war.<sup>17</sup> Strabo describes the ‘other’ as controlled and subject to Roman authority and power,<sup>18</sup> and the Gauls as ‘enslaved’ and living in accordance with the Romans.<sup>19</sup> Plutarch and Suetonius describe the ‘other’ as submitting hostages and tributes to the power of Rome.<sup>20</sup> The latter also refers to the forced resettlement of peoples.<sup>21</sup> He describes the ‘other’ as humiliated under the authority of Caligula at the games and in triumphs.<sup>22</sup> Suetonius describes the massacre of Gauls as an

---

<sup>12</sup> Liv. 21.20.5-6

<sup>13</sup> Liv. 39.3.1-3

<sup>14</sup> Liv. 39.54

<sup>15</sup> Liv. 43.5.8-13.

<sup>16</sup> Sall. *Cat.* 40.

<sup>17</sup> Hor. *Ep.* 7.7-12.

<sup>18</sup> Strab. 4.1.5, 4.3.2, 4.4.3, 4.4.5, 4.5.3.

<sup>19</sup> Strab. 4.4.2.

<sup>20</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 23.3, Suet. *Jul.* 25.2, *Aug.* 21.2.

<sup>21</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 21.1, *Tib.* 9.2.

<sup>22</sup> Suet. *Calig.* 45.1, 47.1.

---

example of the tyranny of Nero<sup>23</sup> and Domitian's campaign against the Chatti as unprovoked,<sup>24</sup> in this instance aiming criticism at Domitian specifically rather than the Romans in general.

Tacitus' writings on the sufferings of the 'other' are extensive. He describes the Britons as bearing or accepting the burdens (*munia*) imposed upon them by the Roman Empire provided that their treatment was not severe, including conscription and tribute (*dilectum ac tributa*), and being subject to Rome, if not in a complete state of slavery.<sup>25</sup> Tacitus points out a difference between tolerable and intolerable treatment of the 'other', as he portrays them as cheerfully bearing duties such as conscription and taxes, but finding undue oppression unacceptable.<sup>26</sup> In a discussion among the Britons he refers to the 'evils of slavery' (*mala servitutis*), of the oppression of the two Romans in control of the area, the Proconsul and Procurator, and details their sufferings: the threat to their lives and property, the violence and insult against them, their children taken from them, the conscription inflicted.<sup>27</sup> However, the words *agitare* and *accendere* at the start of the chapter may suggest that their miseries and wrongs were 'exaggerated' in the speech.<sup>28</sup> He does, however, later describe the Britons as being treated unjustly in their purchases of grain.<sup>29</sup> In a lengthy description of the acculturation of the Britons to Roman ways, he writes that it is called civilisation although it is part of their servitude (*humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset*).<sup>30</sup> In another speech, Tacitus portrays Calgacus as mentioning slavery and oppression at the hands of the Romans, children being taken, conscription, dishonour and violence, and describes the Romans as greedy thieves who through

---

<sup>23</sup> Suet. *Ner.* 43.1.

<sup>24</sup> Suet. *Dom.* 6.1.

<sup>25</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 13.1.

<sup>26</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 13.1.

<sup>27</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 15.1.

<sup>28</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 15.1.

<sup>29</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 19.4.

<sup>30</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 21.2.

---

plunder and slaughter create a solitude and call it ‘peace’.<sup>31</sup> Compelling though this damning description of Roman imperialism may be, it is qualified by Tacitus’ introduction of Calgacus as ‘haranguing the multitude into battle’ and is essentially part of a formulaic literary technique to be discussed in detail later on. Mellor argues that many defiant speeches attributed to the ‘other’ against tyranny were used by Tacitus to highlight the evils of tyranny generally.<sup>32</sup> He also argues that incompetence and corruption of Roman administrators in the *Agricola* was used to emphasise, by contrast, the virtues of Agricola.<sup>33</sup>

Tacitus comments on the wrongs inflicted upon Gallic tribes nearest to the German armies, who were treated unfairly when compared to other Gallic tribes, some having their lands taken from them.<sup>34</sup> Tacitus describes Civilis as ‘making trouble’ by citing a burden laid upon the Batavians by the Romans, a levy of young Batavians made by the orders of Vitellius, which Tacitus describes as ‘naturally heavy’ (*natura gravem*) but made heavier by the greed and licence of those in charge who hunted out the old and weak so they might get a price for letting them off and the most attractive children to satisfy their lust.<sup>35</sup> Tacitus, in the guise of Civilis, again refers to the ‘wretched slavery [which] they falsely called peace’ (*miseram servititem falso pacem vocarent*).<sup>36</sup> These words are very similar to the comment attributed to Calgacus earlier. Tacitus presents the Germans as fighting for *libertas* to be rid of *servitium*.<sup>37</sup> Tacitus writes of Arminius as driven frantic by the seizure of his wife and the subjection to slavery of his unborn child. Although this dramatic image is undermined by Tacitus’ comments on Arminius’ violent nature, the allegation remains about the Romans’ maltreatment of pregnant women and the shame and

---

<sup>31</sup> ‘*auferre trucidare rapere falsis nominibus imperium atque ubi solitudinem faciunt pacem appellant*’ (Tac. Agr. 30.5)

<sup>32</sup> Mellor 1993: 26.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 107.

<sup>34</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.8.

<sup>35</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.14.

<sup>36</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.17.

<sup>37</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.25.

---

servitude of Segestes' surrender to Rome.<sup>38</sup> In a conflict between two Germans, one in favour of Roman rule and one against, Tacitus writes of Arminius as equating Flavius' rewards from the Romans to slavery (*servitii praedia*),<sup>39</sup> but again the one's arguments are matched against another's opposing argument. In a testimony attributed to those bent on faction in Germany, Tacitus writes of a German youth as infected by everything foreign: nurture, servitude, culture (*infectum alimonio, servitio, cultu, omnibus externis*),<sup>40</sup> equating the spread of Roman culture to a kind of servitude. He also describes Corbulo as 'imposing' Roman laws and ways onto the Frisians.<sup>41</sup> Similarly Caratacus, in Tacitus' account, in an effort to stimulate war, declares that to win or lose against the Romans would be mean 'freedom or slavery' (*libertatis aut servitutis*), and makes various allusions to violence against women and children.<sup>42</sup> Tacitus places strong emphasis on the rape of Boudica's daughters and the injury done to her, in a particularly sympathetic account which also describes the kingdom of Prasutagus pillaged by centurions, his household by slaves as if there were a state of war.<sup>43</sup> This is an interesting comment, in that it presupposes that such behaviour would be excusable during war. Tacitus also mentions the Iceni as stripped of their land, and treated as slaves.<sup>44</sup> Boudica herself is recounted as echoing these sufferings, 'lost freedom, a body thoroughly beaten, the man-handled chastity of her daughters' (*libertatem amissam, confectum verberibus corpus contrectatam filiarum pudicitiam*).<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.59.

<sup>39</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.9.

<sup>40</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.16.

<sup>41</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.19.

<sup>42</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.34.

<sup>43</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.31.

<sup>44</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.31.

<sup>45</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 14.35.

---

The only time Smith refers to the Xhosa sympathetically is when he describes them as ‘poor’ or in a ‘pitiful’ state,<sup>46</sup> yet this is not in reference to their relationship with Empire but is more of a reflection of his patronising view of them as inferior, since the word ‘poor’ can mean that which is ‘of small worth’, ‘mean’ and ‘contemptible’, as well as the ‘object of pity’,<sup>47</sup> similar to the tone of ‘pity’ adopted by missionaries at the time.<sup>48</sup> He records at great length Maqoma’s grievances of his maltreatment before Smith’s involvement,<sup>49</sup> which I would argue he used to contrast with his own methods. Any ‘state of misery’ that Smith records during or as a result of conflict, is generally blamed on the chiefs as imposing on their people as a consequence of waging war.<sup>50</sup> At one stage he lists a series of grievances laid out from Sarili and Boku which include the destruction of corn by British troops.<sup>51</sup> He also writes of how Dr Philip had told Maqoma that he had been unjustly treated,<sup>52</sup> as if the idea needed to be planted. Later he describes Dr Philip as having ‘helped to make them think they have been wronged’,<sup>53</sup> intimating that in his opinion they had not been. In response to accusations against his conduct, Smith refers to the idea of the Xhosa as ‘innocent’ or ‘injured’ as ‘absurd’.<sup>54</sup> He later also alludes to ‘grievances’ and ‘hardships’ felt by the Xhosa that were supposedly not communicated through the right channels,<sup>55</sup> but nevertheless he gives one to understand that there evidently were some. Smith often comments on the Xhosa as liable to complain of grievances, but only if encouraged,<sup>56</sup> labelling any reports of dissatisfaction ‘stories and fictions’,<sup>57</sup> used merely as

---

<sup>46</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 29 Sept 1835, 20 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Juana* 12, 30 April, 3, 4 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 35, 67, 78, 91, 100-102.

<sup>47</sup> Barclay 1811: 749.

<sup>48</sup> Jahoda 1999: 198, 199.

<sup>49</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 Jan 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>50</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 4 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>51</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 10 Jan 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>52</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>53</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 5 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>54</sup> Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library.

