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Abstract

This thesis focuses on rock art that was created in the Eastern Cape during the colonial period. It is possible to date the images by what is depicted – muskets, hats and horses. Using San, Khoe and other ethnographic sources, we can ‘see’, through indigenous eyes, how life was experienced on the colonial frontier (and in borderlands) as it moved into the Eastern Cape hinterland. Though hard to believe, this region, having been one of the first and most densely settled by colonists, has received almost no archaeological attention of this sort. The rock art images in question were seemingly made by those who actively resisted the colonial project – bandits or ‘guerrillas’ from mixed cultural backgrounds, each group having its own particular mosaic of individuals and therefore idiosyncratic modes of representation.
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INTRODUCTION
On the 16th of May 2018 the South African flag outside the parliamentary buildings in Cape Town was lowered and replaced with that of the Sovereign State of Good Hope (SSGH). The man who oversaw this act was Khoebaha Calvin Cornelius III, the current Gaob (King) of the National Khoisan Council. The Gaob announced that this marked the official secession of the Cape from the rest of South Africa. Parliament was served with an eviction notice and told that they could remain in the Cape provided they apply for ‘alien’ status (Cilliers 2018).

Although some South Africans found this amusing and a complete impossibility (as noted in the comments sections of various online newspapers1), for the National Khoisan Council it was a carefully orchestrated protest. The Gaob discussed his frustration with the current government which, despite all their measures to create a South Africa for all, still did not recognise the status of the ‘Khoisan’. Their history and struggles remain in the dark as they continue to be relatively unpublicised and misunderstood.

This thesis seeks to shed some light on the struggle of the ‘Khoe-San’2 during the colonial era. I look specifically at the area that made up the eastern borderlands of the Cape Colony, under Dutch and then British rule, during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In examining historical and ethnographic archives and, crucially, the rock art painted by these groups, I aim to understand and show how multi-ethnic groups came together and turned to raiding livestock as a form of resistance against European settlement, all the while drawing on Khoe-San beliefs and practices. Truly, as agents in the shaping of South Africa, their story deserves the same recognition sought after by Gaob Khoebaha Calvin Cornelius III today. They were the ‘Bushman’ bandits of the borderlands.


2 I follow Hollmann (2007) and Morris (2008) in applying this term to rock art which may have been created by either Khoekhoen or San artists or both. I follow Besten (2011) in applying it to people in the colonial period who likely had both San and Khoekhoen ancestry as a result of protracted contact between hunter-gatherers and pastoralists.
Research enquiry

I sought to understand practices of banditry in the colonial-era Eastern Cape, having hypothesised that rock art dating to that period was possibly related to it, and that this material culture might better inform the record of this period of South Africa’s formation. I found that a closer look at the manner of depiction (i.e. how the different features of the subject matter are depicted, what conventions are used) coupled with a reading of the local history gives evidence for the way the colonial project disrupted traditional lifeways and forced individuals to form multi-ethnic groups in order to survive. On investigation it transpired that the creators of this art were mixed groups of ‘Bushmen’ who undertook banditry in protest against the colonial project. This research shows that indigenous beliefs were reconfigured in the colonial period and applied to introduced material culture, notably firearms. As part of this reconfiguring, the inclusion of animals, including ostriches, painted in traditional hunter-gatherer art were re-conceptualised within a framework of banditry.
Fig. 2. RIO001. A rough-brush painted site in the Zuurberg mountains. It includes images of human figures with firearms and cattle, as well as ostriches and baboons. Photo and digital enhancement with DStretch by author.

To these ends I adopted a methodological approach that included the reading of archaeological, historical, ethno-historic and ethnographic literature. The archaeological literature relates to the sites in question and provides a basis for how these sites have been analysed and interpreted by archaeologists. The historical literature is concerned with who was in proximity to these sites and when, as well as the processes that led to the acquisition of material culture and animals introduced by colonists, by various populations. The ethnographic literature gives the closest approximation to an emic perspective into what members of these populations thought of colonialism (epistemology) and, importantly, how they experienced the colonial project (ontology). Groups covered in the ethnographic literature include San, Khoekhoen, Korana, Sotho and Nguni.

