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Appendix 1
Descriptive Bibliography and History of the Grevenbroek Manuscript Including Brief Comments on its Text Editions

Grevenbroek’s letter exists in one manuscript copy, kept at the National Library of South Africa (Cape Town Campus, Special Collections, MSB203).

Descriptive bibliography MSB203

Dimensions:
cover: 18.0x23.5 cm
paper: 17.5x22.0 cm
written space: consistent body of running script; on the inside is added a column for marginalia, 4-5 cm wide.

State:
No significant damage. The title page shows marks indicating considerable use; it is smudged at the sides, with little cracks at the edges.

Cover:
White-grey, undecorated vellum of an unknown date before 1882. Fly sheets on the inside front and back. The title sheet (supposedly the manuscript’s earlier cover) is bound into the vellum with the quires.

Binding:
The bindings of the individual quires are not aligned with those pasting the manuscript to its vellum cover, and are of a different material. There are no signs of rebinding.

Figure App.1 Post Horn set in Crowned Shield. Drawn from the Grevenbroek manuscript (NLSA MSB203) by me, TM.
Late entries:
On the inside cover are the ex libris of the Sutherland Library and that of the South Africa National Library. Two earlier shelf marks, one in ink, one in pencil.

Collation:
Modest 4º: i + A-O² + i [124 pages]¹
A separate title sheet wraps around A-O.

Paper:
The title sheet is made of uneven paper of a thick quality. The quires are made of thinner paper of regular thickness and smoothness. Possibly the title page served as a protective cover before it was bound in vellum. The watermark in the quires is a post horn set in a crowned shield (figure App.1, previous page). Beneath the shield a sign like an arrow, underneath which are letters spelling ‘WR’. On the other half of the sheet is an unclear countermark, probably depicting the papermaker’s initials (figure App.2). The watermarks are horizontal and at the fold. It is impossible to obtain an unobstructed view of the watermarks as the binding runs through their centre. This makes it particularly hard to identify the (smaller) countermark. Each sheet carries either a watermark or a countermark.

Ink:
Black ink for text and margins.

Hand:
The manuscript is written in a clear, consistent book cursive. The character of the writing does not change visibly and there are no clear ruptures that would allow identifying several scribes.

¹ The NLSA catalogue states ‘121pp.’ indicating the number of written pages. Pages 122 and 123 only have numbering. Page 124 is blank. Van Stekelenburg (2003, 95) has 120 pages.
Place and Date of Composition:

No literature exists about the manuscript history. The ex libris, in combination with comments inscribed on the fly sheet of a separate notebook, allow the origin of the manuscript to be pushed back to 1882. Before it was catalogued into the collection of the South African Public Library, the manuscript was kept at the Sunderland Library in London. It is not known when it arrived there. The central ex libris, its bottom edge tucked under another ex libris, reads: ‘From the Sunderland Library, Blenheim Palace, Purchased [sic], July, 1882, by Bernard Quaritch, 15 Piccadilly, London’. Fairbridge would acquire the manuscript from Bernard Quaritch three years later; a scribble in pencil on the right side of the fly leaf states: ‘Purchased from Mr. Quaritch, November 1885 for C.A. Fairbridge’. The second and most recent ex libris, that of the South Africa Public Library, reads: ‘Presented to the South African Public Library by C.A. Fairbridge Esq.’ The year of presentation has been added in a later hand in pencil: 1886. A note in pencil on the right side of the flysheet in the hand of Fairbridge affirms that it was indeed gifted to the library: ‘Presented to the South African Public Library by A. Fairbridge’ follows his autograph. It has resided at the South African Public Library, now the South African National Library, ever since, and is the only known copy of Grevenbroek’s Elegans et Accurata [...] Descriptio.

History of MSB203

In one of his notebooks, kept at the National Library in Cape Town, Fairbridge noted: ‘N.N. Graevenbroek. Secretary of the Council of Policy for India 1695. The original M.S. [sic] was presented by me to the S.A. Public Library. CAF’ (figure App.4, next page). The notebook has Van Oordt’s Dutch translation bound into it. Its second and final part was published in February 1886, so Grevenbroek’s manuscript was gifted to the South Africa Public Library in 1886. It is likely that Fairbridge, who was based in the Cape, took it with him from Mr.