<sup>55</sup> Smith, *Letter to Godlonton* 16 Jan 1852 in *Godlonton Corresp.*

<sup>56</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 16 June, 26 Jan, 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>57</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

---

opportunities to exercise their ability as lawyers,<sup>58</sup> dismissing any real hardships endured. The only exception he makes is his acknowledgment of the chief's loss of cattle and wealth due to his banning of 'eating up' and 'witchcraft',<sup>59</sup> and even relates them saying how they are 'sufferers' under his new system<sup>60</sup> in need of remuneration which he planned to offer.<sup>61</sup> Any sympathy from Smith for the chief's supposed suffering, however, is generally undermined by his constant assertion of their greed and oppression of their subjects.<sup>62</sup>

Both Roman writers and Smith are similar in their tendency to undermine the validity of grievances felt by the 'other'. However, the *extent* to which their suffering is acknowledged is very different, the Romans allowing much more scope for sympathetic representation. A reason for this could be the literary nature of the Roman sources. One could argue that speeches by various leaders of the 'others' 'invented' or 'recorded'<sup>63</sup> by Caesar and Tacitus, in which reference was made to sufferings at the hands of the Romans, were part of a formula of rhetoric which required the balance of both arguments. These juxtaposed speeches were an important part of Greco-Roman historiography,<sup>64</sup> which allowed the literary scope to include a measure of sympathy with the 'other'. The sympathy portrayed in the speeches was, however, often qualified by describing them as 'exaggerations' or as intended to create discord or strife, or in some cases to highlight the vice or virtue of particular Romans. Although it could be argued that the literary technique played to the readers' expectations of the formulaic, the latter temporarily

---

<sup>58</sup> See chapter 1, footnote 167.

<sup>59</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 28 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>60</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 28 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>61</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 29 Dec 1835, 28 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>62</sup> See chapters 2.6, 2.8.1.

<sup>63</sup> It was commonplace in the tradition of histories, to invent and create speeches (Grant 1971: 12, Mellor 1993: 115, Adler 2008: 178). See also Thucydides *History of the Peloponnesian War* 1.22.

<sup>64</sup> Grant 1971: 12, Adler 2008: 178. Mellor notes the elaborate oration by Calgacus written by Tacitus as elevated to represent an opponent worthy of Agricola (Mellor 1993: 12).

---

enabled the writer to lend quite considerable weight to the sufferings of the 'other',<sup>65</sup> while allowing a degree of neutrality and detachment.<sup>66</sup> Whether qualified or formulaic, the references to the loss of liberty, land and sufferings under the Roman Empire are to an extent an acknowledgement of the effect conquest and rule had over the lives of the 'other', Tacitus especially does seem sincerely capable of portraying the 'other' in a sympathetic light.<sup>67</sup> However, the portrayal of a 'tragic' 'other',<sup>68</sup> would also lend drama and empathy to a work that sought to entertain,<sup>69</sup> and also served to emphasise his criticism of particular individuals.<sup>70</sup> It should also be taken into consideration that in the genre of history, the historian seeks to find reasons for events, such as a rebellion, and would therefore be more inclined to acknowledging or at least recording the grievances of the 'other',<sup>71</sup> but not necessarily sharing the views expressed.<sup>72</sup>

Smith, on the other hand, hardly ever mentions the grievances of the 'other' and even when he does he takes pains to deny them or to undermine their validity. Smith seems to have felt it imperative that British rule, in particular his policies, be seen as something positive, even if others at the time did lament the sufferings, loss and maltreatment of the 'other'.<sup>73</sup> As a military leader and administrator, Smith was constantly concerned with being accountable for his actions and did not seek to write great literary works. Hence he did not dwell on grand themes such as the sufferings of the 'other', the implications of imperial rule, and paradoxes involving servitude and liberty. In some Roman writings (notably by Tacitus) 'servitude' under Rome rule is

---

<sup>65</sup> Adler 2008: 179.

<sup>66</sup> Mellor 1993: 116.

<sup>67</sup> Adler 2008: 194-5.

<sup>68</sup> For example, Tacitus' tragic figure of Boudica (Adler 2008: 182). See also Grant 1971: 11, 16.

<sup>69</sup> Murphey 1949: 124. See also Chapter 2, footnote 28.

<sup>70</sup> See Chapter 2, footnote 8 and 33.

<sup>71</sup> Goodyear 1982: 649, Murphey 1949: 121-2.

<sup>72</sup> Adler 2008: 178, Mellor 1993: 108. It is important to note that while Tacitus seems sympathetic to the plight of the 'other', and had no illusions to its supposed 'benefits', he was an imperialist and believed in Rome's destiny to conquer others (Mellor 1993: 105-6, 109).

<sup>73</sup> Arndt comments on the portrayal of the Xhosa as victims by humanitarians and even some soldiers (Arndt 2010: 712).

---

contrasted with the perceived liberty and freedom outside the Roman world, particularly of northerners,<sup>74</sup> although according to Gruen Tacitus complicates and deconstructs this image.<sup>75</sup> Subjugation was not something that necessarily invited sympathy, but rather, to someone like Tacitus, offered a subject for literary irony and contrasts. Balsdon argues that various boasts of freedom are often made by the leaders of outsiders on an ideological level, whereas in reality the common people would have merely exchanged one ruler for another, essentially subjugated regardless of by whom.<sup>76</sup> Subjugation under imperial rule would have been taken for granted by someone like Smith, who also acknowledges the subjugation of the common people under Xhosa chiefs but goes further to describe it as oppressive, essentially arguing that British subjugation was preferable, whereas in reality he promoted their role as subservient labour for the Colony.<sup>77</sup>

#### 4.2.1 Severity or Cruelty of the Conqueror

Whereas subjugation and loss of freedom might have been accepted by the conqueror as part of imperialism, severe cruelty towards the conquered was largely portrayed as unacceptable. As has been discussed, Tacitus particularly comments on the ‘other’ as accepting rule so long as it was not severe, and there are many portrayals of the condemnation of the ‘other’ being maltreated by various Roman governors and administrators.<sup>78</sup> In warfare, the process of ‘conquering’ the ‘other’, those lines seem to become blurred.<sup>79</sup> Caesar records the burning of villages and crops,<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Schadee 2008: 163, 167, Adler 2008: 183, Balsdon 1979: 162-163.

<sup>75</sup> Gruen argues that Tacitus portrays *libertas* in the *Germania* as no more defining the Germans than the Romans, as although the Germans might enjoy freedom they can take it to excess or fall short of it (Gruen 2010: 169-172).

<sup>76</sup> Balsdon 1979: 164, 167. Barlow goes further to comment how the ‘ancient liberty’ portrayed in Caesar’s leaders was devalued and undermined by the vice of the individuals themselves (Barlow 1998: 152, 158).

<sup>77</sup> Smith comments a substantial amount on the ‘usefulness’ of the Xhosa to the Colony and their place in service of the British. He describes Xhosa messengers as ‘useful’ (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 Oct in *Letterbook*). The Kafir police are often described as ‘useful’ (Smith, *Letter to Grey* 23 Aug, 26 Oct 1849, 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850), *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan 1852, 2 Feb 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)). The Xhosa are also described as ‘labourers’ and ‘servants’ in the Colony (Smith, *Letter to Grey* 10 Dec 1849, 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853)) and on occasion Ganya is described as useful to himself (Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 5 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 89). Strobel comments on the exploitation of the Xhosa for labour and their incorporation into the Colony as a dependent class (Strobel 2008: 83-84). See also Chapter 3, footnote 379.

<sup>78</sup> See footnotes 27. See also Balsdon 1979: 169-171.

<sup>79</sup> See footnote 43.

<sup>80</sup> For example, Caes. *B.G.* 4.19.1.

---

the slaughter of German women and children,<sup>81</sup> and the taking of children as hostages,<sup>82</sup> and the expulsion of the Germans.<sup>83</sup> According to Plutarch, the Germans under Ariovistus slain by Caesar's army amounted to 80 000.<sup>84</sup> Tacitus describes the Romans as guilty of robbery, slaughter, plunder<sup>85</sup> and the extermination of the Bructeri.<sup>86</sup> Tacitus notes the extermination of nearly the entire tribe of the Ordovices,<sup>87</sup> the massacre and selling into slavery of thousands of Helvetii<sup>88</sup> and the devastation of German country with sword and flame.<sup>89</sup> According to Isaac, large scale expulsions and uninhibited slaughtering of the 'other' was the norm in ancient Rome.<sup>90</sup> Veyne describes the Romans as relying on a systematic application of terror in combat with the 'other', during which it was common to torch villages, and kill every living thing in their way.<sup>91</sup> Miller and Savage comment on extermination campaigns, indiscriminate killings, and enslavement of Germans by Romans carried on throughout the course of Roman Imperial rule.<sup>92</sup> By modern sentiments what is portrayed in these examples would rightfully be considered cruel, but it must be borne in mind that in Roman times, massacres and killings, for the most part, would have been considered acceptable practices of war,<sup>93</sup> which is perhaps evident in that some Romans acknowledge carrying out similar practices to those of their enemies.

Smith viewed his actions in war much the same way. He describes the burning of huts, villages and destruction of crops, as this was part of his scorched earth policy during much of his military

---

<sup>81</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 111-112.

<sup>82</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.2.5. Burns argues, however, that the taking of hostages in these contexts were common and did not involve cruel treatment (Burns 2003: 101).

<sup>83</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 3.7.1. Plutarch also mentions the expulsion of the 'other' (Plut. *Rom.* 22.2). Although Livy describes the 'other' as driven off (*propulstis*) (Liv. 7.24.5) this does not necessarily have the same meaning as expelling a group of people from an area and could denote simply have driven off the enemy from their attack.

<sup>84</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 19.6. Osgood also comments on the huge numbers of slain and enslaved during Caesar's campaigns (Osgood 2009: 332).

<sup>85</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 30.4-6

<sup>86</sup> Isaac 2004: 432.

<sup>87</sup> Tac. *Agr.* 18.4.

<sup>88</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.68.

<sup>89</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.51.

<sup>90</sup> Isaac 2004: 217.

<sup>91</sup> Veyne 1993: 358.

