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Chapter 4
Postcolonialism and the Historical Novel:
Grevenbroek and the Early Cape in *Eilande*

Maar jy kan nooit vertel sodat iemand ten volle begryp nie, want die hoorder sit in sy eie droom gevang.
Only, one can never tell [history] in such a way that understanding is complete, because the listener is caught in his own dream.

Grevenbroek, in Sleigh (2002, 736-737)

In the previous two chapters I discussed Grevenbroek’s framing of the Khoi in his letter from 1695. In this chapter I explore the Afrikaans historical novel *Eilande* (2002) by the South African novelist and historian Dan Sleigh. The novel is set in the early Cape and features Grevenbroek as its omniscient narrator. In a prologue in the first person, ‘Stemme uit die see’, Grevenbroek introduces himself to the reader as ‘Ek, die klerk’. Through his single voice, a plethora of other voices is preserved: each of the seven chapters that follow stages a different male protagonist who lived during the decades directly preceding or following the founding of the VOC refreshment station at the Cape by the Dutch in 1652. Together, the chapters form Grevenbroek’s draft of an elaborate history of the early Cape called *Beeld van die Kaap. Die eerste halfeeu*.¹ The novel has Grevenbroek writing the draft ‘shortly’ after his retirement, relying on his experiences as secretary to the VOC Council of Policy at the Cape (1684-1694).

As I noted in the Introduction, in South Africa and abroad, *Eilande* was met with wide acclaim for its intricate combination of fact and fiction, and the multiplicity of perspectives it presents. Through the eyes of the seven protagonists, *Eilande* also tells the story of two Khoi women: Krotoa and her daughter Pieternella. Krotoa was one of the first interpreters and intermediaries between the native peoples and the Dutch settlers, and the first native person to marry a Dutch settler; her daughter is known as the first mixed-race Cape person. Krotoa’s name appears in the VOC’s journals from as early as 1652, which is one reason why

¹ In an interview, Sleigh concedes that he is not aware of historical evidence that Grevenbroek wrote a document with that title (Maas (2018)).
nowadays she is one of the most written about women in South African history.² The first chapter of *Eilande* is focalised by Autshumao, chief of the Goringhaicoma and Krotoa’s uncle.³ The English sailors who moored at the Cape to refresh knew him as Harry, with the Dutch calling him Herrie. The chapter recounts his struggle with the arrival of the Dutch in 1652, focusing on their permanent presence and increasingly demanding requests for cattle and land use in their effort to make the settlement self-supportive and capable of resupplying passing VOC ships. Autshumao takes Krotoa to Van Riebeeck when she is still a child. Initially working as a nanny for the Van Riebeeck family, she soon becomes pivotal to Khoi-Dutch relations through her work as an interpreter. The second chapter is focalised by VOC surgeon Pieter Havgard, also known by his Dutch name, Pieter van Meerhof. When he and Krotoa fall in love, Pieter convinces Van Riebeeck to let her become the first native woman to be baptised at the Cape (1662). Krotoa is, tellingly, christened as Eva. From Pieter and Eva’s subsequent marriage is born Pieterenella. The following chapters, in roughly chronological order, present the perspectives of fisherman Bart Boms; Hans Michiel Callenbach, administrator of an outpost; Deneyn, the Castle’s chief lawyer; carpenter Daniel Zaaijman; and finally Grevenbroek himself. Together, *Eilande*’s seven protagonists recount 50 years of Cape history, with the connecting elements being Krotoa/Eva and Pieterenella, whom each of them knew.

Focusing on Afrikaans prose from the period from 1997 to 2002, Henriette Roos in *Perspektief en profiel. ‘n Afrikaanse literatuurgeskiedenis* (2006) notes a rise in novels about the early years of Dutch administration at the Cape after the landing of Jan van Riebeeck in 1652. Indeed, the formal end of apartheid in 1994 that marked South Africa’s first democratic elections saw a renewed interest in the nation’s past. In contrast with pre-1994 novels that focus on the same period, Roos shows, protagonists are less often heroic European or colonial explorers, and the perspective chosen is more often that of non-white (wo)men.

---

² Landman (1996) writes that after Krotoa’s death her story remained less explored than that of white European women who came to South Africa on missionary expeditions. It was not until after the 1920s that her story became a part of South African history. Scully (2005) argues that Krotoa is one of the women than can be used to show the universality of the way that people were treated in the colonial system worldwide. See also Jansen (2003).
³ I adopt the definition of focalisation provided by Bal (1983, 244-250), in whose theory focalisation indicates the viewpoint or angle from which things are visually perceived (as opposed to narrated). In Bal’s model the focaliser’s position is described in relation to the story: the focaliser can be inside the fictional world (character-focaliser) or outside it (narrator-focaliser).
A notable example of recent South African historical fiction that engages the early years of Dutch administration at the Cape from a different perspective is Trudie Bloem’s *Krotoa-Eva. The Woman from Robben Island* (1999), a fictionalised biography of the Khoi woman Krotoa. She was one of the first interpreters and intermediaries between the native peoples and the Dutch settlers, and the first native person to marry a Dutch settler. Set in the politically tense atmosphere of the 17th century Cape, the novel explores the notion of identity and an individual’s response to culture clashes. In her historical Afrikaans novel *Pietermella van die Kaap* (2000), Dalene Matthee tells the story of Pietermella, Krotoa’s daughter, who is known as the first mixed-race Cape person.\(^4\) The blurb of the English translation praises Matthee for renegotiating the dominant narrative of the early Cape by adding the voice of a non-white person, who is, moreover, a woman:

Matthee has resurrected and breathed new life into the early history of the Cape […]. She allows the historically misunderstood Eva finally to come into her own through the eyes of her clever, sensitive daughter.

Krotoa and Pietermella also feature in *Eilande*.\(^5\) Together, these examples of post-1994 South African literature reflect a tendency in the national literary field to re-explore early Cape history through previously unheard voices.

Granting such voices a stage not only acknowledges the heterogeneity of the Cape’s population then and now but also challenges the dominant narrative that prevailed in pre-1994 historical novels about the early Cape. Jakes Gerwel, in *Literatuur en apartheid: konsepsies van ‘gekleurdes’ in die Afrikaanse roman tot 1948* (1983), and Vernon February, in *Mind your colour. The ‘Coloured’ Stereotype in South African Literature* (1981; 2019), show that from the earliest colonial and Afrikaans literature on, native people were structurally marginalised, and that when they did play a role, they were stereotyped as irresponsible, idle creatures, dependent upon the wisdom and good naturedness of their white masters to achieve any degree of civility. Scholars have argued that in the depiction of historical subject matter, Afrikaans historical novels from the first half of the 20th century were inspired by ‘nationalistic approaches’ and that this perspective on the past has been

---

\(^4\) The novel was also published in English as *Pietermella. Daughter of Eva* (2012).

\(^5\) About Pietermella in *Pietermella van die Kaap* and in *Eilande*, see Van Zyl (2003).
‘demythologised’ in post-1994 literature.\footnote{Pretorius (2015, 62) distinguishes between ‘Afrikaanse skrywers se nasionale benadering’ in the first half of the 20th century, and a ‘demitologisering [...] in die Afrikaanse letterkunde’ that followed in depicting the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902). See also Burger (2015) and Viljoen (1996).} The multitude of historical voices that have been added in recent years, including in \textit{Eilande}, question the stereotyping effect as well as the objectivity of a singular historical narrative.

In this chapter, I argue that \textit{Eilande} presents a postcolonial reading of the historical time of its narrative, from the perspective of its environment of production and publication, post-1994 South Africa. I first discuss the novel’s narrative structure. As opposed to much other historical fiction about the early Cape, the narrative structure of \textit{Eilande} reflects the unequal degree to which European and Khoi voices, and male and female voices, have been preserved in the historical archive. Given that it still preserves the European perspective as dominant in making Grevenbroek the narrator, I ask how the novel relates to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s observations about the (im)possibility of narrating ‘the Other’ from the self-side of the colonial divide, and about the ‘epistemic violence of imperialism’.\footnote{Spivak (1988).}

The remainder of the chapter consists of a comparison of Grevenbroek’s presentation of the Khoi in his letter and in \textit{Eilande}. This substantiates how the image of the Khoi has changed as a result of changing beliefs about epistemology, or the framing of knowledge about the world. The ancient and biblical frameworks that are the substratum to Grevenbroek’s letter, which I analysed in the previous two chapters, are not mobilised in the novel as arguments for the Khoi’s humanity. Given that the novel is structured around various protagonists, I build my discussion of the novel’s image of the Khoi around individual characters. Firstly, I contend that central to \textit{Eilande}’s positioning of the Khoi is the opposition between Grevenbroek and Simon van der Stel (governor 1691-1699). The VOC’s extensive archives form the basis for much that is known about the early Cape in terms of political, legislative and economical history.\footnote{See, for example, Schoeman (2008, Introduction; Chapter 1).} These archives have substantiated criticism of Van der Stel’s supposed financial corruption.\footnote{See, for example, Sleigh (1993).} I discuss how \textit{Eilande} – through Grevenbroek’s voice – explores this corruption to de-marginalise the Khoi, thereby renegotiating the historical narrative about the early Cape.

Secondly, I will show how \textit{Eilande} positions the Khoi as confronted with a divide between settlers and native people. By describing a process called ‘Andersmaak’ (remaking),
*Eilande* explores how Krotoa and chief Autshumao are forced to remake themselves in the colonial encounter. I draw on Homi Bhabha’s theory about colonial mimicry and the ambivalence of colonial discourse to explore ‘Andersmaak’ in the context of the power imbalance between Khoi and settlers in the early Cape. I also engage Monika Fludernik’s theory about autostereotypes and heterostereotypes to ask how *Eilande*’s ‘Andersmaak’ helps to materialise the novel’s postcolonial voice.

My analysis of *Eilande* will present it as a historical novel that renegotiates the past for post-1994 South Africa by exploring various forms of conflict and resistance at the early Cape through the interactions of its individual protagonists. In staging a plurality of voices that co-exist, *Eilande* reflects the heterogeneity of both the democratic South Africa and the early Cape.

**Voicing the archive**

*Eilande*’s narrative structure is a distinctive aspect of the novel in the field of post-1994 literature on the early Cape and plays an important role in constituting the novel’s postcolonial voice. The prologue and the final chapter together frame *Eilande* as an exercise in unmuting the voices of everyday people from South Africa’s past. In the prologue, ‘Stemme uit die see’, Grevenbroek presents the ocean of history as a fertile place from which voices are continuously born: ‘Eindelijk die see, die groen vrugwater waarin ons dryf, en gedryf het. [...] [Mense] roep uit die see [...]’. Ook Autshumao roep uit die see. Van hulle vertel ek’ (2). The narrative of *Eilande* is the fruit of Grevenbroek’s effort to preserve these voices, including his own. He emphasises how all seven protagonists possessed valuable first-hand knowledge of the Cape but did not document their personal feelings and thoughts: ‘Ons was soldate, ‘n beeswagter, matrose, ‘n klerk, mense met min emosie in ons wordeskat [...]’ (1). He also reveals that through his job at the VOC Council of Policy he ‘knew’ all six people whose voices he presents in his text, even though he may not have met every one of them. Chief Harry, for example, passed away before Grevenbroek arrived at the Cape.

In the opening paragraphs of the final chapter, Grevenbroek contemplates the purpose of his history *Beeld van die Kaap* in more detail. Reviving the sea metaphor, he muses: ‘Hier[die] stories roep om gehoor te word, soos die hand van ‘n drenkeling uit die see kom en ‘n stem sê: help my’ (687). This makes explicit Grevenbroek’s realisation that
early Cape history is more than the VOC’s economical and legislative history as preserved in its archives.\(^{10}\)

[W]at in daardie wankelrige kaarthuis [van die VOC] nog ontbreek [is] dat die sleutel tot die Kaapse verversingstasie sy buiteposte is. En selfs dié kennis was nie volledig nie. Die buiteposte was *lewende mense*. (691-2)\(^{11}\)

The title of the novel, significantly, refers to this image of ‘*lewende mense*’ as islands in the ocean of history. In relation to these 'islands', Grevenbroek asks himself, ‘[H]oe klink hulle stemme?’ (733). The use of the plural emphasises that there are always multiple voices of history and that *Beeld van die Kaap* (and *Eilande* itself) is therefore only one of many possible histories of the early Cape.