My techniques include the accumulation of data. Sample studies include information on the technique (incised or pecked engraving, fine-line or finger-painted or rough brush painting), the pigment and subject matter, as well as manner of depiction.
Images of many of the sites are already available through the Southern African Rock Art Digital Archive (SARADA). These include photographs, site reports, tracings and re-drawings of the art. This has not, however, negated the necessity of fieldwork. The subjectivity of past surveyors does not always allow for close-up detailed photographs of the imagery with which I am concerned. Field trips were undertaken over the period 2017-2019. These included visits to sites in the Great Fish River region.

Those sites which were not already captured on SARADA were found by consulting local farmers. The contact details for the different farmers were shared by local rock art enthusiasts, Victor Biggs, Stephen Towney-Bassett and Ben Maclennan. Additional contact details were supplied by the Agri Co-ops in the area. Once contact was made with one farmer in a particular location, additional contacts for other farmers were supplied by the first contact.

Accessibility to the sites was only possible with a 4x4 vehicle. Even with this, it was still necessary to always cover the last section of the journey on foot. The distance on foot
typically ranged between 500m and 5km depending on the site. In instances where the walking distance was short, it was often possible to conduct all of the necessary data capturing at a site and then follow this with a second site visit later in the day.

The team for site visits typically included five individuals; my supervisor Sam Challis, three assistants and myself. The assistants helped with filling in the site record sheets (including GPS co-ordinates, direction and site description) and inspected the site to ensure that we did not miss any rock art. Any imagery which we saw was called out to the assistants so that the details could be written down. The photographs were then taken by myself. Once we were satisfied that we had captured all the data at a particular site, we conducted a short survey to see if there were any additional sites nearby.

The mountains in this area are the south-western Drakensberg, Stormberg, Zuurberg, Bamboesberg, Windvogelberg and Winterberg. These areas are historically attested to have housed mixed groups of bandits. These attestations suggested that there was probably rock art in these areas. Following enquiry, I found this to be true, except for the Bamboesberg which had rock art though this did not include images that could be reliably dated to the colonial era.

![Fig. 4. Map of sites and study area surveyed.](image-url)
I acknowledge that photographs are not always necessarily the best medium for a clear descriptive resolution of rock art. In order to study and see the images better I have made use of an editing programme, *ImageJ*, which includes a plug-in called *DStretch* (Decorrelation stretch) developed by rock art researcher Jon Harman. This is achieved by loading a photograph of the art into the program and then using the plug-in to alter the pigment colours. A variety of built-in filters are used to highlight different pigments, thereby creating a clearer image. I have also edited photographs with the programme *Adobe Photoshop*. In this program I trace the images with a tool that allows me to copy it and paste it as a separate layer, with the shelter wall acting as a background layer. This makes it possible to then highlight, lighten or darken the images themselves while retaining the original copy of the shelter wall. In doing so, it is possible to show the art up much better against this backdrop than in the original photograph. Through using these computer programs to create digital copies of the art I felt it unnecessary to trace the images. Tracing has the potential to cause damage to the art and given that these images are made in a chalkier pigment than the ‘traditional corpus’ of hunter-gatherer art (as explained in Chapter Two), I was concerned that if the tracing paper made any contact with the pigment it could flake it off the rock face.

**Rationale**

The 1970s and 1980s saw the beginning of a new approach in rock art research that sought to move away from the belief that ‘San’ artists were merely depicting the scenes they encountered around themselves in everyday life or that they were depicting hunting scenes as a form of sympathetic magic. The use of San ethnography by scholars Patricia Vinnicombe (1976) and David Lewis-Williams (1980, 1982, 2010, 2013, 2019) demonstrates the significance of religious affairs in the creation of rock art. Yet when many scholars (including Vinnicombe and Lewis-Williams) turn attention to later images of European material culture there is a marked regression to interpretations claiming that the artists were merely painting images of new groups of people, notably European colonists, arriving on the landscape – even if they acknowledge that such images are incorporated into ‘San religion’.