<sup>92</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 114, 121.

<sup>93</sup> See also footnote 4.

---

engagements,<sup>94</sup> as well as the burning of huts in order to keep the Xhosa in the areas he assigned to various tribes.<sup>95</sup> Smith notably makes many references to the expulsion of the Xhosa from various areas at different times<sup>96</sup> and to driving them away and clearing them out and dislodging them from areas.<sup>97</sup> He mentions occasionally the taking of the Xhosa as captives.<sup>98</sup> Harington writes of the use of force as well as hut-burning in an effort to keep the Xhosa people in their assigned locations<sup>99</sup> and of his harassment of the Xhosa, the taking of cattle and destruction of crops during the conflict in the 1850s.<sup>100</sup> Strobel describes British forces under Smith as destroying huts, capturing livestock, horses and shooting non-combatants including woman and children.<sup>101</sup> There are also numerous accounts of the killing and mutilation of Hintsas by men directly under Smith.<sup>102</sup> Arndt describes many wartime excesses perpetuated by the British against the Xhosa, such as the targeting of subsistence infrastructure, causing starvation, carrying out mutilations and massacres, specifically mentioning Smith's advocacy for total warfare.<sup>103</sup> As for the treatment of Xhosa under his rule, Smith was known for his fiery temper and bullying of the Xhosa people,<sup>104</sup> which was epitomised in the disgrace and illtreatment of Maqoma, when he ordered the chief to the floor and placed his foot on his neck.<sup>105</sup> Whereas Roman historians aimed to criticise the cruelty of certain individuals in their narrative, Smith was focused on himself as the centre of his own 'story', constantly defending his actions, and one can

---

<sup>94</sup> Smith, *Letters to Grey* 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). See also Lehmann 1977: 333-334, Mostert 1992: 682, 695, 705, 715, 730, 732, 735, 1129.

<sup>95</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 26 Oct, 3, 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>96</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 24 July, 11, 16, 30 Aug, 1 Sept 1835, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letters to Grey* 16 Jan 1852, 16 Feb 1852, 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852, *Letter to Shaw* 20 Feb 1852, *Memorandum* 24 March 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853). There is much written on the dispossession of the Xhosa during Smith's time (Strobel 2008: 83, Lester 1998: 223, 225).

<sup>97</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 17 March 1852, 7 April 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>98</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 17 March 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>99</sup> Harington 1980: 57, Mostert 1992: 765.

<sup>100</sup> Harington 1980: 196.

<sup>101</sup> Strobel 2008: 76.

<sup>102</sup> Strobel 2008: 76.

<sup>103</sup> Arndt 2010: 730-734.

<sup>104</sup> Peires writes of the unnecessary humiliation and demands he made of the Xhosa to 'kiss his feet' (Peires 1982: 165 – 166). Mostert writes of Smith's mercurial personality, flashing temper, swearing, shouting, crudeness and menacing behaviour which he at times exhibited towards the Xhosa (Mostert 1992: 720-22), anything but the calm persuasive example he was supposedly to set. See also Harington 1980: 99.

<sup>105</sup> Peires 1982: 165 – 166, Mostert 1992: 930, Harington 1980: 98.

---

comprehend why he would not criticise himself. Smith early on comments on a need to avoid the ‘charge’ of cruelty in actions against the Xhosa,<sup>106</sup> evidently aware of the many humanitarians, missionaries and even some administrators who considered many of his actions cruel and therefore unacceptable<sup>107</sup> (as we would today).

#### 4.3 The ‘Benefits’ of Empire

Despite the reality and occasional sympathetic portrayals of a suffering ‘other’, Roman writers overwhelmingly portrayed the ‘other’ as benefiting from their rule. Caesar describes the Aedui as having been paramount in Gaul partly due to the friendship of Rome (*Romani hospitio atque amicitia*)<sup>108</sup> and credits their success and distinction, after aiding them in their conflict with the Germans, to his own efforts.<sup>109</sup> Caesar describes the Aduatuci as benefiting from peace on surrendering to his forces.<sup>110</sup> He also alludes to the advantages (*beneficia*) brought to Gaul by Rome<sup>111</sup> and later lists land (*agros*) and wealth (*pecuniariae*) as some of the benefits that were bestowed on two Allobrogian brothers.<sup>112</sup> Cicero equates the offer of imperial rule over Gaul with great things and assumes they would be things to hope for (*spem imperi ac rerum maximarum*).<sup>113</sup> Livy lists a variety of gifts (*munera*)<sup>113</sup> sent to two Gallic princes, jewellery, silver vessels, horses, arms and garments.<sup>114</sup> Tacitus has Cerialis commenting that there were always ‘kingdoms and wars’ (*regna bellaque*)<sup>115</sup> until Gaul came under Roman law, and describing Rome as providing armies to keep the Germans and Britons out of Gaul, providing peace and

---

<sup>106</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 24 July 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>107</sup> For example, as illustrated in the accusations from Glenelg, John Fairburn, Dr Philip and C.L. Stretch who accused him of ill-treating the Xhosa (Lehmann 1977: 195, Mostert 1992: 699-702, 1096).

<sup>108</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.31.7.

<sup>109</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.54.4.

<sup>110</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 2.32.4.

<sup>111</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 7.76.2.

<sup>112</sup> Caes. *B.C.* 3.59.2-3.

<sup>113</sup> Cic. *Cat.* 3.22.

<sup>114</sup> Liv. 43.5.8-9.

<sup>115</sup> This idiosyncratic pairing is similar to one found in the *Germania* (*mutuo metu aut montibus separatur*) (Tac. *Germ.* 1.1). See also Gruen 2010: 162.

---

security (*pacem... securitate*).<sup>116</sup> And Flavius, according to Tacitus, mentions the ‘increased pay, torque, crown and other military gifts (*aucta stipendia, torquem et coronam aliaque militaria dona*) which he received from the Romans.’<sup>117</sup> Augustus writes of bringing peace to the Gauls and Germans,<sup>118</sup> although clearly the peace implied was brought about by hostile military subjugation. Augustus also writes of the Cimbri, Charydes, Semnones and other Germans as seeking the friendship of Rome,<sup>119</sup> as if it were something desirable.

Smith refers to the intentions of his government towards the Xhosa as ‘benevolent’, ‘humane’, ‘just’ and ‘liberal’,<sup>120</sup> a government that would protect and provide for the Xhosa by ‘equitable laws and just magistrates’,<sup>121</sup> with ‘future welfare and comfort’.<sup>122</sup> When Maqoma is reluctant to surrender, Smith describes him as ‘blind to his own interest’.<sup>123</sup> Smith refers to his rule of the Xhosa as a ‘benefit’<sup>124</sup> and ‘advantage’.<sup>125</sup> His and D’Urban’s measures are portrayed as looking to the welfare of the Xhosa.<sup>126</sup> He describes a meeting he held as having beneficial effects on the minds of the chiefs and Xhosa generally.<sup>127</sup> He quite often mentions the receiving of ‘presents’, ‘gifts’ and ‘trifles’,<sup>128</sup> the Xhosa frequently portrayed in a very patronising manner, like children scrambling for little trinkets. He attributed the wealth of Tyali to his own generosity<sup>129</sup> and writes of ‘enrich[ing]’ Ganya who had been ‘in a state of abject poverty’.<sup>130</sup> Rather than protection from

---

<sup>116</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.74.

<sup>117</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 2.9.

<sup>118</sup> August. *R.G.* 5.

<sup>119</sup> August. *R.G.* 5.

<sup>120</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4, 23, 30 Aug, 5, 6 Oct, 25 Nov, 17 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith *Letter to Alice* 18 June 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>121</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 18 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>122</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 30 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>123</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Aug 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>124</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 22, 27 Sept, 6, 12 Oct 1835, 14 Feb, 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p.94. See also Harington 1980: 75.

<sup>125</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 6 Mar, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>126</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>127</sup> Smith *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>128</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 4 Aug, 27 Sept, 5 Oct, 10, 17 Nov, 15 Dec 1835, 4 Jan, 21 Mar, 10, 17 Apr, 6 June 1836, 29 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 91, Smith, *Letter to Mackinnon* 5 Mar 1849, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>129</sup> Smith *Autobiography* p.100.

<sup>130</sup> Smith *Autobiography* p.101.

---

foreign attack, Smith frequently comments on the protection British law brought the Xhosa people, particularly from the rule of their chiefs,<sup>131</sup> providing them with supposedly previously unknown security of life and property.<sup>132</sup> He writes once of a chief reviving a custom supposedly involving the rape of young girls and how they ‘intended to fly to [him] for protection’.<sup>133</sup> He considered himself their ‘general protector’.<sup>134</sup> Similar to the Romans, he writes of ‘peace’ brought about by British rule.<sup>135</sup> He describes land graciously being given back to the Xhosa,<sup>136</sup> which is ironic, as it was the British who took it from them in the first place. He also describes hundreds of Xhosa rescued from starvation by being allowed to take service within the colony,<sup>137</sup> as if using them as labour was a benefit he bestowed on them.

Both Roman and British rule was often portrayed as benefitting the ‘other’ with rewards and material prosperity. Peace, protection and security were particular elements that were highlighted by both Roman writers and Smith and other British writers, as benefits that were given to an otherwise warring and vulnerable ‘other’. Cicero described Roman domination as maintained by the benefits it offered, by protecting its subjects and treating them with equity and good faith.<sup>138</sup> Some Roman writers, however, did recognise negative aspects to the ‘peace’ the Roman Empire offered:<sup>139</sup> that it brought with it a loss of belligerency, virility, freedom and was in some instances connected with effeminacy and corrupting decadence,<sup>140</sup> portrayed by writers such as

---

<sup>131</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 1 Nov, 8, 17 Dec 1835, 23 Feb, 26 Mar, 3 Apr, 10 Apr, 30 May, 6 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Autobiography* p.98. Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852, *Letter to Grey* 7 Apr 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>132</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 8 Dec 1835, 4 June, 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library. See also Harington 1980: 77.