Making space for a plurality of narratives has been identified as an important aspect of healing a fragmented society like that of post-1994 South Africa. In his paper ‘Back to the Future: History in/and the Postcolonial Novel’ (1997), Brian May observes that the historical novel has been a popular medium in the postcolonial context because a new socio-political status quo urges a society to re-assess the past and establish a new equilibrium.\(^{12}\) According to Hayden White in *The Historical Text as Literary Artefact* (1978), historiography in general should certify the existence of a plurality of narratives by underlining that ‘there is no such thing as a *single correct* view of any object under study but that there are *many correct views*’.\(^{13}\) White asserts that any historical study is characterised by a degree of subjectivity since the author is required to give meaning to a set of events by describing or characterising them. In line with White’s theory, Grevenbroek (and by implication Sleigh) in his presentation of multiple historical voices should not just be seen to provide an

---

\(^{10}\) Sleigh (1993) presents a case for the inclusion of the voice of everyday (wo)men in the history of the Cape and in colonial narratives more generally. In an interview (Maas (2018)), he cites a saying from 17\textsuperscript{th} century Holland: ‘De Caab verlooren, de Kompagnie verlooren. Elkeen kon dit soos ‘n kinderrympie opsê. Die sleutel tot Nederland se ekonomie was die Kompanjie, die sleutel tot die Kompanjie se sukses was die besit van Oos-Indië, die sleutel tot Oos-Indië was die Kaapse verversingstasie’. Sleigh (2004, 94): ‘Buiteposte was onontbeerlik vir die VOC se kommersiële stelsel. Die buiteposte was kerneenhede wat die VOC se seehandel met ‘n verskeidenheid ekonomiese aktiwiteite onderskraag het’. ‘De Caab verlooren, de Kompagnie verlooren’: VC 95: Annotatiën en Remarques ... van J.W. Cloppenburg, 7969, g.p. (Verbatim Copies, Kaapse Staatsargiefbewaarplek).

\(^{11}\) Unless stated otherwise, emphasis in citations from *Eilande* in this chapter are in the text.

\(^{12}\) May (1997, 268): ‘Just as the [historical novel] arose [...] as the European bourgeoisie’s instrument of “eclips[ing] [...] the feudal and aristocratic modes of intercourse”, so the postcolonial novel [arose] as an instrument of, and a commentary on, political and cultural independence’. He cites McKeon (1985). See also, for example, Booker and Juraga (1997) and Dalley (2014).

\(^{13}\) White (1978, 47).
alternative history to the VOC’s dominant narrative of the early Cape, but also to question the objectivity of any single, monolithic, totalising, or grand narrative.

Despite Grevenbroek’s prominent role in the novel as narrator and historiographer, many reviewers have suggested that *Eilande’s* central character is not Grevenbroek at all, but Pieternella. After all, the seven focalisers in *Eilande* present a history of the early Cape in which Krotoa/Eva and especially Pieternella occupy a key position. Indeed, in the prologue, Grevenbroek admits that Pieternella is the connecting element in his history of the early Cape:

Ek het dié [sewe mans] uitgesoek wat haar gedra het in die hart, van voor haar geboorte tot ná haar einde. Hulle het gehelp om die klein vlotjie drywend te hou. Tot ná haar dood, en die verpligting was op my, want mense sterf eers werklik as hulle nie meer onthou word nie. (1)

The observations by Grevenbroek and the reviewers about Pieternella’s central role in *Eilande* are important in the light of the abovementioned role of recent historical fiction (such as Matthee's *Pieternella van die Kaap*) in challenging native women’s marginalised position in South African historiography. Yet, it is significant that, in *Eilande*, Pieternella’s voice is not directly represented; she is spoken for and remembered by others, all of whom are men and – except for Autshumao (Harry) – European.

In her seminal essay ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ (1988), Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak explores the problem of speaking for ‘the Other’ or subaltern, with particular reference to (orientalist) colonial discourse and the ideological construct of male gender dominance. Spivak argues that the possibility of representing the subaltern Other is ruled out by the very meaning of ‘representation’. According to Spivak, any effort at speaking for the Other remains limited to a representation of the Other from the Self-side of the colonial,

---

14 See, for example, Quaedvlieg (2004) and more recently Otten (2016). Also, Sleigh (in Steinmair (2004). Sub Jan Smuts, q.4) regrets this and points out that Pieternella is under Grevenbroek’s narrative control: ‘Ek was jammer om dit te verneem. Let op dat De Grevenbroek nie vir Pieterne11l voer op die verhoog nie, maar op die kante en in die hoek8 laat speel. Hou net vir De Grevenbroek dop: hy trek die toutjies. Hy gebruik haar oo as katalisator in die verhaal, die “draad wat die gegewens verbind” wat hy nodig gehad het’.

15 In presenting Pieternella from seven different perspectives, Sleigh strives to counter a perceived limitation of South Africa’s postcolonial discourse: ‘Dit bly by Krotoa, Krotoa, Krotoa met Sarah Baartman as afwisseling. Wanneer gaan dit, byvoorbeeld, uitbrei?’ (Steinmair (2004). Sub Jan Smuts, q.4). Sarah Baartman was a Khoi woman who was taken to Paris and exhibited as an attraction in the early 19th century under the name ‘Hottentot Venus’, with ‘Venus’ referring to the Roman goddess of Love. She has become an archetype of orientalism and the objectification of ‘the Other’ and ‘the female’. See, for example, Holmes (2016).

16 Sleigh concedes in an interview (Maas (2018)) that, of all characters in the novel, Grevenbroek’s voice is by far the one that is best preserved in the historical archives, whereas there are no remains of Pieternella’s voice.
patriarchal borderline. From the European viewpoint, writing about the Khoi is a process of ‘crossing over’ in which the crosser is not, and cannot, be the Other. Any attempt by western intellectuals to represent the Other furthers the Other’s dependence upon western ideological constructs to speak out for themselves, which re-inscribes their subordinate position and re-enforces Western logo-centrism. Eventually, what is at stake in any such representation is an individual’s heterogeneity, which risks being erased through an assumed cultural solidarity. The ‘epistemic violence of imperialism’ described by Spivak challenges Grevenbroek’s stated desire to present and preserve Pieternella’s voice. Indeed, although Grevenbroek may have sympathised with the Khoi cause, the biblical and ancient frameworks he evoked in his letter about the Khoi constitute deeply European modes of understanding the world. In Eilande, too, he ultimately can do no more than present Pieternella and Autshumao (the sole native protagonist) from a European perspective; they cannot speak in their own voices.

Eilande’s significance as a historical novel, then, should not be sought in its narrator’s attempt at lending Pieternella a voice. Rather, through its intricate narratological structure, Eilande explores processes of (un-)silencing as forms of colonial conflict and resistance. Thus, it makes visible how Pieternella’s voice, the voices of the six chapter protagonists and Grevenbroek’s own voice have all been silenced to various degrees by the VOC-based narrative of early Cape history. It does this by replicating the way in which, in the colonial archive, Grevenbroek’s voice has been preserved (through his own writings), whereas Pieternella and other Khoi people only appear in other people’s writings. In Eilande, accordingly, Autshumao’s voice is preserved through Grevenbroek and Pieternella’s voice is preserved in a dialogue she has with Autshumao, which is imagined by Grevenbroek. The novel thus shows how colonial and colonised voices are not equally silenced by history, and how silenced ‘other’ voices can only be recovered or explored through the coloniser’s archive. Considering Pieternella the main character negates the novel’s emphasis on her presentation from other people’s perspectives.

The novel also thematises the gender-based imperialism that characterises the representation of a native woman’s voice by a European male who purports to ‘save’ her. In the final paragraph of the American edition of the novel, Grevenbroek is seen thinking that it is his responsibility to save Pieternella’s voice from the dragon Time, who devours any
voice not put down in words, thereby banishing it from the earth.\textsuperscript{17} Wrapping up his Beeld van die Kaap, Grevenbroek ponders: ‘Thus was slain the dragon Time, the damsel delivered, [the] quest at last at an end’ (758).\textsuperscript{18} The novel opens up this presentation of Pieternella as a native woman without agency who needs to be saved from being forgotten by a European man to a critical reading. Through its narrative structure, which emphasises not Pieternella’s (or other native characters’) but Grevenbroek’s agency and power to (re)shape history, Eilande represents native (women’s) voices in a way that reflects and implicitly critiques colonial power relations, as sedimented in the archives. In what follows, I focus on the novel’s portrayal of Grevenbroek, his views on the Khoi and his critique of the Cape administration, and I assess how this portrayal compares to the conclusions I reached about Grevenbroek on the basis of his letter about the Khoi in Chapters 2 and 3.

**Governor versus secretary**

The novel emphasises Grevenbroek’s resistance to governor Simon van der Stel’s administration, in particular with regard to what Grevenbroek saw as Van der Stel’s unethical policies regarding the Khoi.\textsuperscript{19} In Eilande, Grevenbroek draws on his years of service as secretary to the Council of Policy and is shown to have smuggled home excerpts of minutes that he now relies on for his Beeld van die Kaap (703): ‘hy, die klerk De Grevenbroek, [het] jare lank kort uittreksels gemaak om later te gebruik, en dit in sy mou huis toe gedra’, because ‘as die pen jou wapen is, dan skryf jy’ (717-8). Grevenbroek is portrayed as choosing to destabilise the image of the Cape administration through his writing. In Chapter 2, I observed that Grevenbroek notably left out any direct reference to the governor as well as any legal aspects and suggested that this might have been out of self-preservation in the light of the governor’s ruthless oppression of critical voices. In what follows, I first explore how Eilande develops the tension between the governor and the

\textsuperscript{17} Sleigh concedes that ‘[Eilande] is die verhaal van ‘n reddingspoging [hoe die ridder die dame van die draak [Tyd] gered het]’. (Steinmair (2004). Sub Chris van der Merwe, q.5.) The American edition pursues the dragon metaphor more explicitly than the Afrikaans edition as Sleigh felt it was more appropriate to the American context (Maas (2018)).

\textsuperscript{18} The image alludes to the central quest of a typical medieval epic narrative, the chanson de geste, in which a damsel is rescued by a knight.

\textsuperscript{19} In his seminal study of the historical novel, Lukács (1955) maintains that the quintessential element of the genre is its embodiment of social tension in the form of individual protagonists: ‘Through the plot [of the historical novel], at whose centre stands [the typical hero], a neutral ground is sought and found upon which the extreme, opposing social forces can be brought into a human relation with one another’. Lukács ‘neutral ground’ has since become the topic of scholarly debate; see, for example, White (1978) and De Groot (2010).
secretary in a postcolonial framework, and then compare it with the presentation of the governor in Grevenbroek’s letter.

In their study *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin understand postcolonialism to be an undermining voice to colonialism, rather than a strictly chronologically subsequent era.\(^{20}\) They use the term in reference to any culture affected by the colonial circumstance, which ultimately can be taken to mean that any literature from the colonial era was conceived in a tension with the colonial administration.\(^{21}\) Similarly, Elleke Boehmer, in her study *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* (2005), suggests that postcolonial resistance happens by unveiling the structures of power and suppression that characterise colonial regimes. Boehmer does not limit postcolonialism to the period following colonialism but understands it to refer to an ideology or sentiment that can also be played out in literature from colonial times; this would include Grevenbroek’s letter about the Khoi and the account his fictionalised character writes in *Eilande*.\(^{22}\) This idea is shared by Stephen Slemon – who relates it to the historical novel in particular – in his article ‘Unsettling Europe. Resistance Theory for the Second World’ (1990). There, Slemmon maintains that ‘literary [historical] writing is about internalized conflict’.\(^{23}\) Given the coloniser’s status as settler in the colonial circumstance and his status as former-coloniser in the postcolonial circumstance, neither the colonial nor the postcolonial circumstance is the coloniser’s motherland. Internalised conflict arises as an inevitable consequence of this and is present in white settler writing from both colonial and postcolonial times.\(^{24}\) This understanding of an inherent, unavoidable postcolonial tension pinpoints the urgency of *Eilande* in terms of the historical period narrated and explains its relevance to its contemporary context of composition.\(^{25}\)

For the South African environment, Paul Maylam, in *South Africa’s Racial Past. The History and Historiography of Racism, Segregation, and Apartheid* (2001), embarks from the

\(^{20}\) I do not distinguish between post-colonial and postcolonial. For a summary of the discussion on this distinction, see Oha (2005), who calls preoccupations with orthographical intricacies ‘living on the hyphen’.

\(^{21}\) Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (1989, 1-2).

\(^{22}\) Boehmer (2005, 3). Legally, the Cape only became a Dutch colony in 1695; before that time, the VOC was granted administrative rights. I understand coloniality broadly as indicating an oppressive power relation between a European and non-European people.