---

3 The NLSA catalogue has: ‘Purchased from Mr Quaritch, November 1885 for CAF’.
4 The NLSA catalogue has: ‘Presented to the South African Library by Chas A Fairbridge’.
5 Inside front cover. The flyleaf carries statements from Fairbridge on the poetics of Van Oordt’s translation: ‘Excerpts from the Zuid Afrikaanshe Tijdschrift in which Graevenbroek... is published from the original M.S. – not castrated to suit the modesty of its editor Dr Van Oort. [...] CAF’ And under that: ‘One of the “immodest” passages omitted is curiously illustrative of a feminist [sic] habit regarded by Herodotus as prevailing among the Ancient Egyptians’ (emphasis in text).
Quaritch in London.⁶ Considering the availability of white/cream coloured veal leather vellum at the Cape, the manuscript was probably bound into its current cover at the Sunderland Library.⁷ Watermarks and paper quality provide further clues about the manuscript's time and place of composition.

Grevenbroek must have composed his letter between (late) December 1693 and 1695. Critical literature has assumed the year 1695 on the front page of MSB203 as the date of composition of the original text by Grevenbroek.⁸ This is indeed a convenient date as Grevenbroek would by then have retired and could base his account on the knowledge he acquired during his time as the Council’s scribe at the Castle. Also, considering Grevenbroek’s opinion of the Van der Stel governors, it would have been safer from him to write the letter while no longer in VOC service. Supporting evidence for 1695 from other sources is lacking, but the wrecking of the VOC ship De Gouden Buys in 1693 is extensively covered in the letter, indicating a post-1693 date of composition.

The physical properties of the paper proper (colour, etc.) and watermarks tentatively confirm 1695 as a likely year of composition.⁹ The paper of MSB203 is a writing paper. In early modern times, different purposes of writing were met with types of paper. Parameters that reflect the primary

---

⁶ I have not found additional biographical information about ‘Mr. Quaritch’.
⁷ A bookbinder with expert knowledge in vellum would be able to confirm this thesis. The fly sheets that are glued inside the front and back cover were probably added at the same time.
⁹ The Cape mainly relied on Dutch paper imports as there are no signs that the VOC erected any paper mills or encouraged paper culture at the Cape. Paper used at the Cape largely mirrors the trends of the Dutch paper market. Paper was imported in batches and consumed accordingly. It seems that paper was available to the
usage of a particular quality of paper in early modern paper making are size, watermark, thickness and smoothness.

The primary watermark in MSB203 is a post horn set in a crowned shield (figure App.1). In its manifestation as ‘posthorn in crowned shield’, it was a standard pattern (irrespective of paper size) from the 17th century onwards. The post horn as a watermark has a long history; its predominant use has always been in writing paper. Vice versa, writing paper is characterised by the horn: ‘It was one of the commonest of all watermark patterns, in use as such in Europe since the 14th century. The pattern was presumably intended, at least in later examples, to evoke urgent postal delivery.’ It is often distinguished by a monogram of the paper maker’s initials beneath the main pattern, which is typically echoed in a countermark.

If set in a shield, the posthorn is a relatively unembellished design, as depicted in figure App.5 and figure App.6, or the more elaborate motif of figure App.3. The first two designs bear no crown, have no inverted figure S curves in their outlines and a pendant mark is absent. These designs occur as early as the later 16th century. The earliest post horn set in a crowned shield is dated 1668. The watermark in MSB203, with its crown, elaborate S curves and pendant, is closer to this design. Although this reveals

---

Figure App.5 Post horn, 27 August 1657. Drawn from Daghregister (Western Cape Archives Inventory 1/1/25) by me, TM.

Figure App.6 Post horn, 25 April 1672. Drawn from request from the free-burghers (Western Cape Archives Inventory 1/2/80) by me, TM.

---

general public and that the VOC kept a tight reign over paper trade, but it is unknown how distribution was organised. Evidence that the VOC had paper made to order is only found after 1722. Paper culture only developed after the annexation of the Cape by the British in 1795. In this, the Cape was markedly different from the other overseas territories under VOC administration. Future research into overseas watermark databases could further an understanding of the Cape’s unique position. It would also develop knowledge of the paper trade and global economy in early modern times, and build towards a more reliable framework to date paper sources and open up new windows on relations between the colonial world and Europe.