<sup>133</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 14 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>134</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library. See also Harington 1980: 77.

<sup>135</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 6 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 94.

<sup>136</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 10, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 106.

<sup>137</sup> Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>138</sup> Veyne 1993: 360.

<sup>139</sup> O’Gorman 2000: 10.

<sup>140</sup> Veyne 1993: 343, Isaac 2004: 97, 190-192, 414, 416.

---

Caesar and most famously by Tacitus.<sup>141</sup> Tacitus was preoccupied with the discrepancy between fact and impression<sup>142</sup> and this type of situation provided ample scope for irony. However reflective these writers were, they supported imperialism, as Tacitus concedes that after centuries of conflict, Augustus brought peace and provincials were better off than they had been under the Republic,<sup>143</sup> and that ultimately the *Pax Romana* was a lesser evil than the alternative.<sup>144</sup> Mellor argues that to Tacitus peace was not a goal but a byproduct of conquest.<sup>145</sup> Smith also emphasises the peace that the British had brought to the Eastern Cape, disregarding the fact that it was conflict brought on by the presence of the British that was causing the war in the first place.

#### 4.3.1 Equal Opportunities

Beyond material rewards, presents or protection, Roman writers often refer to political opportunities being offered to the 'other'. Caesar mentions two Allobrogian brothers as being given offices of great dignity in their own communities and arrangements being made for them to be chosen for their local 'senate'.<sup>146</sup> Cicero places great value on the 'reward' of Roman citizenship (*amplissimum praemium*).<sup>147</sup> Velleius mentions Arminius as having been granted the right of Roman citizenship and equestrian rank.<sup>148</sup> Tacitus comments on the Gallic provinces as having recently received the gift of Roman citizenship.<sup>149</sup> Cerialis, in his account comments on the equality experienced by Gauls in the provinces, as they could command Roman legions, rule

---

<sup>141</sup> Caes. *B.G.* 1.1.3, 6.24.5, Tac. *Agr.* 11.5. See also Isaac 2004: 190-192, 414-416, Benario 1999: 101, O'Gorman 2000: 5. Gruen argues, however, that Caesar portrays the corruption as a fault as much as that of the Celts as the Romans (Gruen 2010: 150).

<sup>142</sup> O'Gorman 2000: 5, Grant 1971: 18.

<sup>143</sup> Mellor 1993: 24. See Tac. *Ann.* 1.2.

<sup>144</sup> Benario: 2005: 293.

<sup>145</sup> Mellor 1993: 105.

<sup>146</sup> Caes. *B.C.* 3.59.2

<sup>147</sup> Cic. *Balb.* 18.

<sup>148</sup> Vell. 2.118.2.

<sup>149</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.8.

---

their provinces and would suffer no exclusion from Rome.<sup>150</sup> Tacitus has Segestes refer to his being made a Roman citizen,<sup>151</sup> and describes the leading citizens of Lugdunum and Vienna as having obtained federate rights and Roman citizenship.<sup>152</sup> A speech by Claudius, reported by Tacitus, argues in favour of the admission of Gallic nobles to the senate,<sup>153</sup> so long as they behave peacefully and ascribe to a Roman way of life.<sup>154</sup> This is how Tacitus accounts for the fact that the Aedui became the first Gauls to acquire senatorial rights in Rome.<sup>155</sup>

Smith writes at great length on the equal rights supposedly offered to the Xhosa. He frequently claims that the Xhosa were received as 'British subjects',<sup>156</sup> and that they would therefore be entitled to the rights and privileges of 'British subjects'.<sup>157</sup> He also vaguely alludes to himself as treating them as such,<sup>158</sup> 'without the slightest partiality or favouritism'.<sup>159</sup> He writes of equality under British law,<sup>160</sup> in one instance attempting to demonstrate this by scolding and court martialling British officers for killing a suspected Xhosa marauder.<sup>161</sup> This stress on the status of a 'British subject' seems to have been linked with the lack of distinction between black and white, rich and poor under British law,<sup>162</sup> rather than with offering political rights or positions, although he gave the chiefs minor positions such as Magistrates and Field Cornets in their communities.<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 4.74.

<sup>151</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.58.

<sup>152</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.23.

<sup>153</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.24. A fragment of Claudius' original speech exists (Isaac 2004: 418).

<sup>154</sup> Isaac 2004: 419.

<sup>155</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.25

<sup>156</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 5 Oct, 6 Oct, 26 Oct, 1 Nov, 10 Nov, 17 Nov, 22 Nov, 25 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D'Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Godonton* 15 Dec 1850 in *Godonton Corresp.*

<sup>157</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 28 Sept 1835, 3 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>158</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 7 Feb, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>159</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>160</sup> See footnote 131.

<sup>161</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 10 Nov, 22 Nov, 29 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.. See also Harington 1980: 53, Lehmannn 1977: 193.

<sup>162</sup> Harington 1980: 60.

<sup>163</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 10 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*, Smith, *Address to Caffer Chiefs* 7 Jan 1836 in *Autobiography*.

---

Both Roman writers and Smith describe the ‘other’ as receiving the status of Roman citizens and British subjects respectively and make reference to equal rights and opportunities. These were portrayed as benefits of being ruled by imperial governments. However, the extent to which these representations reflect the actual situations in the Roman and British colonies under discussion, is where these two situations differ substantially.<sup>164</sup> When the Roman Empire awarded or granted Roman citizenship and the franchise to foreigners, they effectively gave them full civic privileges, regardless of appearance, demeanour or history.<sup>165</sup> The incentives of political power and citizenship were a reality in ancient Rome for those with Roman citizenship.<sup>166</sup> From the late third century ‘barbarians’ of all ethnic groups, including Germans, filtered into the Empire through imperial service ascending even as high as imperial office.<sup>167</sup> Veyne comments on the Roman policies towards the ‘other’ as involving either annihilation or, in calculation of their interest in enlarging their own collectivity, absorbing the vanquished.<sup>168</sup> Unlike the British Empire, Rome was seen, particularly after AD 212 when Roman citizenship was extended to all free men of the empire, as a centralised state and provinces as integral parts of an Empire, instead of a colonial hegemony with a centralised state and outside possessions.<sup>169</sup> Although the Xhosa were declared ‘British subjects’,<sup>170</sup> they did not share in its full benefits<sup>171</sup> and never shared equal economic opportunities or political rights with their colonial

---

<sup>164</sup> The uniqueness of the Roman situation is emphasized by Sardar et al (1993: 30).

<sup>165</sup> Gruen 2006: 464- 465, 475, Veyne 1993: 363, 367.

<sup>166</sup> Woolf 1998: 60 – 67, Haverfield 1915: 16.

<sup>167</sup> Miller and Savage 1977: 118, Veyne 1993: 367. Isaac notes the records, after the date of Claudius’ speech, that show hardly any senators from Gallia Comata (Isaac 2004: 419), but I would argue that ‘hardly any’ is decidedly more than the none that the British government would have allowed.

<sup>168</sup> Veyne 1993: 354.

<sup>169</sup> Veyne 1993: 363-4.

<sup>170</sup> In 1835, the treaties that D’Urban signed with the chiefs of the Province of Queen Adelaide declared various groups of Xhosa ‘British Subjects’, although these treaties were not ratified for quite a while, despite Smith’s use of the term (Harington 1980: 60). Glenelg later rejected the treaties on the grounds that aliens were only naturalized by an act of the King (Lehmann 1977: 202, Mostert 1992: 749). The Xhosa of British Kaffraria were again made ‘British subjects’ on Smith’s return in 1848 (Mostert 1992: 943, 962).

<sup>171</sup> According to Mostert, the Xhosa, as ‘British subjects’, were still not allowed to move or settle freely (Mostert 1992: 750). The emphasis and function of making them ‘British subjects’ seems to have been to bring them under full British authority and law (Mostert 1992: 750, 943), rather than offering them rewards or benefits.

---

counterparts.<sup>172</sup> The idea of foreigners ever rising to the level of high political office in the British Empire was never entertained by the British government. According to Tacitus, Rome's imperial success came from translating its former enemies into new citizens,<sup>173</sup> something the British Empire seemed not to have emulated. It could be argued, though, that Roman inclusivity was not always the case – for example in the early principate tribal chieftains in outer or further Gaul had no access to the governing class of Rome<sup>174</sup> – and that the differences between the Roman and British Empires lie in the scope and time for which each empire existed. However, the trend of the Roman Empire was towards increasing inclusivity, whereas the British Empire, regardless of the earlier discourse of inclusivity, became more exclusive as time progressed.

#### 4.3.2. The 'Other' as Grateful and Content

Among Roman writers Tacitus alone portrays the 'other' as 'grateful' (*gratibus*) to the Roman Emperor.<sup>175</sup> Smith on the other hand makes a special effort to portray the 'other' as grateful, content and happy with life under British rule. Smith describes Xhosa chiefs as 'grateful' for their allocations of land, appointments as field cornets and other so called benefits.<sup>176</sup> He also describes the Xhosa people as 'thankful' to him,<sup>177</sup> in particular for protecting them from the supposed abuse by their chiefs.<sup>178</sup> A thief is thankful and grateful for his interference<sup>179</sup> and in another instance a prisoner whom he released is described as 'grateful' and 'thankful' to Smith for sparing his life.<sup>180</sup> A chief is described as feeling gratitude and thanking Smith for his 'life'

---

<sup>172</sup> On the extent to which the Xhosa were actually afforded equal opportunities in reality rather than rhetoric, see Peires 1989: 45-73, Mostert 1992: 750. Similarly, see previous footnote 77 on the use of the Xhosa people as labour rather than incorporation as equal subjects of the Crown. According to van Aswegen, who discusses the various land, social and political rights of the Xhosa, non-white population groups in the Cape Colony were largely subordinate groups by 1854 (van Aswegen 1993: 201-213).