From the mid 1980s, scholars began to look at how the images that include figures with European material culture and animals may also fit within the paradigm of San cosmological
beliefs. Colin Campbell (1986, 1987) and Lewis-Williams and Thomas Dowson (1989) pay particular attention to the famed Beersheba panel (see Fig. 5) and note that the image included subject matter that can be linked to the experience of trance undergone by San shamans. Notable features include a therianthrope seemingly bleeding from the nose (cf. Katz 1982). Campbell (1986) postulates that the arrival of Europeans may have been equated with the feared spirits-of-the-dead in San belief and that shamans could battle these new arrivals as they did the spirits. Lewis-Williams and Dowson similarly (1989: 147) argue that the Europeans and their items and animals were “incorporated within the more traditional shamanistic art”. These scholars, however, continued to assume that the authors of the colonial era rock art were homogenous San. A closer look at the historical record reveals that these groups of painters rather consisted of individuals from mixed-ethnic, and, or, multi-ethnic backgrounds, and that the painters would have drawn on their hybrid or creole worldviews when creating art.

The work of Jannie Loubser and Gordon Laurens (1994), Sven Ouzman (2005) and Sam
Challis (2008, 2012, 2018) demonstrates that we cannot take for granted that the human figures wearing hats and holding guns in rock art are in fact depictions of Europeans. The acquisition of firearms by various ‘Bushman’ groups as well as their history of image-making, and additionally the inclusion of ontologically local subject matter and ‘trance’ motifs in the art, makes it more than likely that in many cases the artists were in fact depicting themselves. Challis (2008, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018) and Ouzman (2003; 2005) further argue that these images are not the mere depictions of newly-acquired material culture and animals, but must rather be seen within the context of ritual and ritual practitioners, a theme also noted by Jamie Hampson (2015: 156-158) in relation to colonial-era rock art in the Trans-Pecos of North America.

That these scholars turned to historical literature to inform their views is crucial. These sources put the lie to interpretations of the paintings based on essentialised understanding of material culture, as mistakenly used by Campbell (1986). I have used historical material, written by early European travellers and settlers, to a greater extent than previous scholars to show how useful these sources are for understanding the socio-political forces at play on the landscape.

These sources include more than thirty contemporary accounts of travellers, settlers, missionaries and government agents, as well as work synthesized by early historians, such George McCall Theal's 35 volume record of the Cape Colony (1899, 1901,
Donald Moodie’s *The Record, or, A Series of Official Papers Relative to the Condition and Treatment of the Native Tribes of South Africa* (1838) and the British Parliamentary Papers (e.g. Papers relative to the condition and treatment of the natives of southern Africa, Volumes I and II 1835). Throughout this thesis I show that these forces had a great impact on the rock art produced in the colonial era and the people who made the images.

The use of historical sources also helps in the understanding that these groups of ‘Bushmen’ bandits were not essentialised ‘pristine’ San. Geoffrey Blundell (2004), Lara Mallen (2009) and Leila Henry (2010) use written accounts from the colonial period to demonstrate that groups who produced art included members from different ethnicities and, as such, were hybrid communities. Challis (2012, 2018) too makes use of historical sources, and coupled with a reading of the art, demonstrates the creolised nature of the AmaTola. In treating these groups as mixed, these scholars draw on a variety of ethno-historical and ethnographic sources, not just those pertaining to the San, to provide a more nuanced reading of the art. I have taken a similar approach to different ‘traditions’ of art found along what were the borderlands of the Cape Colony. In doing so, I show, as had previously been hypothesised by Challis (2008), that the expressions of hybridity and creolisation found in the Maloti-Drakensberg in the mid-nineteenth century began in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries far to the south-west of the regions studied by these scholars.

Rock art research in southern Africa makes very little mention of the institution of slavery. Yet when reading historical sources it is often found that slaves who were imported into the Cape and were able to escape their place of work, joined with indigenes. There was also an illegal slave trade in Khoe-San and other southern Africans, sometimes by people of mixed-descent as well as by European settlers. Challis (e.g. 2012, 2016, 2018), a notable exception, highlights the historical attestations that certain groups of ‘Bushmen’ also included ‘runaway slaves’ among their number. In looking at the art as images that were produced by Khoe-San slaves it can be seen how certain motifs may have related to beliefs pertaining to escape from slavery and harsh labour conditions, as well as following raids, as detailed throughout this thesis.