11 Although the more sober motive is older, it continued to be used alongside the crowned shield throughout western Europe.
nothing about the place the copy was produced, it narrows down the manuscript’s date of composition to after 1668.

The many details in the shield’s design and the horn allow further identification. The letters spelling ‘WR’ beneath the shield the initials of Strasbourg papermaker Wendelin Ri(c)hel (†1555). They were frequently plagiarised as a mark of quality and are found as pendant marks all over western Europe for over three hundred years. They are found in Dutch paper from 1636 onward.\(^\text{12}\) However, I found combinations of ‘WR’ with the post horn only for the period 1614 to 1687.\(^\text{13}\)

The appendage from the bottom of the shield as depicted in figure App.3 became fashionable towards the end of the first half of the 18th century; the inverted lily of orange blossom is a motive that sprang from patriotic sympathies in the Netherlands.\(^\text{14}\) The watermark of MSB203 does not have this appendage. The paper for MSB203 was thus with great likelihood produced in western Europe between 1668 and 1687. As a result of the paper prices in early modern times, it was not unusual that paper was kept for extended periods of time until a purpose that legitimised its use would arise.

Further defining elements of the watermark in MSB203 include the three lilies on the crown of which only the centre one has a pointed top leaf; the two floral elements in between the lilies, that both are three-partite; and the three circles in the crown’s band. Although it has been observed that ‘when paper is viewed from the direction in which the paper makers’ names are to be read […], the bell of the horn always points to the left’, I found that many horns in Cape paper and also the bell of the horn in MSB203 actually point to the right.\(^\text{15}\)

Dedicated post paper was used in the Netherlands from at least 1636. It was bought in from Germany.\(^\text{16}\) In the political turmoil of the time, it would take considerable time for a Dutch paper industry to develop and supply the Dutch market. In 1666, post horns are still

\(^{12}\text{Churchill (1935, 12).}\)

\(^{13}\text{I compared the watermarks in MSB203 against Briquet (1952), Churchill (1935), Heawood (1931; 1950), Voorn (1960; 1973; 1985), the Thomas L. Gravell Watermark Archive and the watermarks in Cape paper presented in this research. Although still considered authoritative in their field, Churchill (1935) and Briquet (1952) rely on a limited data set.}\)

\(^{14}\text{The vast majority of post horns in a crowned shield that carry such an appendage also have a set of initials written under it. The reverse is also true. E.g. SLD361.1 (year: 1787); SLD341.1 (year: 1791). Counterexamples that lack a chauvinist pendant exist for the United States from the final decades of the 18th century.}\)

\(^{15}\text{Tokoo (2002, 12).}\)

\(^{16}\text{It is mentioned in a Dutch Ordinance of 1636 that mentions different sorts of paper (Dutch Ordinances of the Province of Groningen, 1618-1797; cf. Churchill (1935, 11)).}\)
found in imported paper; in this case, paper from Italy. The post horn is first found in paper produced by Pieter van der Ley, papermaker in the Zaan area. Watermark research illustrates that Dutch post paper was imported into England, and that their watermarks were oftentimes also copied by local papermakers.\textsuperscript{17} Original Van der Ley post horn paper was used in England in 1668.\textsuperscript{18} This is a few years earlier than assumed by the great Dutch paper historian Voorn, who suggests that Honigh and Van der Ley produced the first dedicated writing paper in the Netherlands around 1672-73.\textsuperscript{19} None of the great many watermarks produced in the Netherlands in the period 1614 until early 18\textsuperscript{th} century answer to the particularities of the watermark in MSB203. Many feature one or more square gems in the crown for the three round ones in MSB203; the lilies have different centre petals; the two floral elements have only one petal; the dimensions of the watermark as a whole are off; or the proportions of the individual elements are markedly different.