<sup>173</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 11.23-5. See also Gruen 2006: 472.

<sup>174</sup> Syme 1970: 24.

<sup>175</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 12.37.

<sup>176</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 22 Sept, 5 Oct 1835, 19 Jan, 4, 23 Feb, 5, 12 Apr, 1 May 1836, 29 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>177</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 1 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>178</sup> Smith, *Letters to D'Urban* 14 Feb 1836, 1 Aug 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>179</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>180</sup> Smith, *Letter to D'Urban* 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

---

and ‘liberty’.<sup>181</sup> Smith describes the chiefs as grateful and acknowledging the ‘justness’ and ‘clemency’ shown by Smith to three Xhosa men tried for murder of two of their own.<sup>182</sup> Chiefs were highly pleased with what was offered them,<sup>183</sup> and ‘satisfied’ with the new order of things<sup>184</sup> particularly their reallocations of land.<sup>185</sup> The people are also portrayed as satisfied at their treatment and his administration of justice.<sup>186</sup> He writes of how the Xhosa were ‘contented and happy under the British rule’,<sup>187</sup> frequently portraying the Xhosa under his rule in the Province of Queen Adelaide as ‘happy’, if not exceedingly so.<sup>188</sup> He describes the Xhosa people generally as delighted,<sup>189</sup> and the chiefs as also ‘delighted’ with their situation and treatment.<sup>190</sup> He writes of the chiefs as delighted at the prospect of schools.<sup>191</sup> He even describes the ‘joy’ of chiefs outside the province at supposed declarations of the bringing of ‘peace’,<sup>192</sup> and the common people as ‘overjoyed’ at being protected from the oppression of the chiefs.<sup>193</sup> Smith even went so far as to genuinely believe the Xhosa people had a love, devotion and affection for him personally,<sup>194</sup> which was not true.<sup>195</sup> Smith’s need to portray the ‘other’ as grateful, content and essentially desiring British rule<sup>196</sup> speaks to his constant drive to motivate and justify his policy of direct rule and to reassure his superiors that there was no prospect of an outbreak of

---

<sup>181</sup> Smith, *Autobiography* p. 37.

<sup>182</sup> Smith, *Letter to Grey* 7 Jan 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850).

<sup>183</sup> Smith *Letter to D’Urban* 29 Sept 1835, reiterated in *Letter to D’Urban* 17 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>184</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 25 Mar 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>185</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 27 Sept 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>186</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 29 Nov 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>187</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 15, 23 Feb, 26, 29 Mar, 1 May, 6 June 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to Lord Glenelg* 15 Dec 1837 [MS 501] Cory Library, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 23 Apr 1850 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

<sup>188</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 12 Oct 1835, 15, 21, 23, 28 Feb, 1, 6, 26, 29 Mar 3, 5, 12 Apr, 5 May, 4, 6 June, 21 July, 1 Aug 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, H., *Letter to Lord Glenelg* 15 Dec 1837 [MS 501] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 98.

<sup>189</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 24 Mar 1836, 17 Apr 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>190</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 28 Nov, 12 Dec 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>191</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 5 Oct 1835 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>192</sup> Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 9 Feb 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>193</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 28 Dec 1835, 23 Feb, 26 Mar, 30 May 1836 in *Letterbook*.

<sup>194</sup> Smith, *Letter to Juana* 7 May 1835 in *Autobiography*, Smith, *Letter to D’Urban* 12 Apr, 4 June 1836 in *Letterbook*. See also Harington 1980: 65, 74, Lehmann 1977: 192.

<sup>195</sup> Harington states that in reality the Xhosa disliked and feared him (Harington 1980: 105).

<sup>196</sup> Smith, *Letters to D’Urban* 28 Jan, 12, 21, 28 Feb, 1, 21, 26, 29 Mar, 10 Apr, 4, 6 June, 18, 19, 28 July 1836 in *Letterbook*, Smith, H., *Letter to D’Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library, Smith, *Autobiography* p. 87, 89-92, 94-95, Smith, *Letter to Grey* 15 Mar 1849 in *Correspondence* (1850), Smith, *Reply to Chiefs* 15 Jan 1852 in *Correspondence* (1853).

---

war. When war did break out he describes the Xhosa as ‘ungrateful’,<sup>197</sup> as he was bitterly disappointed and bewildered that they had rejected all he had supposedly done for them.<sup>198</sup> Although it is evident that the Xhosa in reality were not content and grateful subjects,<sup>199</sup> it is difficult to discern whether this representation was a result of Smith’s hubris and delusion or an indication of a concerted effort on the part of the Xhosa to mislead the British,<sup>200</sup> either to gain more concessions<sup>201</sup> or possibly to enhance the effect of any surprise attack on the Colony, which, considering the besieging of Smith at Fort Cox,<sup>202</sup> was successful.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

Despite the ‘other’ suffering cruelty and loss at the hands of their conquerors, Roman sources reveal and acknowledge this to much more of an extent than Smith does. This, however, is largely a result of the motives, agendas and literary scope of those Roman writers who provide us with these sources. Many of Smith’s contemporaries both acknowledge the sufferings of the ‘other’, to an even greater extent than Romans did, and even worked actively to alleviate their situation. Where supposed benefits are concerned, it would seem that the representation of the ‘other’ as gaining from imperial rule is very similar in both Roman sources and Smith’s writings. However, despite the rhetoric, it seems that whereas those of the ‘other’ that became Roman citizens were given economic and political rights, the Xhosa were not given those rights under British rule. The portrayal of the ‘other’ as benefiting from conquest served again to justify domination and interference.

---

<sup>197</sup> Smith, *Letter to Alice* 18 Jun 1851 in *Autobiography*.

<sup>198</sup> Harington 1980: 181.

<sup>199</sup> No sooner had he handed over his command of the province in 1836, than the chiefs were demanding their land back and to be allowed to practice the customs which Smith had attempted to outlaw (Mostert 1992: 791). Scholars have noted the general resentment of the chiefs at their loss of power and privilege (Harington 1980: 58, 174, Davenport 1991: 120).

<sup>200</sup> Considering the fact that not only Smith, but Mackinnon and Brownlee were convinced the Xhosa were happy (Mostert 1992: 1001), I am inclined to believe this may have partly been the case.

<sup>201</sup> See chapter 1, footnote 464.

<sup>202</sup> Harington 1980: 183.

---

## CONCLUSION

*'Through the Thou a person becomes I' – Martin Buber: Ich und Du (1923)*

---

Many similar representations and negative stereotypes of the 'other' emerge in this thesis. Out of the first chapter one is left with the image of a disunified, disordered, potentially capable and threatening, yet defeated enemy. The second chapter brings forth the image of a reckless, lazy, greedy, treacherous, inconstant, violent and immoral 'other'. It is also not surprising then that this strange, wild and generically barbaric 'other' of the third chapter would be portrayed as benefiting from Imperial rule, the impression that is left from the last chapter.

These overall impressions encourage us ask why these continuous or similar images would have recurred or continued. While I have argued that Smith and his contemporaries were exposed to ancient texts and ideas that were rediscovered and studied with much enthusiasm after the Renaissance, there is also something to be said for the continuity and persistence of images over time.<sup>1</sup> Theories exist of a collective 'consciousness' or 'memory' through which continuous currents of thought are maintained and perpetuated by a social group.<sup>2</sup> Jahoda argues the image of the generic 'savage' has over the centuries and millennia served to establish and enhance western identity, later underpinning and justifying colonialism.<sup>3</sup>

However, despite similar stereotypes of the 'other' as incapable, immoral or subhuman, it is evident that these images were perpetuated by authors, Roman or British, only when it suited

---

<sup>1</sup> Jahoda 1999: 230.

<sup>2</sup> Jahoda 1999: 239. Jahoda also argues that oral tradition and communication played a role in perpetuating certain myths and lore of the 'other', before the Renaissance (Jahoda 1999: 240).

<sup>3</sup> Jahoda 1999: 239.

---

their agenda. Often when their own experiences or agenda conflicted with such images the reverse was portrayed, the 'other' appearing simultaneously 'weak' and 'strong', 'good' and 'bad', and 'remote' and 'familiar' in varying degrees of barbarity. Many of the ways in which the 'other' is described are even mirrored by the way writers describe themselves and, in some cases, their own actions and behaviours.

While one can easily identify examples of 'othering',<sup>4</sup> as much of this thesis suggests, some scholars have begun to question this idea. Gruen argues that ancient views and representations were mixed, nuanced and complex, and while not above prejudice, Romans could visualise themselves as part of a broader cultural heritage, inventing and discovering links with the 'other'.<sup>5</sup> Lester argues that the representation of the 'other' in the Cape Colony was not a simple, single totalizing narrative of African 'otherness', but a conglomeration of competing discourses.<sup>6</sup> One cannot deny that the stereotypes and prejudice existed, but, as this thesis shows, individual representations are riddled with inconsistencies, ironies and hypocrisies. I would argue that this is perhaps less indicative of open-minded societies or writers, as Gruen would suggest, than of the circumstances, contexts and agendas out of which the sources arise.