\(^{23}\) Slemon (2006, 102).

\(^{24}\) See also Ahluwalia (2005).

\(^{25}\) See also Anker (2009).
popular argument that colonialism only ended with 1994’s democratic elections.\textsuperscript{26} Although Maylam does not provide a definition of colonialism, he convincingly shows that forms of its disruption and subversion go back to the establishment of the first permanent European settlement at the Cape in 1652, and before. Like Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, and Boehmer, Maylam relies on the theory of power which Michel Foucault puts forward in The Archaeology of Knowledge (L’archéologie du savoir (1969)): that power itself inscribes its resistances and, in the process, seeks to contain them. The postcolonial condition can therefore be understood as an ex-temporal circumstance of resistance or ‘tension’ in the time and place under scrutiny produced by colonial power. The conflict between Grevenbroek and the governor’s administration, as portrayed in Eilande, is a case in point.

Grevenbroek’s rationale for writing Beeld van die Kaap becomes clear in the final chapter, which puts him and Simon van der Stel in opposition to each other. The first paragraphs of the chapter present Grevenbroek as he is composing Beeld van die Kaap, living the sober and ascetic lifestyle of a retired academic.\textsuperscript{27} Notably, the opening phrase is a common epistolary greeting from Roman times (Lectori Salutem, ‘hail to the reader’) whereas the chapter’s closing line quotes the inscription on Grevenbroek’s grave (\textit{Hic exspectat resurrectionem}. J.G. de Grevenbroek. ‘Here, J.G. de Grevenbroek awaits the youngest day’). The omniscient narrator of the novel can be understood to be Grevenbroek resurrecting his own voice. The opening reads as follows:

\textit{Lectori Salutem!}

\begin{quote}
U sien die klerk Johannes Guilielmus de Grevenbroek. Hy skryf by kerslig in ‘n buitekamer op die plaas Welmoed, aan die Kaapse kant van Stellenbosch. Hy het nie ‘n vrou, kind of familieled in hierdie land of oorsee nie. [...] Hy het vanaand ‘n akademiese toga om sy skouers. Die kleed is sonder warmte, motgevreet in die some, verslete oor die blaaie en groen van ouderdom. Sy skryftafel was eers die eettafel van ‘n groterige gesin. [...] Op die oomblik het ‘n gedagte by hom opgekom, iets onbelangriks, maar hy wil dit nie vergeet nie. Hy skryf dit in Latyn. [...] Die taak waaraan hy nou werk, is om inligting wat hy gedurende sy loopbaan in Jan Kompanjie se diens en daarna versamel het, te orden en uit te bou tot ‘n geskiedenis van die Kaapse nedersetting se eerste vyftig jaar. [...] Die inligting wat hy versamel vir sy \textit{Beeld van die Kaap}, soos hy voorlopig sy manuskript betitel het, sluit persoonlike besonderhede in van mense wat nog leef en ryk genoeg is om hom te dagvaar [...]\. Dit was ‘n interessante en gebeurtenisvolle tyd, daardie eerste halfeeu wat nou pas verby is. Tipies van
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{26} In this view, apartheid was the inevitable Afrikaner reaction to the Anglo victory in the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), and the Union of South Africa (1910), which formally marked the end of the colonial administration, is regarded as a continuation of Anglo-Afrikaner interests.

\textsuperscript{27} Sleigh: ‘Ons weet egter maar bitter min van Grevenbroek as persoon. Hy was ‘n sekretaris, en sekretarisse praat nie self nie. Vir die persoonlike inhoud is ons afhanklik van sy brief [oor die Khoi]’ (Maas (2018)).
omwenteling wat uit hebsug gebore word, meen hy, was die tydperk van sy ondersoek getroud met die dood en met bloed gedoop. Is dit nou te sterk gestel? [...] Stellenbosch is ’n dom en blinde dorp, en daar is min hoop dat dit sal verander. Hier woon ’n paar met wie hy soms ’n woord wissel, mense wat die geleentheid gehad het om oorsee ’n universiteit by te woon, al het hulle dit nie werklik benut nie. Soos die predikant Beck [...] (689-9).28

Verifiable facts about Grevenbroek are few. His name, profession and domicile are confirmed in archival records but information on his family is lacking. The Latin phrases that frame the chapter are not found in his letter about the Khoi and Grevenbroek’s burial site has – despite efforts in that direction – never been identified.29 As noted in Chapter 3, his private book collection was impressive, both in size and academic stature, boasting ancient literature, expensive editions and titles in various modern languages, with marginalia in Grevenbroek’s hand oftentimes in the language of the book in question. Yet, when his belongings were publicly auctioned after his death, there was only average interest.30 In the novel, accordingly, Grevenbroek’s belongings are described as second hand and worn-down, yet the types of goods – such as a toga – confirm his status as an educated gentleman. He rents the candlelit room where he writes in Latin until late in the evening at Welmoed, a farm near Stellenbosch. The reason for his choice of location is not made explicit, but the chapter suggests that its distance from the Castle and Cape society plays a role.

From what follows, it transpires that Grevenbroek in the novel is concerned about the Cape administration’s corruption. For example, he has taken to concluding the Council of Policy’s minutes and letters with (renderings of) Latin sayings: ‘*Dit is ’n plig om te werk, maar nie in die donker nie*.’ En: ‘*Prodesse orbg. Nocere nemine* – Aan almal het ek goed gedoen, en niemand benadeel nie’ (717). The VOC archives confirm the intellectual’s protest. Although there is no historical evidence that Van der Stel did not read Latin, the novel assumes this: ‘Van der Stel wou weet wat dit [die Latynse spreuk] beteken. [...] “Jy [Grevenbroek] wil hê die Here moet dit lees. Laat staan jou bog en hou jou boodskappies

---

28 The opening address to the reader may call to mind Grevenbroek’s letter but seems to primarily illustrate that he was a learned man.

29 SAHRA (formerly: National Monuments Council) carried out extensive research on Welmoed farm, where Grevenbroek wished to be buried, for the restoration of the Van der Byl tombs (file 9/2/084/176). They found no sign of a grave that can be connected to Grevenbroek. (Private correspondence with Clinton Jackson, SAHRA, 10 November 2017.)

30 The bidding records are preserved in the Cape Town Archives and Records Services. See Van Stekelenburg (2001).
hieruit. Ek sê wat in die boek gaan en wat nie’’ (717). The novel thus positions Grevenbroek as part of the settler administration but also embodying a challenge to it.

Over the course of the chapter, a conflict develops between the humanist secretary and the autocratic governor. Grevenbroek shows that Van der Stel manipulates what is being archived. Not only does he expose the governor’s fraud, but he also challenges the image of the VOC based on the archives. In one example, Van der Stel refuses to let Grevenbroek copy a letter from the Lords XVII into the council’s minutes: ‘Een brief van die direkteure wou Van der Stel hom nie laat sien nie. Hy het gesê daar staan niks in wat die Politieke Raad aangaan nie’ (718). As it turns out, the Lords XVII want Van der Stel to reimburse a bandit whom he robbed in Batavia, so as not to compromise the peace in the East.

On another occasion, Van der Stel is shown to not follow VOC directives, which is to report on all of his actions. As noted in Chapter 1, Van Riebeeck’s mission letter indicates that the Lords XVII strived for appeasement of the Khoi. When Van der Stel attacks a native tribe, the Lords XVII write a letter in which they express their dismay over what they see as a violent act against a former ally:

Eenkeer skree Here Sewentien in teleurstelling en hulpeloze woede oor tienduisend myle groen seewater, in hulle brief aan Van der Stel: “Ons kan nie begryp hoe dit moontlik in u harsings kon gekom het om ‘n man wat die Kompanjie se vriend was en ons soveel jare getrou gedien het, op hierdie wyse aan te val nie, en ons vrees die gevolge van u daad, wat bitterheid en haat onder die Hottentotte sal wees.” Hy, die Kaapse goewerneur, het nie eens die Direkteure laat weet dat hy die Chainouque-stam van kaptein Dorha in die Overberg, daardie een stam wat die Kompanjie amper veertig jaar lank deur sy meeiikste tye gevoed en gehelp het, laat aanval en uitwis het nie. (718)

Notably, the imagined response by the Lords XVII to Van der Stel’s actions does not express regret over the loss of native life but anger and fear concerning the bitterness and hatred these actions incited among the Khoi. This can be explained through their awareness of the Cape’s importance to the VOC’s future commercial success. The novel implies that Amsterdam was too far away for Van der Stel to be bothered by his superiors’ directives too much, but the letter does support Grevenbroek’s argument about Van der Stel’s corrupt administration.

31 See Van Riebeeck’s mission letter discussed in Chapter 1.
In yet another case, founded in historical fact, Van der Stel disowns the private farm Wittebome without legal cause. In the chapter, we find Grevenbroek busy drafting the Cape’s land deeds when Van der Stel barges into his office:

Van der Stel het skree-skree by Grevenbroek se kantoor ingekom en die grondbrief van die plaas Wittebome geëis. Grevenbroek het geskrik, maar hom kalm gehou en met waardige stilte in ‘n lëer daarna gesoek. Van der Stel het dit uit sy hande geruk, die woord Herroep tussen twee lyne daarop gekrap, dit neergesmyt en weer uitgestorm. (715)

No reason is given for Van der Stel’s desire to confiscate Wittebome. However, Grevenbroek’s timidity and the governor’s brusqueness (he rips the deed out of Grevenbroek’s hands and revokes its previous ownership) prompts the reader to side with Grevenbroek. The next day, Grevenbroek watches as the governor commits fraud in the company’s records. Van der Stel attempts to cover up his actions by making it appear to be the Council’s decision to take Wittebome from the farmer Coenraad Visser. Subsequently, Van der Stel also tampers with the Daghregister – the official annals of the settlement kept by the governor as a daily journal – to make up a Council meeting where this was supposedly decided. The following passage stresses Grevenbroek’s dismay at Van der Stel’s immorality:

Die oggend daarna lees Grevenbroek in die dagregister dat dit ‘n Raadsbesluit was om Coenraad Visser van Wittebome van sy grond te jaag en Mauritius toe te verban, omdat hy net wil jag en nie graan verbou nie. Twee vars leuens, dié oggend in die loflike Kompanjie se Dagregister, want eerstens is geen raadsvergadering gehou nie, en tweedens, nadat Van der Stel tot bedaring gekom het, gee hy Visser verlof om te wag tot sy koring ryp is vir sekel voor hy Wittebome moet verlaat. So, Visser se fout was, dit word nou duidelik, dat die goewerneur sy stukkie grond wil hê omdat dit aan Constantia grens, en hy was onwillig om dit in nederige diensbaarheid af te staan. Dit is waarom Nabot deur die koning gestenig is, was dit nie? Moes vry Nederlanders hierdie hebsugtige man sy sin gee? (715)\(^\text{32}\)

Grevenbroek thus presents evidence that the narrative of VOC history as it is preserved in the official archives has been tampered with, which provides the rationale for his drafting of an alternative history of the early Cape.

The depiction of Grevenbroek in this passage lends authority to his postcolonial counter-voice to the official VOC archives. He is shown to advance his understanding of the

\(^{32}\) The archival evidence on which this account is based is the sudden and unmotivated disappearance of Wittebome from the Company’s books. Van der Stel’s tampering with the Daghregister is the only plausible explanation for the silent change of ownership and Grevenbroek was in a position to have known about it.
Scripture to make an ethical judgment about events at the Cape. A parallel is suggested by him between the dispossessed farmer and the biblical Naboth, whose farm was taken from him by the greedy King Ahab. The rhetorical question at the end Grevenbroek answers elsewhere: ‘[Maar] onder die Van der Stels is geen burger vry nie’ (717). The novel’s depiction of Grevenbroek’s argued reflection and Van der Stel’s whimsical actions develops the animosity between the two.

In the following paragraph, a confrontation between Grevenbroek and Van der Stel is imagined. It includes one of the novel’s few dialogues between Van der Stel and Grevenbroek:

Toe Van der Stel die namiddag weer op kantoor kom, het De Grevenbroek hom daarop gewys dat die verbanning nie ‘n Raadsbesluit was nie. Van der Stel se blas vel het verbleek. Hy het sy vinger voor sy gesig kom skud. “Hou jou neus uit my sake, as jy in jou pos wil bly.” “Die Hoë Kommissaris het my in die pos aangestel.” “Hy is dood. Bly uit my pad uit. Hou jou bek verder.” (716)

This shows Grevenbroek as acting in accordance with his duties, whereas Van der Stel does not seem to be following any rationale other than his whimsical character. As such, it validates Grevenbroek’s effort to write his Beeld van die Kaap and explains why he could do so only after retirement, away from the Castle.