However, matches for MSB203 are found in paper from late 17\textsuperscript{th} century London. Some do in fact seem clean copies of the watermark in MSB203.\textsuperscript{20} An example is shown in figure App.7. Variations between different moulds from the same papermaker were common, and are no reason to discard a possible match MSB203 with paper made in or around 1687.\textsuperscript{21} Dutch writing paper gained particularly popularity on the English market after 1670, and considerable quantities of Dutch paper were imported into England in the following decades. Conversely, there is no proof of English writing paper imported into the Netherlands.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure_app.7}
\caption{A close match with MSB203. SLD.138.1, courtesy of the Gravell Watermark Archive.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Churchill 1935 and the Gravell database.
\textsuperscript{18} Gravell Watermark Archive SLD.090.1.
\textsuperscript{19} Voorn (1960, 102).
\textsuperscript{20} E.g. Gravell Watermark Archive SLD.138.1. No further samples of this particular post horn design have been found in other sources or repositories.
\textsuperscript{21} I have not been able to identify the paper maker. The Gravell database does not mention a countermark. The Folger Shakespeare Library finds itself unable to disclose such information by correspondence.
It has not been possible to connect the watermark in Grevenbroek’s manuscript to a particular paper maker or paper mill. Paper trade and watermark suggest that MSB203 might have been copied from a primer in England, possibly London, around 1695. The Grevenbroek manuscript was certainly not produced before (late) December 1693. The ex libris on the inside cover of MSB203 from an English library in 1882 might suggest English ownership for the intermediate years; this would falsify a tentative suggestion in critical literature for two Dutch addressees of the letter.

Text editions

Farrington-Schapera’s 1933 diplomatic transcription of the Grevenbroek manuscript is an attempt at establishing a ‘best’ reading. As the editors point out, in their transcription and translation they have only ‘slightly modernized the punctuation [and] curbed the lavish and erratic use of capitals [and] silently corrected many small slips’. Their rendition of the opening lines of the manuscript is exemplary of the edition as a whole:

Admodum Revdo. Doctissimoque [Doctissimoq.] Viro

N.N. S.P.D.


To the right reverend and learned gentleman......

Greetings.

You say that you receive great pleasure from my letters; I feel the same and perhaps more from the expressions of your goodwill towards me, so full of charm and thought, with which you honour me. I

---

22 French, Dutch and German watermarks and countermarks have enjoyed greater attention in filigranological studies than their English counterparts. Looking at the British role in overseas explorations, it is a matter of consequence that a more extensive British watermark and countermark database be developed, that the paper and countermark of the match at the Folger Shakespeare Library be studied and that the importance to include countermarks in any watermark database be stressed. This would further research into the origin of MSB203 and build a more reliable framework of watermarks for the purpose of dating paper sources not only from Europe but from the early modern world at large.


24 Farrington-Schapera (1933, 169). I did not encounter too many of the alleged ‘many small slips’. A full list of discrepancies with the manuscript rests with me, TM.
can never read nor relish them enough, and from the bottom of my heart I thank the Powers above through whose kindness there has been granted me, perhaps to test me, some little share of this world's goods so that they may see a proof of my pious devotion to you.25

In square brackets, I have shown discrepancies with the manuscript text. Farrington-Schapera’s edition obscures one or two mannerisms of Grevenbroek’s style, such as his use of abbreviations, which in the manuscript makes him come across as a conscious classical philologist.26 Farrington-Schapera do present the Latin and the English translation on parallel pages, so that one can develop a feel for Grevenbroek’s Latin, particularly where the connotations and syntax of the translation differ from the Latin. Caution is due when relying solely on the English translation, which, as I explain in Chapter 3, in referring to the Khoi betrays a particular view of them that is not Grevenbroek’s. As stated in the Introduction, a censored Dutch translation was prepared by Jan van Oordt (1886, reprinted 1932).

---

25 Farrington-Schapera (1933, 172).
26 The choices for a diplomatic or a ‘best’ reading are only occasionally acknowledged (as footnotes), which stands as a point of critique. ‘q.’ is short for the enclitic Latin ‘-que’. Another common manuscript abbreviation used by Grevenbroek is ‘-ā’ for a word ending in ‘-am’.
This page intentionally left blank.
Appendix 2
Comparative Ethnography