Notwithstanding the inconsistencies, the image of 'barbarity' in relation to a 'civilised' Empire was a strong and persistent one, and central to western identity, both Roman and British. Despite fundamental religious differences and implications, both imperial societies evidently viewed themselves divinely destined to rule over the 'other' and write of 'civilising' the 'other'.

However, in spite of the similar discourse of civilisation and the benefits of Empire, the reality of

---

<sup>4</sup> Gruen 2010: 3.

<sup>5</sup> Gruen 2010: 3-4.

<sup>6</sup> Lester 1998: 2-3.

---

the situation in these two areas of the Roman and British Empire was vastly different. Where the Roman Empire enabled the 'other' to be incorporated within its own society as equals, the British Empire sought to impose a colonial hegemony over a perpetually marginalised 'other'. Racism and missionary teachings on humility and industriousness served to further justify this treatment of the 'other' in a colonial context, such concepts that were entirely alien in the pre-Christian Roman Empire.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> It is commonly accepted that there was no distinction made of the 'other' along racial lines (Veyne 1993: 367).

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### Primary Sources – Roman

\*\*The initial lists of references under each author are for the works cited, while the subsequent Loeb references for each are for the translation used.

#### **Augustus**

*Res Gestae*: Malcovati, E. (ed.), *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta* (Turin: Paravia, 1962)

Shipley, F.W. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (eds.), *Compendium of Roman History: Res Gestae Divi Augusti/ Velleius Paterculus*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1924)

#### **Caesar**

*Bellum Gallicum*: Seel, O. (ed.), *C. Iulii Caesaris: Commentarii Rerum Gestarum*. Vol. 1 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1961).

*Bellum Civile*: Klotz, A. (ed.), *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii*. Vol. 2 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1950).

Edwards, H.J. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Caesar: The Gallic War*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1946).

Pleskett, A.G. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Caesar: The Civil Wars*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1951).

#### **Catullus**

*Carmina*: Goold, G.P. (ed.), *Catullus* (London: Duckworth, 1983).

Cornish, F.W. (tr.) & Goold, G.P. (ed.), *Catullus*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1988).

#### **Cicero**

*Cato Maior de Senectute*: Simbeck, K. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*. Fasc. 47 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1917).

*De Divinatione*: Mueller, C.F.W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*. Part 4, Vol. 2 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1890).

*De Domo Sua*: Peterson, W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

*De Haruspicum Responso*: Peterson, W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

*De Inventione*: Stroebel, E. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*. Fasc. 2 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1915).

*De Legibus*: de Plinval, G. (ed.), *Cicéron: Traité des Lois* (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1968).

*De Officiis*: Atzert, C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*. Fasc. 48 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1932).

*De Oratore*: Wilkins, A.S. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica*. Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford

- 
- University Press, 1902).
- De Partitione Oratoria*: Rackham, H. (ed.), *Cicero in Twenty-Eight Volumes*. Vol. 4 (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1942).
- De Provinciis Consularibus*: Peterson, W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- De Republica*: Mueller, C.F.W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*. Part 4, Vol. 2 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1890).
- Epistulae ad Atticum*: Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. 6 vols. (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1965–1968).
- Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem*: Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem et M. Brutum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- In Catilinam*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).
- In Verrem*: Peterson, W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1917).
- Philippicae*: Clarke, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918).
- Post Reditum ad Populum*: Peterson, W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- Pro Archia*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 6 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- Pro Balbo*: Peterson, W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- Pro Caelio*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).
- Pro Flacco*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909).
- Pro Fonteio*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 6 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- Pro Ligario*: Clarke, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918).
- Pro Plancio*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 6 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- Pro S. Roscio Amerino*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).
- Pro Sestio*: Peterson, W. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- Pro Sulla*: Clark, A.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. Vol. 6 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).
- Tusculanae Disputationes*: Pohlenz, M. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*. Fasc. 44 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1918).
- Armistead Falconer, W. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: De Senectute, De Amicitia, De Divinatione*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1946).
- Freese, J.H. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (ed.), *Cicero, The Speeches: Pro Publio Quinctio, Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino, Pro Quinto Roscio Comoedo, De Lege Agraria I, II, III*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1930).
- Gardner, R. (tr.) & Warmington, E.H. (ed.), *Cicero in Twenty-eight Volumes: Pro Caelio, De Provinciis Consularibus, Pro Balbo*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1970).

- 
- Gardner, R. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero, The Speeches: Pro Sestio and In Vatinius*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1958).
- Glynn Williams, W. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: The Letters to his Friends III* Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1929).
- Greenwood, L.H.G. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: The Verrine Orations 2 Volumes*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1928, 1935).
- Hubbell, H.M. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1949).
- King, J.E. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (ed.), *Cicero: Tusculan Disputations*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1927).
- MacDonald, C. (tr.) & Goold, G.P. (ed.), *Cicero in Twenty-eight Volumes: In Catilinam I-IV, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1977).
- Miller, W. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: De Officiis*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1938).
- Rackman, H. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: De Oratore III, De Fato, Paradoxa Stoicorum, De Partitione Oratoria*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1942).
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (tr.) & Henderson, J. (ed.), *Cicero: Philippics 2 Volumes*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
- Sutton, E.W. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: De Oratore I, II*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1942).
- Walker Keyes, C. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: De Re Publica, De Legibus*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1948).
- Watts, N.H. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero, The Speeches: Pro Archia Poeta, Post Reditum in Senatu, Post Reditum ad Quirites, De Domo Sua, De Haruspicum Responsis, Pro Plancio*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1935).
- Watts, N.H. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (ed.), *Cicero, The Speeches: Pro T. Annio Milone, In L. Calpurnium Pisonem, Pro M. Aemilio Scauro, Pro M. Fonteio, Pro C. Rabirio Postumo, Pro M. Marcello, Pro Q. Ligario, Pro Rege Delotaro*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1953).
- Winstedt, E.O. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (eds.), *Cicero: Letters to Atticus 3 Volumes*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1920, 1925, 1928).

### **Frontinus**

*Strategemata*: Bendz, G. (ed.), *Frontin Kriegslisten* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963).

Bennett, C.E. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (ed.), *Frontinus: The Strategems and The Aqueducts of Rome*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1925).

### **Horace**

*Carmina*: Klingner, F. (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1959).

*Epodi*: Klingner, F. (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1959).

Bennett, C.E. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (ed.), *Horace: The Odes and Epodes*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1946).

---

## Livy

- Ab Urbe Condita*: Conway, R.S. & Walter, F. (eds.), Bks. 1–5: *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita*. Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).  
Conway, R.S. & Walter, F. (eds.), Bks. 6–10, 21–25: *Ibid.* Vols. 2–3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919–1950).  
Conway, R.S. & Johnson, S.K. (eds.), Bks. 26–30: *Ibid.* Vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953)  
McDonald, A.H. (ed.), Bks. 31–35: *Ibid.* Vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)  
Weissenborn, W. & Mueller, M. (eds.), Bks. 36–40: *Ibid.* Part 3, (Leipzig: Teubner, n.d.)  
Weissenborn, W. & Heraeus, W. (eds.), Bks. 41–45: *Ibid.* Part 4 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1908).
- Foster, B.O. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Livy i-xxii* Vol 1-5, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1919-1929).  
Gardner Moore, F. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al (eds.) *Livy xxiii-xxx* Vol 6-8, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1940, 1950, 1949).  
Sage, E.T. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Livy xxxi-xxxix* Vol 9-11, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1936, 1949, 1936)  
Sage, E.T., Schlesinger, A.C. (trs.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Livy xl-xlii* Vol 12, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1964)  
Schlesinger, A.C. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Livy xliii-xlv* Vol 13, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1951).

## Plautus

- Bacchides*: Leo, F. (ed.), *Plauti Comoediae*. Vol. 1 (Berlin, 1895).  
*Curculio*: Leo, F. (ed.), *Plauti Comoediae*. Vol. 1 (Berlin, 1895).  
*Mostellaria*: Leo, F. (ed.), *Plauti Comoediae*. Vol. 2 (Berlin, 1896).
- De Melo, W. (tr.) & Henderson, J. (ed.), *Plautus* Vol 1-3, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2011).

## Pliny the Elder

- Naturalis Historia*: Mayhoff, C. (ed.), *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVII*. Vols. 1–5 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1892–1909).
- Rackham, H. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Pliny: Natural History iii-vii* Vol 2, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1947).

## Pliny the Younger

- Epistulae (C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum Libri Decem)*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, 1966).
- Radice, B. (tr.) & Warmington, E.H. (ed.), *Pliny: Letters viii-x*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1969).

## Plutarch

- Perrin, B. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (ed.), *Plutarch's Lives* Vol 1-3, 5, 7, 9-10, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1914, 1916, 1955, 1928, 1920, 1949)

---

## **Polybius**

Paton, W.R. et al. (trs.) & Henderson, J. (ed.), *Polybius: The Histories* 6 Vol, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010-2012).

## **Propertius**

*Elegiae*: Goold, G.P. (ed.), *Propertius: Elegies* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1990)

Butler, H.E. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (eds.), *Propertius*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1916).

## **Quintilian**

*Institutio Oratoria*: Winterbottom, M. (ed.), *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Libri Duodecim*. Vols. 1–2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

Butler, H.E. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (eds.), *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian* Vol 1, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1921).

## **Sallust**

*Ad Caesarem de Re Publ.*: Kurfess, A. (ed.), *Appendix Sallustiana*. Fasc. 1 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1970).

*Catilinae Coniuratio*: Kurfess, A. (ed.), *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Fragmenta Ampliora* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1957).

*Bellum Iugurthinum*: Kurfess, A. (ed.), *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Fragmenta Ampliora* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1957).

Rolfe, J.C. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Sallust*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1931).