Previous studies have attempted to historicise rock art based on the subject matter, especially when it contains images of ‘outsiders’ or introduced material culture (see e.g. Loubser and Laurens 1994; Dowson 1994; Blundell 2004). These studies have been
critiqued, especially when direct dating has revealed accurate chronologies that do not correspond with the indirect dating attempts (see e.g. Mullen 2018). For example, Dowson (1994) arranged paintings into a chronology which he argued showed the economic rise of singular shamans within San groups who had come into contact with African farmers. Yet without direct dating, Dowson is not able to say whether these paintings were created in the sequence he postulates or if they were even painted at the time of contact with African farming groups. Furthermore, where Dowson (1994) considers paintings that are demonstrably from the colonial era, in ignoring the written record he is not able to see that the groups of ‘Bushmen’ from this time period were of mixed-ethnic backgrounds. Interpreting these paintings based solely on San ethnography is, therefore, problematic. I take an arguably more accurate approach to historicising rock art in looking not only at the subject matter but also the techniques of production and manner of depiction. In so doing, I show how the art changes owing to contact with outsiders and how protracted contact led to mixed groups that produced art in their own unique ways. This approach ensures that it is not just historical sources that are employed to explain the socio-political forces present on the landscape during the colonial era, but also uses the art itself as evidence in its own right.

Contribution to the discipline

This thesis includes several new approaches and contributions to the study of southern African history, archaeology and rock art.

- It demonstrates how the images and manners of depiction may be used as a historical archive to provide an emic view of the experience of contact and colonisation.
- It provides an in-depth explanation, using the work of Eric Hobsbawm (1969) as well as a reading of local histories, for the formation of bandit groups during the colonial era.
- It examines how the impact of slavery affected indigenous populations, despite this practice officially being outlawed.
- It considers how ostriches may have been associated with beliefs specifically relating to banditry and runaway slaves.
- It explores how items of material culture introduced by Europeans, firearms, were incorporated into an indigenous southern African worldview that drew on past beliefs as well as forming a new epistemology.
‘Bushman’ bandits of the borderlands

Bushman vis à vis San

Before explaining my theoretical approach to the rock art discussed in this thesis, it is important that a key term, ‘Bushman’, is clearly understood. In recent years it has been commonly used as an alternative term for the word ‘San’, meaning the hunter-gatherers who inhabited southern Africa prior to the arrival of the herders, farmers and colonists (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1982). Historically, however, the term ‘Bushman’ as used by colonists most commonly meant anyone ‘of the bush’ with no fixed abode and who did not practice animal husbandry, rather than signifying a specific racial or ethnic group (for discussions see e.g. contributions in Hamilton & Leibhammer 2016). As a corollary, anyone ‘of the bush’ was considered an inveterate thief, vagabond, freebooter or raider. Perhaps the best example of this, and the most accurate in terms of contemporary observations of the socio-economic classification, comes from François Le Vaillant (1972 [1790] 402- 404):

These vagabonds are not...a particular nation of savages, natives of the country they inhabit. The word *Boshis-men* is derived from two Dutch words, which signify, men of the wood, or thickets; by which appellation the Dutch inhabitants, whether in Africa or America, distinguish the robbers, or assassins, that desert the colonies to escape chastisement; such as in the French islands are called *Negres Marrons* (run away negroes); thus, so far from being a particular nation..., they are a collection of Mulattos, Negroes, Bastard-Whites, and, sometimes, Hottentots; mongrels of all kinds, and every shade of colour, resembling each other only in treachery and villainy; they may truly be called land pirates, living without law or order, and abandoned to every excess of misery and despair, being hopeless deserters, who have no resource but pillage and murder. They pass their lives on the tops of the steepest rocks, in almost inaccessible caverns; the height of the situation giving them an extensive view of the surrounding country; and no sooner do they perceive travellers or scattered flocks, than they dart down unawares upon their prey, killing man and beast without distinction, and, loaded with the spoil, regain those dens (parentheses in original).