There are also examples included in the novel of how Simon van der Stel acted in direct violation of the VOC rules and regulations, which carefully outlined a governor’s rights and responsibilities. The VOC constitution, for example, forbade a governor to hold estates or cattle in private ownership. Nonetheless, Simon and his son Willem-Adriaan van der Stel possessed growing numbers of cattle and confiscated a larger share of outpost produce than they were entitled to. They also took possession of state land which had been confiscated from the Khoi people. At a time when Simon van der Stel’s private farm at

---

33 The story of Naboth is recounted in 1 Kings 21. ‘Naboth owned a vineyard in Jezreel near King Ahab’s palace. One day, Ahab said, “Naboth, your vineyard is near my palace. Give it to me so I can turn it into a vegetable garden”. […] Naboth answered, “This vineyard has always been in my family. I won’t let you have it”.’ In what follows, the King’s wife Jezebel incites Naboth’s neighbours to lodge false accusations against him in a makeshift court. He is subsequently stoned to death, the farm thus being disowned.

34 Interestingly, Grevenbroek would be involved in the 1705 free-burgher revolt. The novel appears to interpret the scarce archival evidence for Grevenbroek’s opposition to Van der Stel as a precursor to this revolt.

35 Sleigh maintains: ‘Hulle was groot dieue. Willem-Adriaan het die buitepos Hottentots-Holland, naby Stellenbosch, eenvoudig geskrap uit die kompanjie se boeke en dit vir homself gevat. Hy het groot eie besittings gehad en die Kompanjie se slave gebruik om die buitepos te omskep in een van die grootste plase in die Kaap, hoewel albei sake verbode was vir ’n goewerneur’ (Maas (2018)).
Constantia covered more morgen than Amsterdam, his son confiscated the VOC outpost of Hottentots Holland and had it registered as Vergelegen under his own name. In the novel, it takes Grevenbroek several years to find out about this corruption. A report by inspector Van Reede serves as the first clue:

This passage concludes with a strong sense of irony. In what follows, it is explained that, in the East, rich men and company officials constructed country houses to escape from Batavia’s mosquitoes and poor sanitation. ‘Maar’, Grevenbroek is shown thinking, ‘destyds aan die Kaap was daar geen enkele rede vir heer Willem Adriaan om vir hom ‘n hofstede ‘n volle dagreis van die Kasteel af aan te lê nie, behalwe heersug en hebsug, en dit het hy in oormaat gehad’ (725). Again, Grevenbroek asserts that the dominant VOC narrative is lacking information that would have changed it. He also suggests that there are particular reasons for this that have to do with power relations. In uncovering these reasons, Grevenbroek, in the novel, can be seen to build a postcolonial Cape narrative, as does the novel itself.

As Boehmer and also Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin argue, postcolonial resistance occurs when the structures of power and oppression that characterise colonial regimes are unveiled. In the terms of Slem’s theory of internalised conflict as a defining feature of postcolonial tension, Grevenbroek embodies contending societal forces. By having him

---

36 Sleigh (2004, 161-2) cites Bogaert (1711, 471): Constantia stretched 891 morgen; Amsterdam was 822 morgen. Sleigh (1993) also notes anomalies in VOC budgets with regards to outposts and a rapid expansion of Hottentots Hollands following the sudden change in its name and owner. Kolb mentions this as well (Volume II, 98, 100-1, 250).
37 ‘Dit was die toestand in die Ooste, en die rede waarom welgestelde here vir hulle ‘n buiteverbys gebou het’ (725).
38 ‘Destyds’ suggests a gap between the time of writing and the time described. Grevenbroek retired in 1694, only three years after Willem-Adriaan van der Stel succeeded his father as governor, and a good seven years before the former would confiscate Hottentots Holland. Grevenbroek is thus imagined to be writing Beeld van die Kaap sometime between 1701 and his death in 1724 or 1725. The free-burgher revolt of 1705 and the ensuing expulsion of Willem-Adriaan van der Stel are not mentioned in the novel, which would point to 1701-1705.
expose Van der Stel’s fraud and corruption, *Eilande* destabilises the master narrative of VOC and Cape history.

As a postcolonial historical novel, *Eilande* thus provides a stage for playing out the conflict and resistance that characterised colonial societies, with the narrative clearly leaning towards a critique of colonialism. Although Grevenbroek in the novel does not question colonialism as a structure, he does resist the governor’s VOC administration and exposes it as corrupt and unethical. His criticism touches on the injustices that Maylam identified as core to the colonialism of pre-1994 South Africa: the suppression of native people, abuses of power and the undermining of public policies. In reflecting ethically on these injustices, the novel’s Grevenbroek provides a postcolonial counter-narrative to the VOC archives.

Grevenbroek’s voice of resistance in the novel is not the voice of resistance in his actual letter about the Khoi. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the letter on the Khoi is concerned with changing the European image that exists of them and with the epistemological premises on the basis of which this image is construed through an appeal to Christian, ancient and ethnographic frameworks. In the letter, repeated comparisons of the settlers with the Khoi serve to underscore the unspoilt, Christian and thus virtuous nature of the latter and the corruption of the former, especially – though he is not named explicitly – Simon van der Stel.\(^{39}\) The novel does not invoke the frameworks of the letter, but advances an image of Grevenbroek as a learned secretary objecting to the autocratic governor’s actions on ethical grounds – arguably, this is a more modern image that reflects contemporary South African concerns about public office.

In the next sections, I shift to my second point of comparison between the letter and the novel, which concerns their portrayal of the Khoi. I first discuss how a stereotyped image of the Khoi saturates the 17\(^{th}\) century world of the novel and how the characters of Van Meerhoff, Deneyn and Grevenbroek are seen to criticise this image. The novel makes apparent that the derogatory image of the Khoi is related to their position as colonised in the colonial circumstance. Next, I contend that, through the process of ‘Andersmaak’, the novel explores the possibility of the colonised crossing the colonial divide to become part of the world of the coloniser. As the novel’s portrayal of the characters of Autshumao and

\(^{39}\) Although the letter does not mention the governor by name, it is clear that the accusations target him in particular. See Chapter 3.
Krotoa/Eva makes clear, their lack of power prevents them from ever fully crossing over. At the same time, however, the novel also demonstrates the untenability of the colonial divide and thus, through ‘Andersmaak’, develops its postcolonial voice.

**The Khoi in *Eilande***

In the opening paragraphs of his letter about the Khoi, Grevenbroek asserts that he seeks to address his ‘youthful prejudices’ about them, which had been belied by empirically acquired evidence regarding Khoi life at the Cape. Over his years there, he has come to regard the Khoi as human, more Christian than the settlers. Likewise, the novel suggests that Grevenbroek’s interest in the Khoi developed the more time he spent away from Europe.\(^{40}\)

*Eilande* grounds Grevenbroek’s interest in the Khoi in his academic, humanist upbringing and his command of Latin. Both these aspects are traced back to a two-year absence from the Cape. Shortly after his arrival at the Cape in 1684, having taken up his position as secretary to the Council of Policy, Grevenbroek left for India as assistant to VOC Commissioner Van Reede. Archival sources do not provide insight into Grevenbroek’s motivation but do reveal that he resumed his duties upon his return to the Cape in 1686.\(^{41}\)

Between 1678 and 1703, Van Reede published his *Hortus Indicus Malabaricus*, an influential series of 12 volumes on the flora and fauna of the Malabar on the west coast of India, in Latin.\(^{42}\) The novel speculates that when Grevenbroek returns to the Cape, his interests shift from botany to the Khoi, and he discovers in himself a passion for writing in Latin:\(^{43}\)

---

\(^{40}\) Sleigh: ‘Sy medelye met die Koina het nie altyd bestaan nie, dit was as gevolg van ‘n verandering van denke nadat hy meer oor hulle en die verhouding tussen hulle en die blankes geleer het’. (Private correspondence with Dan Sleigh, 15 May 2018).

\(^{41}\) Farrington-Schapera (1933, 161) mistakenly writes that Grevenbroek accompanied Commissioner Van Goens. Van Goens’ log book mentions Grevenbroek’s request to return to the Cape, as does the Cape’s *Daghregister*, but again without any statement of motivation. Farrington-Schapera (1933, Introduction to Grevenbroek).

\(^{42}\) The entire series was translated into Dutch by Abraham Poot in 1720 as *Malabaarse Kruidhof* (Amsterdam).

\(^{43}\) Sleigh: ‘Ons weet […] nie hoekom Grevenbroek die Kaap kortliks verlaat het om later weer terug te kom nie. Maar dit is ‘n feit dat kommissaris Van Reede die boek *Hemelse velde* geskryf het. Grevenbroek se brief oor die Koina en Sonqua is amper poeties waar dit handel oor die Kaapse flora. So ek het maar besluit dat hy met Van Reede saamgekom het omtrent sy botaniese belangstelling – en natuurlik die salaris’ (Maas (2018)).
plantaarde? Miskien het hy nie die wetenskappelike gawe nie. Hy het begin om homself te ken. Sy
gawe was taal. En sy hart was nog nooit in die botanie nie. (713-14)

It is not known if Grevenbroek ever wrote on botany. However, both the letter and
the novel relate his interest in the Khoi to his experiences outside Europe. As noted,
Grevenbroek’s introduction to the letter frames his discussion of the Khoi in ancient and
Christian discourse. Also, his ubiquitous referencing of and allusions to ancient literature
suggest a humanist, academic upbringing. Post-mortem auction records of his book
collection confirm that Grevenbroek possessed a humanist interest and command of
modern and ancient languages that was most likely unique for the Cape at the time. 44

A notable difference with the letter is that in Eilande neither an ancient nor a
Christian discourse plays a role in framing Grevenbroek’s thoughts about the Khoi, although
Christian values are seen to shape his character in a more general way. Chapter seven
provides one of the more explicit instances of this. When Grevenbroek is writing an
epigram, this is described as follows:

Probeer so leef dat dit hoop op ‘n ewige lewe skep, anders is menslike bestaan doelloos. As daar ná
ons sterwe niks is nie of geen hiernamaals, moes ons so geleef het dat dit ‘n onreg sal wees. Hy
herlees die epigram met sy kop skep gehou, vervang die woord skep met bevorder, plaas ‘n
vraagteken daarby, maak ‘n punt bo elke i, en druk die papier bo by sy toga se mou in om later
daaroor te dink. Die gedigte het hy meer as sestig jaar gelede by ‘n vader ab gekry, en hy werk steeds
aan die bewoording. Hy is oortuig hy kan daarop verbeter. Moontlik word dit ‘n bruikbare epigraaf,
eendag. (687) 45

The epigram suggests an attempt to live a meaningful personal life and the ‘vader ab’ and
‘hiernamaals’ invoke Christian connotations. 46 However, in the novel these connotations do
not have a bearing on Grevenbroek’s engagement with the Khoi. Eilande, although alluding
to the idea that Grevenbroek’s Christianity is different from that of his fellow-settlers, does
not present it as a pillar of his worldview. 47 As I will show, underpinning his framing of the
Khoi in the novel is, rather, a concern with the dominant (colonial) discourse.