## **Strabo**

Leonard Jones, H. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (eds.), *The Geography of Strabo* 8 Vol, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1917, 1923, 1924, 1954, 1944, 1950, 1954, 1949)

## **Suetonius**

*De Vita Caesarum*: Ihm, M. (ed.), *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Opera*. Vol. 1 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1908).

Rolfe, J.C. (tr.) & Goold, G.P. (ed.), *Suetonius* Vol 1, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1998).

Rolfe, J.C. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Suetonius* Vol 1, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1914).

## **Tacitus**

*Annales*: Fisher, C.D. (ed.), *Cornelii Taciti Annalium Ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906).

*De Vita Iulii Agricolae*: Anderson, J.G.C. (ed.), *Cornelii Taciti Opera Minora*

---

(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939).  
*De Origine et Situ Germanorum*: Anderson, J.G.C. (ed.), *Cornelii Taciti Opera Minora* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939).  
*Historiae*: Fisher, C.D. (ed.), *Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Libri* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

Hutton, M. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (eds.), *Tacitus: Agricola and Germania*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1925).  
Moore, C.H. & Jackson J. (trs.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Tacitus: The Histories, The Annals* 4 Vol, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1956).

### **Valerius Maximus**

*Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*: Kempf, C. (ed.), *Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem cum Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani Epitomis* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888).

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (tr.) & Henderson, J. (ed.), *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings* 2 Vol, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2000)

### **Velleius**

*Historia Romana*: Hellegouarc'h, J. (ed.), *Velleius Paterculus: Histoire Romaine*. Vols. 1–2 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1982).

Shipley, F.W. (tr.) & Capps, E. et al. (eds.), *Velleius Paterculus: Compendium of Roman History*, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1924)

### **Vergil**

*Eclogae*: Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

*Aeneis*: Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

Rushton Fairclough, H. (tr.) & Goold, G.P. (rev. tr. & ed.), *Virgil: Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid i-vi*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1999)

Rushton Fairclough, H. (tr.), Goold, G.P. (rev. tr.) & Henderson, J. (ed.), *Virgil: Aeneid vii-xii*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2000)

### **Vitruvius**

*De Architectura*: Krohn, F. (ed.), *Vitruvii de Architectura* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912).

Granger, F. (tr.) & Page, T.E. et al. (eds.), *Vitruvius: On Architecture* 2 Vol, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1931, 1934)

---

Primary Sources – British

Smith, Sir H., *The Godlonton Correspondence: Letters to the Hon. R. Godlonton, 10.2.1837 – 19.1.1859* [A 47] The Western Cape Archives and Records Services

Smith, Col. H.G.W., *Letterbook, Eastern frontier, 1835-1836* [GH 34/7 - 8] The Western Cape Archives and Records Services

Smith, H., *Letter to D'Urban* 20 Oct 1836 [MS 482] Cory Library

Smith, H., *Letter to Sir G. Napier* 28 Jan 1838 [MS 488] Cory Library

Smith, H., *Letter to Lord Glenelg* 15 Dec 1837 [MS 501] Cory Library

Smith, H., *Letter to [Addressee unknown]* 7 May 1835 [MS 511] Cory Library

Smith, H., *Report on Frontier Conditions* 27 Oct 1850 [MS 611] Cory Library

Smith, H., *Letter to the Duke of Wellington* 19 Dec 1851 [MS 617] Cory Library

Smith, H., *Letter to Lord Palmerston* 1 Sept 1857 [MS 694] Cory Library

Le Cordeur, B., Saunders, C., *The War of the Axe, 1847: Correspondence between the governor of the Cape Colony, Sir Henry Pottinger, and the Commander of the British forces at the Cape, Sir George Berkeley, and others* (Houghton: Brenthurst Press, 1981) Cory Library

Moore Smith, G.C. (ed.), *The Autobiography of Lieutenant-General Sir Harry Smith* (London: John Murray, 1901) Albany Museum

Theal, G.M., *Records of the Cape Colony: from May 1818 to January 1820, copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London, Vol. 12* (London: William Clowes and Sons, 1902) Albany Museum

Correspondence with the Governor of the Cape Of Good Hope Relative to the State of the Kafir Tribes on the Eastern Frontier of the Colony, Cape of Good Hope, Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty 14 Aug 1850 (London: William Clowes and Sons, 1850) Cory Library

Correspondence: Government of the Cape of Good Hope Relative to the State of the Kafir Tribes and the Recent Outbreak on the Eastern Frontier of the Colony, Cape of Good Hope, Presented to both houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty May 31 1853 (London: Georbe Edward Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1853) Cory Library

*Correspondence of Lieut.-General the Hon. Sir George Cathcart, K.C.B., Relative to his Military Operations in Kaffraria* (London: John Murray, 1856) Cory Library

---

Secondary Sources

- Adcock, F.E., *Caesar: As Man of Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956)
- Adler, E., 'Boudica's Speeches in Tacitus and Dio', in *The Classical World* Vol. 101, No. 2 (2008) p. 173-195
- Allen-Hornblower, E., 'Beasts and Barbarians in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* 6.21-8', in *The Classical Quarterly* Vol. 64, Issue 02 (2014) p. 682-693
- Archer, R.L., *Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921)
- Arndt, J.S. 'Treacherous Savages and Merciless Barbarians: Knowledge, Discourse and Violence during the Cape Frontier Wars, 1834 – 1853' in *The Journal of Military History* 74 (2010): p. 709-735
- Asad, T. (ed.), *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (London: Ithaca Press, 1973)
- Ayto, J., *Oxford School Dictionary of Word Origins* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D., *Julius Caesar and Rome* (London: The English Universities Press, 1967)
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D., *Romans and Aliens* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co, 1979)
- Bank, A. 'Of 'Native Skulls' and 'Noble Caucasians': Phrenology in Colonial South Africa' in *Journal of South African Studies* Vol. 22 No. 3 (1996) p. 387-403
- Barclay, J. *The London Edition of Barclay's Universal English Dictionary* (London: R. Edwards, 1811)
- Barlow, J., 'Noble Gauls and their Other in Caesar's Propaganda', in Welch, K. and Powell, A., *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments* (London: Duckworth, 1998)
- Benario, H.W., *Tacitus: Germany* (Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips Ltd, 1999)
- Benario, H.W., 'Recent Work on Tacitus: 1994 – 2003', in *The Classical World* Vol. 98, No.3 Special Survey Issue (2005) p. 251-336
- Berndt, C.H. and Berndt, R.M., *The Barbarians: An Anthropological View* (London: C.A. Watts, 1971)
- Bickford-Smith, V., 'Revisiting Anglicisation in the nineteenth-century Cape Colony', in *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 31.2 (2003) p. 82-95

- 
- Birley, A.R. 'The Life and Death of Cornelius Tacitus', in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 49.2 (2000) p. 230-247.
- Biskup, T., 'The Enlightenment', in Griffin, M. (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2009)
- Bowder, D. (ed.), *Who was who in the Roman World 753BC – AD 476* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1980)
- Brunt, P.A., 'Reflections on British and Roman Imperialism', in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol.7 No.3 (1965) p. 267-288
- Burn, A.R., 'Tacitus in Britain', in Dorey, T.A. (ed.), *Tacitus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969)
- Burns, T.S., *Rome and the Barbarians: 100 BC – AD 400* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press: 2003)
- Cartledge, P., *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)
- Clarke, K., 'An Island Nation: Re-Reading Tacitus' "Agricola"', in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 91 (2001) p. 94-112
- Classen, C.J., 'Tacitus: Historian between Republic and Principate', in *Mnemosyne* 4<sup>th</sup> Series, Vol. 41, Fasc.1/2 (1988) p. 93-116
- Clifford, J. and Marcus, G.E. (eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (California: University of California Press, 1986)
- Cohen, B. (ed.), *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art* (Leiden: Brill, 2000)
- Coleman, J.E. and Walz, C.A., *Greeks and Barbarians: Essays on the Interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism* (Bethesda: CDL Press, 1997)
- Crais, C.C., *The Making of the Colonial Order: White Supremacy and Black Resistance in the Eastern Cape, 1770-1865* (Johannesburg: Witwaterstrand University Press, 2001)
- Curtis, S.J. and Boulton, M.E.A., *An Introductory History of English Education since 1800* (London: University Tutorial Press, 1966)
- Davenport, T.R.H., *South Africa: A Modern History: Fourth Edition* (London: Macmillan, 1991)
- Davies, M.W. et al, *Barbaric Others: A Manifesto on Western Racism* (London: Pluto Press, 1993)

- 
- DeWitt, N.J., 'The Non-Political Nature of Caesar's Commentaries', in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* Vol. 73 (1942) p. 341-352
- Dorey, T.A., 'Agricola and *Germania*', in Dorey, T.A. (ed.), *Tacitus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969)
- Fothergill, A., 'Of Conrad, Cannibals and Kin', in Gidley, M. (ed.), *Representing Others: White Views of Indigenous Peoples* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1992)
- Freeman, P., 'British Imperialism and the Roman Empire' in Webster, J. and Cooper, N. (eds.), *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives* (Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996) p. 19-34
- Fuller, J.F.C., *Julius Caesar: Man, Soldier, and Tyrant* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1965)
- Furneaux, H., *Cornelii Taciti: De Vita Agricolae* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922)
- Galbraith, J.S., *Reluctant Empire: British Policy on the South African Frontier 1834 – 1854* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963)
- Gardner, J.F., 'Introduction' in Radice, B. (ed.), *Caesar: The Conquest of Gaul* Revised Edition (London: Penguin Group, 1982)
- Gardner, J.F., 'Introduction' in Radice, B. (ed.), *Caesar: The Civil War* (London: Penguin Group, 1967)
- Gidley, M., *Representing Others: White Views of Indigenous Peoples* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1992)
- Goodman, M., *The Roman World: 44BC – AD 180* (New York: Routledge, 1997)
- Goodyear, F.R.D., 'History and Biography', in Kenney, E.J. and Clausen, W.V. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: II Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- Grant, M., *Tacitus: The Annals of Imperial Rome* (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1971)
- Gruen, E.S., 'Romans and Others', in Rosenstein, N. and Morstein-Marx, R. (eds.), *A Companion to the Roman Republic* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006)
- Gruen, E.S. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010)
- Hall, E., *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)
- Hall, J.M., *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1997)