Le Vaillant made this observation while travelling around the Cape Colony in the late 1700s.
and so it must be understood that when examining other written records from this period that where the term ‘Bushman’ appears, it is to these figures that the term refers, and not those whom we may think of as ‘ethnic’ San today. The early travellers also used the terms ‘Chinese Hottentots’ and ‘Hottentot Bushman’ (Le Valliant 1972: 80; Raper and Boucher 1988). Robert Gordon reiterates that the Dutch term Bossiesman was specifically used to refer to bandits and that the word only came to describe a distinct ethnic category from the late nineteenth century onwards (Gordon 1992: 173-174). All the historic texts examined in this thesis were written before the late nineteenth century. Therefore, when earlier travellers describe their encounters with, and the activities of, ‘Bushmen’, they are specifically referring to groups of what I term bandits.

The pejorative term ‘Hottentot’ is used throughout the writings of early travellers. This has been equated with the Nama term Khoekhoe by many historians (see Chapter Two), but this is also problematic as we see it being used, especially in the early days of the colony, to discuss any click-language speaking indigenes in the Cape. Beginning in the 1970s, scholars have increasingly argued that Khoekhoe and San are polarities along an economic scale oscillating between hunting and gathering and pastoralism, rather than distinct ethnicities (Marks 1972; Elphick 1977). Following this argument, rigid distinctions between San and Khoekhoe are as problematic as the distinctions between ‘Hottentot’ and ‘Bushman’. Issues with the term ‘Hottentot’ and its equation with Khoekhoe as well as the use of the term ‘Khoe-San’ are discussed in Chapter Two.

It is important to draw a distinction between the type of raiding against the colonists committed by these ‘Bushmen’ and the institutionalized raiding associated with African farmer societies. Rachel King (2017) considers how livestock raiding was used by groups like the Sotho as a means for nation building. During these raids the aim was to capture cattle, the epitome of wealth in African farmer society, rather than kill an enemy. In considering the wealth exemplified by cattle, the goal was certainly not to kill the livestock. Yet when looking at the raids committed by ‘Bushmen’ in the study area against colonists we see a very different approach. If the group was pursued by a commando (an organized militia consisting of farmers and their farmhands) they might take drastic measures to ensure the Europeans did not retrieve their cattle. Multiple historical accounts describe the Bushmen massacring or maiming the cattle while making a hasty retreat (e.g. Pringle 1840). This shows a clear sense of resistance, what Challis (2012) argues to be guerilla warfare, rather than the practice of institutionalised raiding in which, if one fails at a raid, one may always
return later to steal the same cattle. I suggest, following Le Vaillant, that these Bushmen were rather bandits than institutionalised raiders.

I therefore draw on Bandit theory as introduced by Eric Hobsbawm (e.g. 1959, 1960, 1969), though with the benefit of subsequent critique, in order to explain the material culture, including rock art, and beliefs, that were likely associated with these groups.

**Hobsbawmian ‘Bandit Theory’**

Hobsbawm developed his theory of banditry from 1959, most famously in the 1969 book *Bandits*. He suggested that there is a specific class of bandit, which he refers to as ‘social bandits’ (e.g. 1960, 1969), who can be viewed as heroes protesting against the unfair treatment of the peasant class by a ruling class within a pre-industrialised economy, thereby acquiring a ‘sense of injustice’ (Hobsbawm 1969). Importantly, social bandits do not prey on other peasants, but rather purposefully go after those deemed to be part of the oppressive class (Hobsbawm 1969: 14). This gives the actions of the social bandit a political, as opposed to merely criminal, edge.

Importantly, bandit groups are heterogeneous. While they typically include young male peasants, they also include the dispossessed within a society, such as military deserters, prisoners and the down and out who head out to the frontiers, where they are safe from the law (Hobsbawm 1969: 27). These are the exact sorts of people who make up the ‘Bushman’ groups described by Le Vaillant.

Hobsbawm’s first category of bandit is the noble robber. This is the figure of the Robin Hood archetype. Hobsbawm (1969: 34), however, notes that these characters are possibly not as noble as the legends make them out to be. He claims that the noble robber does not start life as a criminal, but is typically the victim of injustice (Hobsbawm 1969: 35). In his idealised account, Hobsbawm claims that noble robbers do not kill unless they absolutely have to. However, he admits that the noble robber may not always remain noble and may indeed turn on, and even kill, the poor as the bandits attempt to better themselves by any means possible (1969: 48). I suggest that few, if any, of the bandits discussed in this dissertation are noble robbers. Certainly, far from not shedding blood, many historical accounts claim that bandits typically killed the herd boy, himself from the peasantry, who was caring for the stock they stole (e.g. Kay 1833).