45 I have found no historical evidence of this epigram or of any other personal writing by Grevenbroek besides
his letter on the Khoi.
46 The epigram can be traced back to Ancient Greece, where the term εἰγραφή (epigrafe, inscription) referred
to an inscription, mostly in stone, such as a funerary or religious inscription. The Roman poet Martial (40-104),
who wrote short, often quippy verses, was influential in establishing it as a literary genre.
47 In his diary, Adam Tas (Fouché and Smuts (1914)) mentions that Grevenbroek worked with him to safeguard
people in a church in Stellenbosch during a storm one night. Sleigh: ‘Hoewel hulle [die Stellenboschers] maar
As for the second pillar of Grevenbroek’s letter, the ancient worldview, the novel explicitly refers to Grevenbroek’s ancient schooling and upbringing to speculate that herein lies the root of his academic, humanist reflections on the Cape and appreciation of the Khoi. Drawing on archival sources, Eilande mentions that Grevenbroek’s father was a teacher at the ‘Latynse skool’ and speculates that ‘Dit was sy vader, wat sy enigste seun Guilielmus in plaas van Wilhelmus laat doop het’ (693). Indeed, Grevenbroek was raised in the heart of town at Leiden’s most-prestigious canal (‘Raapenburg’ (699)), on the doorstep of Leiden University. Although there is no evidence of his education, the novel suggests a certain privilege derived from being so near the Leiden academic environment: ‘Wat homself betref, hy het as kind nooit ‘n skool besoek nie omdat dit nie nodig was nie. As ‘n kind in Leiden sy dag in ‘n skool moet omsit, is daar ‘n fout met sy ouers. Elke openbare gebou binne die Singels is ‘n skool’ (693). Reflecting the knowledge systems of Grevenbroek’s time, the novel depicts him as raised by university and church, as being educated about the world through books, most notably from the ancient world, and suggests that the world of the VOC was equally close:

Benewens die Latyn van sy ouerhuis vir universiteit en kerk, kon hy vroeg ook Frans en Engels lees. Vreemde lande het in biblioteke bestaan. Die hele wêreld was in boeke. Geheimsinnige helde, deels mite, deels vermoede, uit Persië, Rome en Griekenland, het in sy kamer herleef, en die Ooste was daar net oor sy drumpel. (695)

The novel has Grevenbroek, like many privileged youngsters of his time, undertake a Grand Tour of several years of Europe’s ancient and religious monuments at the end of his education: he visits Rome and Naples, and spends time in the monasteries of Benedict, Franciscan, Dominican, Carmelite, Capuchin, Servite and Jesuit monks (697-699). Eilande thus suggests that by the time he signed up for the Cape, Grevenbroek had enjoyed a full humanist upbringing, making him a learned secretary working under a less educated, unscrupulous governor. As with the Christian framework, the novel does not explicitly develop particular elements of Grevenbroek’s ancient education.
Thus, while Grevenbroek’s concern in the letter on the Khoi is an epistemological re-orientation with regards to their image, in order to show that virtue can exist in any ‘genus’ of native people, in the novel, it is his academic background that explains his critical mindset with regards to the governor, and that lends authority to his postcolonial effort to make heard various voices silenced by the monolithic VOC-generated narrative of the early Cape.

The seven protagonists whose voices are unsilenced in the novel are introduced in the prologue through their name and occupation. They are Europeans from within the Castle or Cape settlement – Grevenbroek, Deneyn and Pieter Havgard –, a European from outside the Castle – the postkeeper –, one non-European (Chief Harry) and a fisherman. The prologue establishes three binaries that govern the narrative: Europeans versus Khoi, men versus women, and the Castle versus the non-Castle. In the course of the novel, however, these binaries are also disturbed: the two learned gentlemen at the Castle, Grevenbroek and Deneyn, hold different opinions about the Khoi from the other settlers, and Krotoa physically moves from her tribe to the Castle.

Although the novel shows that diverging views about the Khoi existed at the Cape, even within the Castle administration, its focal point is the Castle, centre of European administration at the Cape. This brings along with it an hierarchical, oppositional framing of the Khoi-settler dynamic, visualised as Castle versus non-Castle, and expressed in the use of derogatory terms for the Khoi. In the novel, Van Riebeeck adopts a hostile stance towards the Khoi: ‘Vir die inboorlinge moet daar nie ‘n duim grond oorbly nie. Hulle moet weg uit Tafelberg se skaduwee uit’ (92). As commander of the Cape, Van Riebeeck must make the refreshment station a success and perceives the ‘Hottentots’ as contestants for the fertile ground in the Castle’s vicinity: ‘Dit was nie die Here Meesters se bedoeling dat hulle skepe vir ons van kos moet voorsien nie, maar andersom. […] Die Hottentotte hou ons skraal, die hase en bokke vreet ons groente, en die volk is opstandig van honger’ (78). The early years of Dutch settlement at the Cape were marked by gradual expansion of the settler community: the VOC pushed demands for exclusive use of lands, for which – it is stressed in the novel – little compensation was offered to the Khoi besides tobacco, brandy, beads and

---

48 The early success of the VOC at the Cape was dependent on the Khoi’s willingness to barter. As shown in Chapter 1, the mission letter from the Lords XVII from 1651 outlined the appeasing approach to the Khoi that Van Riebeeck was to build his policies at the Cape around. In his reply, Van Riebeeck, however, expressed a reluctance to trust the Khoi on the basis of reports of Khoi violence written after the experiences of two shipwrecked Dutch crews near the Cape in 1644 and 1647.
other trifles. In the novel, Van Riebeeck drafts a plan to confiscate the fertile Liesbeeck Valley from the Khoi and build a palisade with armed checkpoints all the way from Table Mountain to False Bay to mark it off:

Dar sou ‘n heining wees om rowers uit te hou, en gewapende ruiter, en alles sou met kanonne bewaak word. [...] Hy sou al sy mag in die projek gooi, en die Liesbeeckvallei een groot bewaakte boerdery maak, sodat die bruin herders besef dit kan nie herwin word nie. (89)\(^{49}\)

Within a year after Van Riebeeck’s arrival, the spatial separation between natives and settlers develops into a physical border. A hedge physically separates Khoi and settlers and serves as tangible confirmation of an imagined separation of the uncouth, idle animal from the civil, hard-working man.

Van Riebeeck’s opposition of Khoi and European man, as portrayed in *Eilande*, is grounded in 17th century European discourse about the Khoi – the very discourse that Grevenbroek challenges in his letter. The binary opposition between Khoi and Europeans is established in the first chapter of the novel, with the arrival of the English:

[Autshumao] hoor die Engelse praat oor die Kaap se kos en water en brandhout. “My dear fellow, a simple takeover. No trouble at all.” Jy stamp die stinkerds opsy, en vat grond, water, bome en gras. “The natives are harmless. Like children, really.” (7)

Although Grevenbroek as narrator refers to various Cape tribes and peoples by distinct names, the English, Van Riebeeck and various other settlers amalgamate them under labels such as ‘natives’ or ‘Hottentots’. The point of departure in each of the seven chapters is the dominant 17th century image of the natives as unworthy of the name of man (91), cowardly (173), superstitious (309), rude, clumsy, without education, more bestial than human (395), barbaric and a disgusting race (444). This image is maintained through a sustained practice of spatial separation.

In the novel, demarcated, physical boundaries such as Van Riebeeck’s hedge between the natives and the Dutch appear in several chapters. Hans Michiel, outpost commander at Keert de Koe, comments that his outpost and the fence that runs from it marks the border between the settlement grounds and the ‘suiwer en onophoudelike barbarisme’; the fence is patrolled from his outpost, ‘die enigste opening tussen die kolonie

\(^{49}\) A short stretch of Van Riebeeck’s hedge has been preserved *in situ* at the Kirstenbosch Botanical Gardens in Cape Town.
en Afrika’ (309). Keert de Koe’s perspective exemplifies the hierarchisation of colonial and native culture, and the resulting marginalisation of the Khoi. The opposition between the Dutch self and the Other, between European civility and its perceived absence in native culture, is further stressed by the novel’s mentioning of ‘wit mense’ who return from the other side of Keert de Koe after dusk, when the gate is closed for reasons of safety, and ‘Afrika, nog leër, donkerder [as die nag]’ (314).

The fence is a one-sided construct on the part of the settlers and is the materialisation of a mental opposition. Time and again, the fence is the cause of strife and war. The omniscient narrator emphasises that ‘Die Koina het nie van die hek gehou nie’, and asserts that ‘Hulle sou die hekwag te lyf gaan en die hek probeer oopbreek’. Van Meerhoff reflects:

Oorlog het tussen sy mense en [Krotoa se] mense uitgebreek, omtrent ‘n jaar na sy aankoms. Dit was ook onvermydelik. Daar was twee aanspraakmakers op ‘n voedingsbron en die swakke moes wyk vir die sterke. Wie die sterke was, die Koina of die wyebroek, moes uitgemaak word. (77)

War is presented as an inevitable consequence of the aim of the refreshment station. Gradually, the threat of war comes to frame the relations between the settlers and the natives. Van Riebeeck asks Krotoa to bring to her people a declaration of war (‘oorlogsverklaring’ (87)) and puts a reward on killing or bringing in male natives: ‘Van Riebeeck het uit sy eie sak honderd gulde aangebied vir die een wat die leier van die rowers [inbring]. Vyftig vir sy dooie kop. Vir ander Hottentotte was die vergoeding tien gulde [per kop]’ (87). Thus develops the general opposition between Khoi and Europeans.

Francois Smith, in his article ‘Sleigh met Tolstoi vergelyk’ (2004), points out that policies of suppression and annihilation are not regarded as inhumane in colonial discourses where ‘the Other’ is regarded as unworthy and only partially human or lacking humanity altogether. Indeed, Van Riebeeck uses the term ‘Hottentotte’, thereby invoking the dominant derogatory 17th century discourse about the Khoi. In Eilande, the Dutch settlers and the VOC administration take for granted that Khoi lands can be taken without legal procession, that they may be shot if seen with a weapon (87), that they should face the death penalty if caught stealing cattle (86), that their heads are worth 10 Dutch guilders each (87) and that their names will be erased from the books of history (119). Also, during
an expedition into the Cape hinterlands a Dutch sergeant tells Pieter about his feelings after a war against the French and compares it with skirmishes against the Khoi:

[...] jy voel soos ‘n koning wat uit goue skottels eet, want jy het hard geveg en oorwin, en jou respek vir die vyand is hoog. Maar hier voel jy aldag slegter; dit voel of jy teen verdomde skape veg [...] ‘Ek het vir hulle geen respek nie, meester [Pieter]. Nie op die slagveld nie en nie op straat nie. Ek reken hulle nie as waardig nie’. (91)

The sergeant’s comparison of the Khoi with sheep reflects the contemporary animalisation of the Khoi.

Thus, the novel shares with Grevenbroek’s letter its point of departure in developing an argument for the Khoi: the dominant 17th century idea that the Khoi are not on a par with European man. In the novel, Grevenbroek, Deneyn, and Van Meerhoff are the three Europeans who present a counter-voice. In the case of Van Meerhoff, Eilande relates this to his affection for Krotoa and their subsequent marriage. Grevenbroek and Deneyn have different motivations.

Chapter 7 immediately makes clear that Grevenbroek aims to oppose Company policy with regards to the Khoi out of a desire to contribute to the body of human knowledge:

Wat De Grevenbroek geïnteresseer het, was die vraag: Daardie inboorlinge wat uit hierdie waterryke oowerweiding verdryf is, wat het van hulle geword? Hoe meer hy oor hulle gelees het, hoe meer wou hy oor hulle lot weet. Die antwoorde, vir hom as ‘n nuwe Kapenaar, was uiers interessant. Dit wou voorkom asof die Kompanjie hulle opsetlik aan drank en tabak verslaaf gemaak het om hulle beeste goedkoop in die hande te kry. Die beeste was nodig vir landbou en vervoer. Valentyn, die predikant, het reeds een en ander daaroor gepubliseer. Hy, De Grevenbroek, sou dit ook doen; miskien was hy tog hier in die beste posisie om ‘n bydrae tot die menslike kennis, tot die rekord, te maak. (702)

Grevenbroek provides a critical perspective on the relationship between the Khoi and the Dutch. The phrasing implies an ethical disparity between company policy and Grevenbroek’s opinion: the Dutch have wilfully addicted the Khoi so that they could buy their cattle at a bargain. Grevenbroek’s ‘bydrae tot die menslike kennis’ in Eilande consists in uncovering this unequal relationship between VOC and Khoi, and the role played in this by governor Simon van der Stel. Ultimately, in the novel Grevenbroek aims not so much to make an argument for the Khoi as an argument against a singular image of the past.
The person in *Eilande* who seems most concerned with the Khoi from an academic point of view is not Grevenbroek, but the lawyer Deneyn, who, in Chapter 5, is confronted with a case of murder.\(^{50}\) A settler has murdered a Khoi man who was allegedly involved in a cattle raid on the Castle. Three Khoi chiefs report to the Castle, reminding the Council that not so long ago five young Khoi men were captured by the Company, whipped, and sent to Robben Island to work for the Company.\(^{51}\) The chiefs ask: ‘Hoe kan daar sekere strawwe vir Koina en ander strawwe vir Hollanders wees?’ (396). Deneyn does not answer immediately as he struggles to justify the company’s refusal to bring the murderer to justice whilst punishing the five native cattle thieves. In his papers, however, he legitimates the punishment of the five thieves through the popular view that Khoi were beasts, not men:

> Deneyn het nie ‘n antwoord vir hulle [the chiefs] gehad nie, maar destyds het hy sy persoonlike oortuiging duidelik op papier gestel toe hy sy pleidooi vir die straf van die vyf seuns gelewer het. Die Afrikaanse inlanders, genaamd Hottentotte, het hy geskryf, is deur alle Europese nasies waar in die wêreld hulle ook al mag reis, tot dusver die brutaalste bevind, wat volgens die autoriteit en geloof van geskiedskrywers alle ander in onkunde en verfoeilike sedes ver te bowe gaan. Ten opsigte van hulle opvoeding, geaardheid en leefwyse skyn hulle meer dierlik as menslik te wees. Hulle het die voorkoms van redelike wesens en het gevolglik ‘n redelike siel, maar ek is onseker of die beginsels van die volkereg op hulle van toepassing is. So staan dit daar, in sy skrif. (396-7)\(^{52}\)

In its exploration of the opposition between European peoples and ‘other peoples’ along the lines of contemporary ethnographic categories – virtue, nature and way of life – this passage reflects the method employed in Grevenbroek’s letter.\(^{53}\) In opposition to the letter, however, as argued in Chapter 3, Deneyn’s use of ‘Hottentotte’ confirms a dominant 17\(^{th}\) century presentation of the Khoi.