- 
- Hannaford, I., *Race, The History of an Idea in the West* (Washington: The Woodrow Wilson Centre Press, 1996)
- Harington, A.L., *Sir Harry Smith: Bungling Hero* (Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers, 1980)
- Harrison, T. (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (New York: Routledge, 2002)
- Harrison, T., 'Ancient and Modern Imperialism', in *Greece and Rome* Vol. 55 No.1 (2008) p.1-22
- Hartog, F., *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History* (California: University of California Press, 1988)
- Haverfield, F., *The Romanization of Roman Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915)
- Hertz, F.O., *Race and Civilisation* (Jersey City: Ktav Publishing House, 1928)
- Hingley, R., 'The 'legacy' of Rome: the rise, decline, and fall of the theory of Romanization', in Webster, J and Cooper, N. (eds), *Roman Imperialism: post-colonial perspectives* (Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996)
- Hirsch, S.W., *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1985)
- Holmes, T.R. (ed.), *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914)
- Isaac, B., *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004)
- Jahoda, G., *Images of Savages: Ancients Roots of Modern Prejudice in Western Culture* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Jones, R.F.J., 'Cultural Change in Roman Britain', in Jones, R.F.J. (ed.), *Britain in the Roman period: Recent Trends* (Sheffield: J.R. Collis, 1991)
- King, R., *Orientalism and Religion: Post-Colonial Theory, India and 'the mythic East'* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Kraus, C.S., 'Bellum Gallicum', in Griffin, M. (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2009)
- Kraus, C.S. and Woodman, A.J., *Latin Historians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Lacey, W.K., 'Augustus' *Auctoritas* and Other Aspects of his Government' in *Prudentia* 30.2 (Auckland 1998)

- 
- Laurence, R., 'Introduction' in Laurence, R. and Berry, J. (eds.), *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 2001)
- Lehmann, J.H., *Remember you are an Englishman: A Biography of Sir Harry Smith 1787-1860* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1977)
- Lester, A., 'Settlers, the State and Colonial Power: The Colonization of Queen Adelaide Province, 1834-37', in *The Journal of African History* Vol. 39, No.2 (1998) p. 221-245
- Lester, A., 'Otherness' and the Frontiers of Empire: the Eastern Cape Colony, 1806-c.1850', in *Journal of Historical Geography* 24, 1 (1998) p. 2-19
- Levick, B. *The Government of the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- LeVine, R.A. and Campbell, D.T., *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behaviour* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972)
- Lewis, C.T., and Short, C., *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879)
- Long, T., *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986)
- Lorenz, C., 'Comparative History: Problems and Perspectives' in *History and Theory* 38 (1999) p. 25-39
- Lucas, C.P., *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912)
- Macfie, A.L., *Orientalism* (London: Routledge, 2002)
- Mason, P., *Deconstructing America: Representations of the Other* (London: Routledge, 1990)
- McClendon, T., 'The Man who would be Inkosi: Civilising Missions in Shepstone's Early Career', in *Journal of Southern African Studies* Vol. 30, No. 2 (2004) p. 339-358
- McLaughlin, M., 'Empire, Eloquence, and Military Genius: Renaissance Italy', in Griffin, M. (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2009)
- Meier, C., *Caesar* (Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995)
- Mellor, R., *Tacitus* (New York: Routledge, 1993)
- Miller, D.H. and Savage, W.W. Jr., 'Ethnic Stereotypes and the Frontier: A Comparative Study of Roman and American Experience', in Miller, D.H. and Steffen, J.O. (eds.), *The Frontier: Comparative Studies* (Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977)
- Millett, M., *The Romanization of Britain: An Essay in Archaeological Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

- 
- Moore Smith, G.C. (ed.), *The Autobiography of Lieutenant-General Sir Harry Smith* (London: John Murray, 1901)
- Moore Smith, G.C. (ed.), *The Autobiography of Lieutenant-General Sir Harry Smith: 1787 – 1819* (London: John Murray, 1910)
- Morrish, I., *Education since 1800* (London: Routledge, 1970)
- Mostert, N., *Frontiers: The Epic of South Africa's Creation and the Tragedy of the Xhosa People* (London: Pimlico, 1992)
- Murphey, C.T., 'The Use of Speeches in Caesar's *Gallic War*', in *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 3 (1949) p. 120 - 127
- Murphey, P.R., 'Themes of Caesar's *Gallic War*', in *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (1977) p. 234 - 243
- Nandy, A., *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)
- Ogilvie, R.M., 'Caesar', in Kenney, E.J. and Clausen, W.V. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: II Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- O'Gorman, E., *Irony and Misreading in the Annals of Tacitus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Osgood, J., 'The Pen and the Sword: Writing and Conquest in Caesar's Gaul', in *Classical Antiquity* Vol. 28, No. 2 (2009) p. 328-358
- Owen, D., *Ubukhosi neenkokeli: A Directory of Eastern Cape Black Leaders from c. 1700 to 1990* (Grahamstown: Albany Museum, 1994)
- Pagden, A., *The Fall of Natural Man: the American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Peires, J.B., *The House of Phalo* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1982)
- Peires, J.B., *The Dead Will Arise* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1989)
- Radin, M., 'The Date of Composition of Caesar's *Gallic War*' in *Classical Philology*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (1918) p. 283-300
- Ramsey, J.T., 'The Proconsular Years: Politics at a Distance', in Miriam Griffin (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2009)

- 
- Rawlings, L. 'Caesar's portrayal of Gauls as warriors' in Welch, K. and Powell, A., *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments* (London: Duckworth, 1998)
- Riggsby, A.M., *Caesar in Gaul and Rome: War in Words* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006)
- Rosenstein, N., 'General and Imperialist', in Griffin, M. (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2009)
- Rusen, J., 'Some Theoretical Approaches to Intercultural Comparative Historiography' in *History and Theory* Vol 35, No. 4 (1996) p. 5-22
- Said, E.W., *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (New York: Penguin Group, 1978)
- Sardar, Z., et al., *Barbaric Others: A Manifesto on Western Racism* (London: Pluto Press, 1993)
- Schadee, H., 'Caesar's Construction of Northern Europe: Inquiry, Contact and Corruption in "De Bello Gallico"' in *The Classical Quarterly. New Series.* Vol. 58. No.1 (2008) p.158-180
- Seeger, R.M., 'Romans and Barbarians in Tacitus' Battle Narratives' MA Thesis (University of Georgia, 2002)
- Segall, M.H. et al., *The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1966)
- Sherwin-White, A.N., *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967)
- Skocpol, T. and Somers, M., 'Approaches to Historical Comparison: The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry' in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol 22, Issue 02 (1980) p. 174-197
- Stray, C., *Classics Transformed: Schools, Universities, and society in England, 1830-1960* (1998)
- Stray, C., 'Curriculum and Style in the Collegiate University: Classics in Nineteenth Century Oxbridge' in Feingold, M. *History of Universities Vol XVI2, Vol 16* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- Strayer, J.R., 'Some Reflections on Roman and Modern Imperialism', in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol.9 No.1 (1966) p. 101-104
- Strobel, C., *The Testing Grounds of Modern Empire: The Making of Colonial Racial Order in the American Ohio Country and the South African Eastern Cape, 1770s-1850s* (New

- 
- York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2008)
- Syed, Y., 'Romans and Others', in Harrison, S. (ed.), *A Companion to Latin Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005)
- Syme, Sir R., *Ten Studies in Tacitus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)
- Tajfel, H., *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1981)
- Thompson, L., *A History of South Africa* (Sandton: Radix, 1990)
- Thorne, J. 'The Chronology of the Campaign against the Helvetii: A Clue to Caesar's Intentions?' in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd 56 H.1 (2007) p. 27 - 36
- Tuplin, C. 'Greek Racism? Observations on the Character and Limits of Greek Ethnic Prejudice', in Tsetschladze, G.R. (ed.), *Ancient Greeks West and East* (Leiden: 1999)
- van Aswegen, H.J., *History of South Africa to 1854* (Pretoria: Academica, 1993)
- Varisco, D.M., *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007)
- Veyne, P., 'Humanitas: Romans and Non-Romans', in Giardina, A. (ed.), *The Romans* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993)
- Wagner, R., *The Invention of Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980)
- Walker, E.A., *A History of Southern Africa* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957)
- Webster, J., 'Ethnographic barbarity: colonial discourse and 'Celtic warrior societies'', in Webster, J. and Cooper, N. (eds.) *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives* (1996) p. 111-123
- Wilkinson, L.P., 'Cicero and the relationship of oratory to literature', in Kenney, E.J. and Clausen, W.V. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: II Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- Wilson, M., 'Co-operation and Conflict: The Eastern Cape Frontier' in Wilson, M. and Thompson, L. (eds.), *The Oxford History of South Africa* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)
- Woodman, A.J., *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1988)
- Woolf, G., 'Beyond Romans and Natives', in *World Archaeology* Vol. 28, No. 3 (1997) p. 339-350

---

Woolf, G., *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilisation in Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)