Hobsbawm contrasts the noble robber with the avenger. Unlike noble robbers, who do not
attempt to kill anyone through their banditry, the avenger relies on creating terror by killing, raping and maiming; the avengers are so desperate to avenge the wrongs that they and their people have suffered, that they repay their suffering in kind to those who they think deserve it (Hobsbawm 1969: 50). However, Hobsbawm notes that often this violence extends from those who deserve it to innocent victims as the avengers become lost in their bloodshed to the point that they become blinded to their initial cause (Hobsbawm 1969: 50-60).

A third category of Hobsbawmian bandits are the haiduks. The haiduks of the Balkans in the last 500 years were both bandits and rebels in the political sense. Hobsbawm considers how these people arose due to desperate economic conditions, that were imposed on them by a conquering foreign power, in this case Turkey. The haiduks were heroes of the peasants for fighting against the foreigners. Unlike noble robbers, they used cruel force, but this was seen as justified by their admirers owing to the oppression that all were suffering at the hands of the Turks (Hobsbawm 1969: 64-68).

I argue that the example of the haiduks probably comes closest to the people who formed the groups under discussion in this study, especially when taking into account the influence of a conquering foreign force, in this case embodied in the forces of Dutch and British colonists. That said, I hesitate to place too much emphasis on trying to fit the creators of the rock art into any of these categories, for Hobsbawm has certainly come under criticism, some of which is well-deserved.

**Critiques of Hobsbawm**

One of these critiques is that Hobsbawm is guilty of romanticising banditry. Anton Blok (1972) suggests another category, that of the unsocial or antisocial bandit. He proposes that in many cases bandits actually prey on the defenseless, rather than the wealthy. He sees bandits as rather seeking personal gain than performing any sort of social protest (Blok 1972: 496).

This theme of antisocial banditry appears to have occurred in nineteenth-century Ethiopia. Donald Crummey (1986: 133) argues that the *shefta* were both robbers and political rebels who resided beyond the confines of normal society by hiding out in forests. One would think that this form of residence or habitation (hiding out) as well as the fact that the theft by the *shefta* was linked to political rebellion would make them prime examples of Hobsbawm’s social bandits. However, the *shefta* were not champions of the peasantry.
as they were typically upper class warlords, and sought to exert their own political will through criminal activities, including the targeting of peasants (Crummey 1986: 135). Anti-social bandits have also been studied by historians of southern Africa.

Jeff Peires (1994) uses Blok’s concept of the anti-social bandit to examine stock theft in the Qumba district of the Eastern Cape in the late twentieth century. Peires notes that, far from attacking the wealthy and uplifting their fellows, these thieves frequently stole stock from the poor. Their cavalier attitude would see them arrive unannounced at social gatherings, and demand tribute from potential victims in the form of protection money, on top of the cattle they had already taken. It was well known who the thieves were, and they were not shy of flaunting their wealth (something I examine later considering bandits and material culture, Chapter Three). To this end, families sometimes hoped to marry their daughters to these thieves so that they would be cared and paid for (Peires 1994). Peires does, however, draw on the category of the social bandit, but in this case he identifies them as ‘anti-thieves’ who rose up to flush the thieves out of their villages. They burnt the huts of thieves, but importantly had a sense of ‘noble cause’ as they alerted the thieves beforehand so that they might remove themselves and their families from their homesteads to prevent bloodshed (Peires 1994). This is a marked difference in tactic to the antisocial bandits who relied on fear and terror.