In what follows, Deneyn casts doubt on his earlier judgment and proclaims the treatment of the Khoi unjust in a similar way to Grevenbroek putting his ‘youthful prejudices’ into question in the letter. Where Grevenbroek’s position is marked out through an opposition with Simon van der Stel, governor IJsbrandt Goske appears as Deneyn’s

---

50 Huigen (1991): ‘Tot einde 1674 was De Neyn fiscaal aan de Kaap. Daarmee was hij de hoogste juridische ambtenaar. De fiscaal moest zorgen voor de handhaving van wet en orde en de bewaring van de voc-monopolie in de handel. Het was een positie van enig aanzien, zeker ter plaatse’.

51 In Chapters 2 and 3 I explained that ethnographic parameters drive Grevenbroek’s discussion of Khoi culture in his letter. In the novel, the image of the Khoi is built around more general conditions that are constitutive of the colonial master-narrative, such as forced labour. It is a historical fact that Khoi were sentenced to work for the Company at Robben Island.

52 There is no historical evidence that Deneyn wrote any pleas or passages of this nature.

53 Indeed, besides Grevenbroek, Deneyn is the only protagonist in the novel who, by virtue of his profession, may be supposed to have enjoyed an academic education.
antagonist. More so than his predecessors, Goske, the Cape’s first governor from 1672 until 1676, actively suppresses the Khoi and does not bother with his chief-lawyer’s concerns.\(^{54}\) Grevenbroek, the narrator, comments: ‘Goske het begin deur sy gesag op die Skiereilandse Koina af te dwing’ (425). The governor issues a letter of instruction for his soldiers, his \textit{Instructie}, ‘wat sê die Gonjemans [a Cape tribe] moet ’n skrik kry wat hulle nageslagte sal onthou’ (439). He also issues orders such as this one: ‘Goske het laat bekend maak dat enige Hottentot wat met ’n assegai gesien word as ’n vyand beskou en sonder uitsondering gedood sal word’ (441). Eventually, he wages war against the Ngonnemoa, a native people who live on fertile lands that the Company seeks for herding its cattle. Deneyn wonders if confiscating the land out of the blue and a potential massacre are the right course:

Was dit oorlog? het Deneyn gewonder [...] Oorloë word verklaar deur die oorhandiging van amptelike notas tussen regerings, en in hierdie geval het die Nederlander tot die vlak van die barbaar gedaal en hulle struikrowery met massamoord vergeld. [...] Die gedane misdaad kon binne weke ’n volksmoord word, want die Koina leef van hulle vee se produkte, en Ngonnemoa se mense en hulle kinders was nou sonder kos in die hart van die winter. Of was volksmoord Goske so doel? Hy sou dit ontken, dit is te verwagte. (441-2)

Deneyn assesses the events against a European ethical framework for warfare; this leads him to feel that the Khoi do not deserve the governor’s approach (declaring war as a response to an act of robbery seems excessive to him, especially when this war will lead to starvation), but does not see him argue in favour of ‘elevating’ the Khoi to the same level in the chain of being as the Dutch. A second case that troubles Deneyn in the novel is Goske’s invitation to witness an ‘execution’ by the beating of natives at the Castle. For Deneyn, the execution’s brutal manner confirms that European justice in Africa is unlawful:

“[E]n as jy vandag iets wil leer van justisie in Afrika, kom saam met my op die muur, en kyk van daar af.” Wat Deneyn van die muur af gesien het, was die stadige, stelselmatige doodslaan van vier mense deur vreemdelinge wat niks daarby verloor het of baat nie, met stokke effens dikker en skaars langer as sy eie wandelstok. Dit is onwettig, was sy eerste gedagte; die mense is ter dood veroordeel, maar nie tot marteling nie. (443)

\(^{54}\) The rank of governor, having been created as a temporary measure during the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-1674), would be re-installed at the Cape in 1691 for the remainder of the Dutch administration, with Simon van der Stel the first incumbent. Before a governor was installed, the VOC appointed administrators, the first of whom Jan van Riebeeck. Goske started the construction of a more permanent Castle at the Cape that still stands today: the five-pointed star.
These two examples convince Deneyn that installing true justice at the Cape demands a different approach. He seeks guidance from the lawbooks he looked to as a student but these books have nothing of use to tell him about the status of the ‘Hottentots’, the power invested in a governor, or the applicability of European frameworks to an African context:

[Deneyn] het naslaanboeke uit sy studiejare gelees om leiding. Dit was maklik om te sê: My boek weet nie van slawe nie; my boek sê niks van Hottentotte nie; my boek weet nie van [goewerneur] Goske nie; my boek ken nog nie ’n handelsmaatskappy wat die wêreld aan die keel beet het nie; my boek sê niks van ’n Kasteel wat met krag en kaal hande uit dorre duine boontoe gebeur word nie. Dit was maklik om vir homself verskonings te vind. [...] Die boek vertel net van my jeug in Wes-Europa. Ek sien niks wat hier kan help nie. Hier is die Kaap; ek is gevang en verban op ’n dorre eiland; ek staan alleen, ek het geen leier of leiding nie. (444)

Deneyn concludes that knowledge is situated and not of use outside the context it was produced in:

Toe kom die gedagte by hom: hy sou graag nou terug universiteit toe gaan om vir die studente te sê: “Wag. Pas op. Wat julle leraars verduidelik, wat julle hier in boeke lees, lyk anders buite Leiden se stadsmure, anders in ’n storm op see, anders in Afrika, anders in ’n kaserne in die Ooste. En as hulle hom sou antwoord: “Wat moet ons doen? Het jy advies vir ons?” Dan moet hy sê hy weet nie, hy probeer sy bes doen op die plek waar hy is. Deneyn was ’n gevangene van daardie kasteel. (444-5)

Deneyn’s assertion that Africa is different from Europe follows from the urge to provide an alternative to Goske’s oppression – to adapt his knowledge to adequately and justly serve the unfamiliar environment. The final line of the passage, which proclaims him a prisoner of the Castle, makes clear that his views are not shared by the administration he serves. In Eilande, then, Deneyn shares with Grevenbroek the desire to make known the untenability of the way the Cape is run and particularly how the governor acts with regards to the Khoi.

Eventually, Deneyn is dismissed from the Cape by the new governor, Bax, who demands that he overturn some of his verdicts. Deneyn, the highest-ranking jurist at the Cape, refuses, as he feels this would be unfair to the Khoi. Bax concludes his discussion with Deneyn thus: “As jy nie omgee vir my wense nie, kan jy liwier jou kis gepak hou vir die eerste baarskip wat hier inloop. Jy sal Batavia toe gaan, of jy wil of nie” (518). These final words of the chapter on Deneyn confirm the degree of autonomy with which governors
after Van Riebeeck were able to run the Cape.\textsuperscript{55} Deneyn’s voice is made to submit to the colonial master-narrative, but Grevenbroek’s \textit{Beeld van die Kaap}, by including it, preserves Deneyn’s island in the ocean of history.

In the novel, Deneyn, with his troubled vision, is one of the voices resisting the dominant discourse of the time about the Khoi. Rather than providing a single, coherent alternative view, the novel presents a postmodern, postcolonial history of the Cape in which the multiplication of perspectives argues for the untenability of any master narrative. Where Grevenbroek’s letter limited itself to the self-side of the colonial divide (he is ultimately concerned with the behaviour of the Dutch), \textit{Eilande} as a historical novel not only presents conflicting colonial voices, but also explores Khoi actions relating to the divide between them and the settlers that the latters’ arrival had initiated. The novel frames historical facts about Krotoa and Autshumao as reactions to the colonial divide and as attempts to resolve it. After exploring the failure and detrimental consequences of these attempts, \textit{Eilande} concludes that a successful reframing of the Khoi as human is impossible in a society shaped by colonial discourse. Yet, as I will show in the following section, although Krotoa and Autshumao fail to become a part of Dutch society, their actions point to the unsustainability of the unequal power balance through which a colonial society justifies its authority.

‘Andersmaak’

The arrival of the Dutch at the Cape leads to an opposition between settlers and Khoi that materialises in measures such as Van Riebeeck’s hedge. Several of \textit{Eilande}’s characters, notably Autshumao (Chief Harry; Herrie) and Krotoa (Eva), are moved into frustrated efforts to overcome or resolve the divide. I argue that they find themselves unable to cross over and ‘become’ the other, because the colonial context, although initiating their remaking within the coloniser’s discourse (‘Andersmaak’), also prevents them from being framed as equals to the settlers. Ultimately, this leads to the colonised’s demise. Yet, the cases of Autshumao and Krotoa also point to how the unequal power balance makes a colonial

\textsuperscript{55} Huigen (1991) describes how Deneyn moved from the Cape to India in 1674, not forced by the governor, but of his own accord, ‘in de hoop daar zijn fortuin te maken’. Accusations of drinking, frivolity and illegally benefiting from selling goods transported on Company ships followed him, but he never admitted any wrongdoing.
society untenable in the long run. This makes ‘Andersmaak’ a key aspect of Eilande’s postcolonial critique.

The ‘Andersmaak’ of Chief Harry plays out in the face of an increasing European presence at the Cape. Eilande’s opening chapter Die andersmaak van Chief Harry (The Remaking of Chief Harry) shows how Autshumao’s identity is remade three times as a direct consequence of the arrival of Europeans at the Cape. Autushumao’s story illustrates that ‘Andersmaak’ involves complex processes of identification across the boundaries between social groups. Before 1652, Authumao, ‘een rooi sonop leier van die Goringhaicona’ (3), has regular dealings with mainly the English, who come to Table Bay to refresh and barter cattle, and who call him Chief Harry. Grevenbroek recounts how Autshumao’s name was changed to Chief Harry when he was taken on a journey to the East by the English: ‘Op daardie reis het Autshumao die seenvolk se siektes aangesteek, hulle taal geleer en Chief Harry geword. Jy kon maar soek, Autshumao was nie meer daar nie’ (5). The change in names is marked typographically in the novel: ‘Autshumao, Chief Harry, het die laaste dae van die maande van die seereis [to the East] deur die hete trope op sy rug deurgebring’ (7). The chapter continues by focusing on the arrival of the Dutch and their initial contact with the native peoples, which prompts a second change of identity for Autshumao. The Dutch still call him Chief Harry (Herrie), but Grevenbroek comments that they have changed his identity yet again by framing him as the leader of the ‘Hottentot’ rather than as ‘Strandloper’ or ‘Sonqua’: ‘[Hy] het drie maal andersmaak gehad. Hy was Strandloper, toe Sonqua, en nou is hy Hottentot, soos die Hollander dit sien’ (53).56

Although the name Chief Herrie confirms Autshumao’s status as chief, the colonisers’ unwillingness to call him by his birth name illustrates the unequal power balance between the Europeans and the Cape native people. Eilande’s protagonists – with the exception of Grevenbroek – give no sign of any awareness that Autshumao belongs to the Goringhaicona. As explained in Chapter 1, European reports from the decades before Van Riebeeck already attest to an awareness that the Cape peoples are not one. Nevertheless, the Dutch settlers in the novel frame him as a Hottentot, the generic derogatory term for a Cape native.