The table below compares the structure of three major treatises about the Khoi from the early Cape, which together make up Volume 14 in the Van Riebeeck Society Series: Farrington-Schapera (1933). Details have been omitted to bring out patterns in the structure and topics covered. There is no connection between topics that are next to each other in separate columns in the table. Note the variation in the peoples discussed and the time spent at the Cape: there is no proof that Dapper ever left Holland; Ten Rhyne was at the Cape for about four weeks; and Grevenbroek had been there for ten years when he wrote his letter. Also note the many new topics added by him, as well as the loose structure of his account in comparison to those of Dapper and Ten Rhyne, which are more encyclopaedic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olfert Dapper (1668), Kaffrarie of lant der Kaffers, anders Hottentots genaemt. (Kaffrarie or land of the Kafirs, otherwise named Hottentots.)</th>
<th>Willem ten Rhyne (1686), Schediasma de Promontorio Bonae Spei; eiusve tractus incolis Hottentotis. (A Short Account of the Cape of Good Hope and of the Hottentots who inhabit that region.)</th>
<th>Johan Willem de Grevenbroek (1695), Elegans et accurata gentis Africanae circa Promontorium Capitis Bonae Spei vulgo Hottentotten Nuncupatae Descriptio Epistolaris. (An Elegant and Accurate Description of the African Race living round the Cape of Good Hope commonly called Hottentots, from a letter.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical description of the land.</td>
<td>The Arrival</td>
<td>Captatio; Aim and purpose of the letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land is not divided into kingdoms, but some peoples are governed by chiefs.</td>
<td>Chap. I The Situation of the Cape of Good Hope [Geography]</td>
<td>First impression: whiteness of body – whiteness of soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative organisation of the Hottentots:</td>
<td>Chap. II Animals</td>
<td>Superior senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goringhaikonas</td>
<td>Chap. III Birds</td>
<td>Feeding habits: food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gorachouquas</td>
<td>Chap. IV Fish</td>
<td>Women’s duties in household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goringhaiquas</td>
<td>Chap. V Insects and Poisonous Creatures</td>
<td>Twins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cochoquas or Saldanhars</td>
<td>Chap. VI Plants</td>
<td>Subsistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Great and little Karichuriquas and Hosaas</td>
<td>Chap. VII The Seasons of the Year</td>
<td>Men’s duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chainouquas</td>
<td>Chap. VIII The Hottentots who inhabit this realm:</td>
<td>Purses around neck, attire, quiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kobonas</td>
<td>• Essequaes</td>
<td>Warfare and peacemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sonquas</td>
<td>• Namaquas</td>
<td>The Supreme being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Namaquas</td>
<td>• Sousvas</td>
<td>Rivers and hot springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brygoudys</td>
<td>• Sonquas</td>
<td>Female knapsack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build of the Kafirs or Hottentots</td>
<td>Heusaquas</td>
<td>Gregoriquas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing of the men</td>
<td>‘Those who mingle freely with our men about the Castle.’</td>
<td>Worship of sun and moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing of the women</td>
<td>Chap. IX Their relations with other peoples</td>
<td>Watering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamentation</td>
<td>Chap. IX Their relations with other peoples</td>
<td>On the Jewish connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>Chap. X Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Chap. XI Clothing</td>
<td>Story of William Chenut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Chap. XII Buildings</td>
<td>Failed trading mission to Magosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>Chap. XIII Furniture</td>
<td>Story of Goude Buys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>Chap. XIV Their Character</td>
<td>Laws of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Chap. XV Their Habits</td>
<td>Critique of DEIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishments of Theft</td>
<td>Chap. XVI Means of Livelihood</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>Chap. XVII Their mode of War</td>
<td>Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment of Homicide and Assault</td>
<td>Chap. XVII Mode of Buying and Selling</td>
<td>Sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Chap. XIX Their Mode of Dancing</td>
<td>Medical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Chap. XX Religion</td>
<td>Extreme penalties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Chap. XXI The Magistrate</td>
<td>Moving around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Chap. XXII The Law of Nations</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Chap. XXIII Marriage</td>
<td>Jewellery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXIV The Education of the Children</td>
<td>On greeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXV Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>Chap. XXVI Their Medical Practices</td>
<td>Ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Washing of skins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Daggha and Cama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>The veld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Soil and crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Seasons and flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Arts and crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Witnesses, sources and method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Chap. XXVII Their Language</td>
<td>Farewell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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