Penn (1988: 2-3, 15) following Austen (1986) argues that social banditry is best expressed where there is a powerful state to enforce the oppressive laws described by Hobsbawm (1969). Considering that the power of the colonial state stopped at its borders, those who escaped beyond the political geography seemingly cannot be considered social bandits. The bandits described in this thesis appear, however, to have remained within the confines of state power, if not directly within the border of the colony then certainly within range of state-sanctioned commandos. Penn (1988: 15) further sees the Khoe-San of the northern frontier in the eighteenth century as being primary resistors rather than social bandits. This argument is based on the fact that these Khoe-San were outsiders from colonial society who were resisting colonial expansion rather than figures within colonial society who felt oppressed by the state and consequently rebelled. While the term ‘primary resistors’ may apply to the Khoe-San who fought against the colony in the northern territories during the eighteenth century, I do not believe that it necessarily applies to the individuals I discuss. As covered in chapters 3, 4, and 5, many of the members of these bands had also been members of colonial society either as farm labourers, slaves or soldiers. That these individuals did not
flee the colony wholly but remained in the borderlands from where they could enact revenge on nearby farmers (cf. Penn 1988: 15) makes them ideal candidates for the appellation ‘bandits’ rather than ‘primary resitors’.

A further critique of Hobsbawm concerns the backgrounds of individuals who become bandits. Ralph Austen (1986:94) is critical of the idea that slaves may become social bandits, seeing them instead as more likely to become involved in other sorts of organised crime (Austen 1986: 94). He gives the example of nineteenth-century Nigeria where escaped slaves formed their own paramilitary groups that aimed to acquire their own slaves by preying on the local peasantry (Austen 1986: 95).

While this may have been the case in Nigeria, it certainly does not hold in other contexts. Ray Kea (1986: 111) notes that the rise of bandit groups in Ghana came about after the economy shifted from agriculture to mercantilism in the sixteenth century as a result of contact with Portuguese and Dutch traders. In many cases these bandit groups, referred to as ‘pirates’ by contemporary European travellers, consisted of peasants and escaped slaves as well as common criminals (Kea 1986: 110 & 116).

**Responses to the critiques**

Robert Gordon claims that despite the many criticisms of Hobsbawm, some of which are due, bandit theory is still a useful lens for understanding and studying certain groups of people (Gordon 1986: 173). Gordon avoids the issue of whether a bandit group is social or antisocial by instead considering how the ‘sense of injustice’ motivated people to rebel *within their means* on a small scale against an oppressive force. He examines the reasons why groups of twentieth-century San in the Kalahari formed bandit groups to raid livestock from white farmers. He found that San who work on farms may revolt and turn to raiding if they are mistreated by their employers. San men also experience their wives being captured and used as concubines by white settlers. Adding to this, San traditional hunting grounds were affected when land became used for agriculture by farmers who prevented access to and destroyed the natural fauna on which San hunters relied (Gordon 1986: 180). Gordon does not concern himself with trying to fit these San bandits into one of Hobsbawm’s categories, he instead takes what is useful from bandit theory and focuses on why these groups came together in the contexts in which they did (cf. Gordon 1992:7). This is the approach that I take throughout the thesis.
The borderlands

In Chapter Three, I explain how much of the study area falls within what was the borderlands of the Cape Colony’s eastern border, marked by the Great Fish River, during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Importantly, borderlands can be seen as spaces of contention where identities are formed and authoritarian structures are undermined.

Michiel Baud and Willem van Schendel (1997: 216) consider borderlands to be the space on either side of a border that has been established by a stately authority. In the context of the borderlands discussed in this thesis, the actual border was the Great Fish River which was established as the eastern boundary of the colony in 1778 (Saunders 1994: 69). Although initial borderland studies viewed the border as existing between two colonial powers (Adelman and Aron 1999), more recent scholarship suggests that it “is an area located between two political and cultural units that may be cut by the border” (Naum 2010: 103). As to how far this space exists on each side of the border, Baud and van Schendel (1997: 222) note that there is the border heartland, the intermediate border and the outlying outer borderland. This division of space is based on the influence of the border.

Importantly, Baud and van Schendel (1997: 235) write that borderlands ought not to be treated as a system where a core (state) determines what happens on the periphery but rather that as places of activity the borderlands may influence the state. This is a marked difference to the study of frontiers which drew on World Systems theory as a reaction to the work of Frederick Jackson Turner (who first introduced frontier studies in the late nineteenth century) in which frontiers were seen as entirely independent from the ‘civilised’ state (Cronon 1987: 173).