56 The novel portrays the Dutch as aware that the Khoi are not one people, but finding this irrelevant: ‘Die Hollanders kon nie verklaar waarom daar twis tussen die groepies Hottentotte was nie, maar dit was van geen belang vir die skeepsdiens nie’ (16).
The ‘Andersmaak’ that Grevenbroek has Chief Harry undergoing goes beyond a change of names. The Europeans and Khoi frame the world and the people that inhabit it very differently. By adopting the European nomenclature to refer to himself, Autshumao accepts the European framing of the Cape as the dominant one. However, when he tells his tribe that he has a new name, they do not accept his new identity: ‘Hy het hulle vertel sy nuwe naam is Chief Harry, maar hulle het hom nie geglo nie’ (8). Autshumao decides to shift between identities: amongst his native people, he is Autshumao; amongst the Dutch, he is Chief Harrie. This indicates an awareness on Autshumao’s part of the new power balance that the European arrival has initiated, and his position in it. He adopts the identity the coloniser ascribes to him as a means to secure his people’s future in a Cape dominated by settlers. As Grevenbroek the narrator tells the reader, focalising through Autshumao:

Vreemde nasies sal in Gogosoa [a native chief] se weiding kom woon; dit is hulle kinders wat sy land sal besit. Hy [Autshumao] sien dat dit vir die Koina in komende tye beter kan wees om vriende met die wittes te bly, om eers die teenstander se vee en kinders te help grootmaak. [...] Vir die guns om self ‘n paar beeste te laat wei, en ‘n kans om op die been te kom, moet die Koina vrede hou met hulle. So gaan dit beter wees vir die Koina, vir hulle wat sonder perde die nuwe heersers moet verwelkom. (7)

Autshumao realises that the Khoi will be dominated by the ‘wittes’ and focuses his thoughts on the need to keep the peace with them in the terms of the inferiority implied by the Dutch ‘Hottentot’.

Another chief, Oedasoa, realises that white men will continue to increase their presence at the Cape at the cost of the native peoples. As the European settlement struggles to become self-sufficient, let alone re-supply passing ships, fertile lands are sought further inland, where tribes are put under increasing pressure to barter and surrender pasture. Oedasoa discusses his concerns about the future of his people with Autshumao and accuses him of helping the Dutch to destroy the Khoi:

“Die Hollander sal oor die berg gaan en die Chainouqua en die Hessequa uit hulle weidings uitjaag, dat sy diere daar kan loop. Waar moet ons Koina wei?” “Dit sal nog lank wees voor hy so sterk is.” “Maar jy, Autshumao, jy help hom vooruit. Jy is nie ’n Hollander nie, waarom werk jy teen jou mense?” (46-47)

Oedasoa confirms that the separation between native people and the Dutch cannot be overcome by Autshumao’s pragmatic strategy of shifting identities, by his ‘Andersmaak’. By
trying to be both Khoi and Dutch, Autshumao confirms the divide between coloniser and colonised. Although he clearly hopes that his approach will ensure his people’s survival, Oedasoa points out that Autshumao is not in fact Dutch and has betrayed his people by choosing their side. Thus, ‘Andersmaak’ manoeuvres the native people into a marginalised position.

The inequality between coloniser and colonised is a central concern of Homi Bhabha in his paper ‘Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse’ (1984). In his discussion of the colonial circumstance, he asserts that a colonial setting is characterised by a fundamental inequality that can be described in terms of power, and he observes that ‘the question of representation of difference is therefore always also a problem of authority’. Where such authority is established or enforced, patterns of thought about the other become rigid and keep the (colonised) other separated from the (colonising) self. Importantly, the authority to which the colonial subject is subjected determines the representation of the other. Bhabha describes this as ‘the process of the fixation of the colonial as a form of cross-classificatory, discriminatory knowledge’. From the perspective of the coloniser, renaming Autshumao Chief Harry fixes him as the colonial subject and the animalistic ‘Hottentot’.

As mentioned in the Introduction, in her article ‘Cross-Mirrorings of Alterity’ (1999), Monika Fludernik distinguishes between heterostereotypes and autostereotypes to understand the processes at play in ‘conditions of colonial oppression or, [...] in the circumstances of migration, exile and cultural hybridity’. She defines a heterostereotype as an imagological framework about another people, while an autostereotype is a person or a people’s self-image. By adopting the name that the Europeans gave him and introducing himself to his tribe as Chief Harry, Autshumao subsumes his self-image as Goringhaicona to the European heterostereotype of the Other. Fludernik would see this as an example of ‘the appropriation on the part of the colonial subject of the negative heterostereotype imposed on him as his very own autostereotype’. Autshumao’s presentation as Chief Harry thus

---

57 Bhabha (1984, 130).
58 Bhabha (1984, 131).
60 Fludernik (1999, 31). She also goes into the gender aspect of the colonial scenario.
contributes to the fixation of an unequal power relation between the ‘wittes’ or ‘die nuwe heersers’ and the native peoples.\textsuperscript{61}

Autshumao is forced to remake himself in the colonial encounter, being subjected to a power imbalance engrained in the colonial relation between coloniser and colonised. Yet, Bhabha emphasises that, under colonial conditions, one cannot attain settler identity but only approximate it. The colonised subject is only allowed to appropriate or imitate particular aspects of coloniser culture that are earmarked for this purpose. Bhabha calls this mimicry, because it ‘appropriates [into coloniser culture] the Other as it visualizes the power’.\textsuperscript{62} Colonial mimicry arises from the colonist’s ‘desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite’.\textsuperscript{63} As Bhabha describes it for the British colonial setting: ‘to be Anglicized, is emphatically not to be English’.\textsuperscript{64} What this suggests is that the “colonial” is dependent for its representation upon some strategic limitation or prohibition within the authoritative discourse itself.\textsuperscript{65} In other words, mimicry gives the colonial subject a partial presence in the coloniser culture, while keeping this subject recognisable as the other. As I have shown, the novel grants Autshumao a partial presence in the coloniser culture insofar as it benefits the refreshment station: Van Riebeeck concedes that Autshumao – by virtue of the respect his people accord him as chief and because he speaks English and Dutch – is instrumental to the early settlement’s barter and peace with the natives. This partial presence or mimicry materialises around his name: Autshumao is given a Dutch name, Herrie, but with the added title ‘chief’ which marks him as still a native (non-Dutch) person. Moreover, ‘Herrie’ is surmised to be not just the Dutch rendering of the name the English gave to him, Harry, but to be also an onomatopoeia for the undefinable noise (Dutch: herrie) that his native language makes to Dutch ears.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, Autshumao, notwithstanding his (forced) adaptation of the negative heterostereotype as his autostereotype, is only partially appropriated into the coloniser culture.

\textsuperscript{61} One could argue that in adopting the coloniser’s title for him, Autshuamo expresses a ‘wish to become white, to exchange places with the colonizer’ (Fludernik 1999, 31). Yet, I find there to be little evidence for this; Autshumao’s ‘Andersmaak’ is presented in the novel as a strategic choice to ensure the future well-being of his people.
\textsuperscript{62} Bhabha (1984, 126).
\textsuperscript{63} Bhabha (1984, 126, emphasis in text, as for all other emphasis in Bhabha (1984)).
\textsuperscript{64} Bhabha (1984, 128).
\textsuperscript{65} Bhabha (1984, 127).
\textsuperscript{66} Schoeman (2008, Chapter 1).
Because of this irony, ‘colonial subjection’, Bhabha writes, makes apparent the ‘ambivalence of colonial discourse’. The fact that Autshumao is endowed with particular aspects of coloniser culture exemplifies that coloniser identity is (also) a construct, exposing its alleged signs of ‘racial and cultural superiority’, according to Bhabha, as non-inherent and non-essential. The coloniser’s authority, he maintains, is founded solely in power. Exposing the non-naturalness of colonial authority leads to a crisis in the colonial administration, as *Eilande* shows through the case of Krotoa.

Like Autshumao, Krotoa occupies a central place in the relations between the Dutch and the native tribes in the early years of Van Riebeeck’s administration. Yet, in opposition to Autshumao’s narrative, which is told in one chapter, Krotoa’s story runs through all seven chapters. As Grevenbroek notes in the prologue, all seven protagonists knew her or her daughter, Pieternella. Starting as a nanny in the Van Riebeeck family, Krotoa becomes increasingly involved with the Van Riebeeck administration. As an informant and interpreter, she becomes instrumental to the relative success of some of Van Riebeeck’s early measures against the Khoi, such as the fence and targeted campaigns against particular tribes. *Eilande* speculates that, until she and Pieter van Meerhoff, VOC surgeon, meet and fall in love, Krotoa wants to follow the native custom and marry a man of her tribe, but she defers the marriage by repeatedly returning to Van Riebeeck, where she enjoys the comforts the Dutch life offers. Like Autshumao, Krotoa uses the name (Eva) the Dutch give her whenever she is with the settlers. She also changes her clothes when she moves between her native people and the settler community. This again emphasises that ‘Andersmaak’ is not something that happens by choice: Van Riebeeck’s wife insists that Krotoa wash and wear Dutch clothes when she is with them.

After Krotoa falls in love with Pieter, she leaves the Van Riebeeck household less often to visit her people. She is baptised, becomes Pieter’s lawful wife and – in the novel and in South African cultural memory – gives birth to the first legitimate mixed-race baby at the Cape, Pieternella. Differently from Autshumao’s ‘Andersmaak’, Krotoa’s christening and

---

68 Conversely, whenever Krotoa/Eva goes home she changes her Dutch gown for her tribe’s clothes: ‘In haar Hollandse klere het sy tot by die drif in die Brakrivier geloop. [...] [Sy het] haar Hollandse klere uitgetrek, opgevu en in haar bladsak gesit. Toe het sy ‘n velrok en karos omgehang, haar armringe aangesit, en met ‘n stok in die hand verder geloop’. (118)
marriage thus involves the very Christian foundations on which the European autostereotype in the 17th century was founded.

In the novel, Grevenbroek surmises that Eva is at first unwilling to undergo baptism: ‘Eva was onwillig. [...] Hulle wil haar in die Hollandse kamp injaag’ (159), and: ‘Pieter wou haar ompraat’ (160). Yet, seeing that she is pregnant and that, as a consequence, she is irrevocably rejected by her native family, and considering that she will be rejected by the Dutch community unless she marries Pieter, she concedes to embrace settler customs. This, however, does not mean that Krotoa now fully belongs with the Dutch. In *Eilande*, this is first pointed out by Van Riebeeck when she has only just joined his household. Observing that she commutes between her native tribe and the Castle, Van Riebeeck shares his concerns about where she belongs with Pieter:

> Die ding is net, Pieter: Wie is vandag haar mense? Is dit ek of Maria [Van Riebeeck’s spouse], of Herrie [Chief Harry] se mense, of Oedasoa [a Khoi chief] se mense, of haar oorlede pa se mense anderkant die berg? Hier het veranderings oor die Kaap gekom wat haar lot vier, vyf keer verander het. (59)

The passage illustrates an awareness on the part of the coloniser of the effect of the ‘Andersmaak’ induced by the colonial circumstance. Like Autshumao’s fate, that of Krotoa has changed several times under the influence of the Dutch settlement at the Cape. Van Riebeeck acknowledges that Krotoa’s situation is changing as a direct consequence of her work for him, but he is also doubtful about where her loyalty lies – with the Dutch or one of many native peoples. He admits, moreover, that his relationship with her is self-serving: ‘“Ek het gemeen om hulle taal te leer by haar; dit is waarom ek haar in my huis geneem het,” het Van Riebeeck gesê’ (55). Van Riebeeck aims to use Krotoa to learn the Khoi language, signalling that there is no real acceptance: Krotoa remains an Other firmly placed on the other side of the colonial divide. Indeed, Van Riebeeck’s efforts in facilitating the first non-white baptism and the first mixed marriage at the Cape stand in sharp contrast with various suppressive policies he comes to enforce against the Khoi. The novel emphasises that his loyalty ultimately lies with his employer, the VOC, and that although he is not in favour of slavery, he will endorse it as a necessary evil: ‘In Suid-Amerika het die Spanjaard en die Portugees op groot skaal slawe gebruik. Hy was nie ten gunste van slawerny nie, dis op sy beste ’n noodsaklike euwel. Maar hy sal dieselfde doen as daar nie bestes kom vir die Kompanjie se werk nie’ (47). Krotoa, as a go-between, is essential to maintaining good
relations with the native tribes and for successful barter. She is thus tolerated on the Dutch side of the colonial divide, but Van Riebeeck clearly does not consider her ‘one of us’.

The novel shows Krotoa caught between the two sides of the colonial divide, each of which progressively comes to regard her less as a mediator (Khoi) or interpreter (Dutch) than as a traitor (Khoi) and unreliable messenger (Dutch). Seeing that she is spending extended periods of time with the Dutch, her tribe does not accept her anymore as ‘one of them’. Autshumao calls her ‘n spioen van die vyand’ (50). When he is taken captive by the Dutch, Krotoa translates his bile for Pieter: ‘Hy sê ek is ‘n wit man se teef’ (106). Being rejected by her people pushes Krotoa towards Pieter’s colonial life. Tellingly, at her baptism she is granted the name of Eva, the first woman created by God according to the Bible, in a process of ‘Andersmaak’ that Pieter asserts will give her immortality:

Eva, of dalk Krotoa, het Pieter gedink, jou naam is nou ingeskryf, jy sal nooit meer sterf nie. Ek hoop dié andersmaak bring geluk. (162)

As a consequence of the colonial circumstance, Krotoa is thus manoeuvred into a position in which she is left with little choice but to adopt, in Fludernik’s and Bhabha’s terminologies, particular aspects made available to her of the coloniser’s autostereotype. During an evening stroll on the Castle walls, she describes to Pieter that Van Riebeeck’s importance in her life: ‘Die kommandeur is my vader. Die lewe is maklier vir my, en ek kan eendag rustig oud word’ (63). This indicates a pragmatic adoption of the settler identity to make her life easier, rather than an adoption of Dutchness out of a desire to become Dutch. In the same way as Autshumao’s ‘Andersmaak’ is presented in the novel as a strategic choice to ensure the future well-being of his people, Krotoa does not, in Fludernik’s words, ‘wish to become white, to exchange places with the colonizer’.69 In the same dialogue, Krotoa is quoted as admitting to Pieter what she also told Van Riebeeck, who had it copied down in the Daghregister: “Meeste dae dink ek is ek ‘n Hollander” Dit het hy [Pieter] self geskryf gesien, in Van Riebeeck se handskrif, in die Fort se dagregister: Krotoa het gesê dat sy ‘n Hollandse hart het’ (62-3). Here, Krotoa does not say that she is Dutch but that she feels like a Dutch person most days. Also, the novel emphasises that the statement about having a Dutch heart does not come from her but from Van Riebeeck. Thus, Krotoa is not

remade completely. At the same time, by appropriating the particular aspects of colonial identity made available to them, Krotoa and Autshumao underline that the Dutch identity can be adopted by others, exposing, in Bhabha’s words, ‘the ambivalence of colonial discourse’.

In *Eilande*, Krotoa is gradually excluded from both sides of the colonial divide. Pieter observes that she is ‘alone amongst strangers’ and reflects on how this affects her:

> Hy kon sien hoe Eva los raak van Van Riebeeck en sy vrou, die gewoontes, die hoflike taal van die groot huis, en die godsdiens wat sy daar geleer het. Sy het meer gedrink, en soms gevloek. Dit het sy by hom geleer. Soms wou sy net die Koina-taal praat, met hom en al die ander. Hy het vermoed dat sy Van Riebeeck se guns verloor het. Sy was nou alleen tussen vreemdelinge. Die Hollandse vroue het haar vermy omdat sy die goeie sedes oortree het, en sy moes hulle afkeer daarvan verduur. Die Koina, haar enigste mense, het van haar af weggeby omdat sy die Hollander in die oorlog gehelp het, en deesdae omdat sy ’n wit man gehad het wat haar geen respek gee met andersmaak nie. (151)

The ‘Andersmaak’ in the final line of this passage refers to the native transition rites that Krotoa would have gone through had she chosen a native life. Pieter no longer acknowledges aspects of her native identity, making apparent that Krotoa has physically crossed over to the settler culture, but, at the same time, that she is rejected by her own people and increasingly by the man whose colonial customs she has come to embrace. In the passage above, Pieter notes that his wife is becoming more and more depressed: she has started to drink more and is wilfully breaking Dutch norms of good behaviour. From a colonial perspective, she is lapsing back into the heterostereotype of the uncultured, beastly native. Pieter realises that Krotoa’s ‘Andersmaak’ haunts her:

> Dit het Pieter bekommer dat sy neerslagtig word. Hy kon dit daagliks in haar sien, maar vermoed dit is eensaamheid omdat sy geen ma of susters het om haar sake mee te bespreek nie. Hy het nie vermoed dat sy droom oor die andersmaak waaronder sy en haar kind die lewe moes ingaan nie. Want sy was ’n weeskind, ’n dier wat van ’n trop weggedwaal het. (152)

‘Andersmaak’ has forced Krotoa into a crisis of belonging. Pieter surmises that the ‘Andersmaak’ that he hoped would grant her immortality is incomplete, and that the native transition rites (the ‘Andersmaak’ in the passage) now haunt her to the point that she feels orphaned into settler culture. Fludernik notes that the colonised subject’s failure at ‘transferring the image’ — a failure that is inscribed into the colonial system — causes ‘the colonized subject [to] flounder in self-hatred’ (31). As, in response to this self-hatred, Krotoa
begins to shame the settler culture she was awarded entry to, she is more and more rejected by the settlers. Indeed, her ‘Andersmaak’ is halted in that she is offered no further aspects of settler culture to adopt. On the contrary, she is increasingly identified as an outsider in an effort to explain her ostensibly uncultured behaviour. Her skin colour is noted as one aspect that prevents her from ever completely becoming part of settler culture. As Grevenbroek comments: ‘Die arm kind. Die Hollanders het haar geminag omdat sy bruin is, en die Koïna omdat sy onder die Hollander woon. Al twee roep en wys na haar – verraaier’ (97).

The fact that Krotoa is thus caught in the colonial divide brings to the fore the ambivalence of the colonial discourse: she has remained identifiable as a non-settler to the settlers, despite her baptism, marriage and European-style clothing. Through Krotoa’s crisis, *Eilande* explores the conflict in colonial discourse that Bhabha describes as a case of double articulation, or ‘mimicry’. Mimicry, he asserts, on the one hand refers to the partial appropriation of coloniser culture. The coloniser culture sees itself partially represented in the Other and through this partial representation confirms its authenticity and superiority. Krotoa’s baptism and marriage confirm the superiority of settler culture to the administration that enforces it: Krotoa embraces the foundations of the coloniser’s autostereotype, distancing herself from her native customs. However, from the coloniser’s perspective, she again drifts to the native heterostereotype as a consequence of the crisis that ‘Andersmaak’ has brought to her. Moreover, she has always remained identifiable as colonised, most immediately through her skin colour. Krotoa is now simultaneously the embodiment of the ‘Hottentot’ and the archetype of Christian women – Eva. This shows that the image of the Hottentot and that of the coloniser is a construction and can be deconstructed. In Bhabha’s words, Krotoa’s dual embodiment, or ‘Andersmaak’, ‘problematises the signs of racial and cultural priority’, bringing a crisis to the colonial administration.  

The crisis is seemingly resolved by moving Krotoa to Robben Island, when the governor conveniently ‘promotes’ Pieter to be the island’s postkeeper. After Pieter is killed during an expedition to Madagascar, Krotoa is forbidden to return to the Cape. The administration decides to keep her out of public sight. Banished to Robben Island, Krotoa

---

70 Bhabha (1984, 126).
can no longer confront the administration with the ‘double vision’, the ambivalence of colonial discourse. Addicted to alcohol, the novel surmises that she dies there with no friends or family to surround her in 1674.71

Krotoa’s physical banishment from settler culture and her death provide, however, no real solution to the crisis faced by the Dutch coloniser culture that seeks to re-establish its authority. The confrontation with a partial vision of the self that preceded her banishment ‘poses an imminent threat to both “normalized” knowledges and disciplinary powers’ by revealing that settler culture is not naturally superior.72 The sign of Krotoa-as-the-inappropriate-settler makes it necessary for the colonial power to exert its authority by, in Bhabha's terms, intensifying surveillance. Yet, such a re-confirmation of the fixation of the colonial as ‘a form of discriminatory knowledge’, Bhabha maintains, also makes apparent that ‘a colonial circumstance hides no essence, no “itself”’.73 By enforcing its authority and superiority through the exercise of power, a colonial circumstance ‘necessarily raises the question of the authorization of colonial representation’ (131). Thus, Krotoa’s demise, as a consequence of ‘Andersmaak’, ultimately illustrates that a colonial system that defines itself in terms of strict oppositions is set up to never fully accept a colonised subject. Moreover, eventually, it will be exposed by the colonised as not possessing any inherent superiority. In Eilande, at the dawn of the 18th century, when Grevenbroek is writing his Beeld van die Kaap, governor Simon van der Stel is far from realising this. Yet, the notion of ‘Andersmaak’ frames the stories of Autshumao and Krotoa in such a way that, for readers of the novel, the unsustainability of the colonial framework is exposed.

**Conclusion**

*Eilande* is a historical novel that presents a postcolonial reading of the early colonisation of the Cape from the perspective of post-1994 South Africa. The novel is narrated by Grevenbroek and its seven chapters constitute his effort at unsilencing the voices of seven protagonists – presented as forgotten islands in the ocean of history – who all knew the Khoi woman called Krotoa and her daughter Pietermella.

---

71 After Krotoa’s death, her story would become a focus of historical research and a part of South African history after the 1920’s. See, for example, Jansen (2002) and Landman (1996). Examples of her legacy in literature and film include Bloem (2000) and the feature film *Krotoa* (2017).

72 Bhabha (1984, 126).

73 Bhabha (1984, 131).
It is noteworthy that the 17th century frameworks that, in the previous two chapters, I showed to be essential for Grevenbroek’s argument for the Khoi’s humanity in his letter – a ancient worldview, Christian eschatology and early modern ethnography – are not mobilised in relation to his character or his view of the Khoi in the novel. Instead, Grevenbroek’s interest in the Khoi is seen to be driven by a more general humanist concern that is triggered by the unethical way the Cape is being governed by Simon van der Stel’s administration, in which governor Van der Stel is seen to tamper with VOC minutes and records, thereby corrupting the archive and, ultimately, history, underlining the novel’s postcolonial point that seemingly authoritative archives and histories should be questioned and supplemented by the voices they silence.

In this chapter, I have shown how part of Eilande’s value as a postcolonial novel lies in its narrative structure, which reflects the unequal way in which European and Khoi voices, and male and female voices, have been preserved in the historical archive. Rather than suggesting that this inequality can be easily overcome by recuperating the lost voices of history, the way the stories of the native characters in Eilande are told through European eyes draws attention to Spivak’s ‘epistemic violence of imperialism’, which keeps the subaltern from speaking for itself. Another important aspect of Eilande’s renegotiation of the colonial history of the Cape is underlined by its depiction of the colonial process of ‘Andersmaak’ (remaking). By outlining the effects of ‘Andersmaak’ on the Khoi characters of Autshumao and Krotoa, Eilande highlights the harm caused by the strict colonial divide between settlers and native peoples in the early Cape. The novel shows how Grevenbroek, as a colonial narrator, can ultimately only observe the Khoi from the colonial side of the divide, while Autshumao and Krotoa experience the impossibility, within the colonial framework, of being accepted either as native or as assimilated into Dutch culture. By accepting the settler’s name for him and keeping peace with the Dutch, Autshumao hopes to protect his people, but his actions ultimately affirm the dominancy of the settler’s framework and the marginalisation of the native peoples. Krotoa, despite marrying a Dutch man, having his child and being baptised as Eva, is never fully accepted by the Dutch and also loses her native home. Her frustrated crossing over – and the Dutch determination to never fully let her do this, in line with Bhabha’s theory of colonial mimicry – leads to her banishment and untimely death.
The case of Krotoa/Eva illustrates the unsustainability of a society characterised by a colonial divide. Jan van Riebeeck approves Krotoa’s Christian baptism and marriage, seemingly allowing her access to the foundational values of European settler identity. Yet, partly as a consequence of her skin colour, Eva remains Krotoa. The partial representation of the colonial self in the colonised other brings a crisis to the coloniser’s self-image, or, in Fludernik’s terms, autostereotype. Krotoa’s unsuccessful ‘Andersmaak’ illustrates that the coloniser’s supposed authority is not founded in any definite racial or cultural superiority but in the exercise of power.

Eva’s banishment to Robben Island may physically remove the threat she embodies to the administration, but it does not provide a solution to the colonial divide between Cape natives and settlers. The fixed and rigid division of power in which the authority of a colonial regime is invested will also lead to the administration’s ultimate demise. By highlighting what Bhabha calls the ambivalence of colonial discourse, Eilande allows for a different articulation of Cape history. The novel cannot change the course of Cape history as we know it, but it does show that under any apparent (colonial) stasis, there is a (postcolonial) challenge to the status quo.