Pekka Hämiäläinen and Samuel Truett (2011: 359) argue that the approach of looking at how borderlands form and exert influence multi-directionally offers a contrast to earlier frontier models where colonial expansion and influence were understood as progressing in a uni-directional manner (cf. Turner 1897). These earlier models accordingly looked at change in frontier society as one of acculturation as those who came into contact with the frontier gave up their traditional lifeways (Naum 2010: 105). As demonstrated throughout this thesis, even when Africans did take on European material culture, they did so by redefining these new items within their own framework rather than merely acculturate them. Concerning the uni-directional approach of frontier studies, in the context of southern
Africa, colonial expansion was often halted, or indeed reversed, as settlers abandoned their farms in the face of resistance by bandits and other African chiefdoms (Saunders 1994: 73; Newton-King 1999: 111).

States may establish borders as a way of demarcating people and cordonning them off from each other, however, in practice those who live along the border and in the borderlands rarely heed this authority (Baud and van Schendel 1997: 211). For example, European settlers often crossed the border to trade with Xhosa chiefdoms, and vice-versa, despite this being expressly forbidden by the colony (Giliomee 1989: 432). Rather, borderlands serve as the space where different people interact in many different ways, often forming new identities in the process (Adelman and Aron 1999). Hamalainen and Truett (2011: 351) argue that violence which occurs in the borderlands, owing to state subjugation in an effort to establish authority, often brings different people together. This is something which is explored throughout this thesis in the formation of multi-ethnic bandit groups. This phenomenon also occurred along the northern borderlands of the colony in the late eighteenth century (Penn 1999: 166). These groups turned to violence to contest the development of the Cape Colony’s border and the colonial project.

These groups do seem to be bound to the borderlands. Nigel Penn (1999: 81) refers to the ‘parasitic existence’ of bandit groups in the northern borderlands of the Cape Colony. Although they may desire greater freedom from the Colony, and effectively escape to a greater distance where official control is lacking, these groups cannot stay away too long or move too far as they rely on robbing those farmers established in the borderlands. The necessity for bandits to stay within a suitable distance of society is noted throughout the work of Hobsbawn (1969).

Recognising the interstices that occur between borders of power, King and Challis (2017) use the term ‘interior world’ to describe the Maloti-Drakensberg in the nineteenth century. They highlight the formation of the BaPhuthi nation as a raiding polity who had previously been farmers (see also King 2014, 2017, 2019) as well as that of the AmaTola Bushmen whose individuals came from a variety of backgrounds before joining as raiders (see also Challis 2008, 2012, 2018). Indeed, Hampson (2015: 157) argues that it is almost impossible to assign a singular economic identity to a group. One group of bandits who were aligned with the BaPhuthi was the San group led by Soai and based at Sehonghong in the Maloti (Mitchell 2010). Geoffrey Blundell (2004) notes that to the east of the Maloti, in the Drakensberg, was a group of bandits under the leadership of a San man,
Nqabayo. In all of these cases, the groups assembled in the borderlands from pre-existing ethnicities, a common feature of these types of territories as outlined above. The groups actively contested the power of both Europeans and African chieftains by committing stock theft against them and, in the process, transgressing established boundaries. Importantly, evidence for these activities is found not just in the historical archives, but also painted on the walls of rock shelters. Fieldwork into the areas that make up the borderlands considered in this thesis has revealed that the shelters in the Great Fish River valley region also contain rock art. This thesis is concerned with these paintings and finds that indeed they were assuredly made by borderland raiders.

Chapter outline

Chapter Two: The impact of contact and colonization on the indigenous worldview, rock art and history of southern Africa: The Disconnect

This chapter has been submitted as a paper co-written with Sam Challis to the journal Current Anthropology. At the time of writing it is in press. The formatting and references are in accordance with the journal.

This paper includes a review of existing rock art research as well as original research. Sam Challis is lead author, though all research that went into the review parts of the paper was conducted by both authors. The section detailing the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’ is the work of Challis. The section detailing the Tarka Banditti is the work of Sinclair-Thomson.

The formation of what might be termed the Khoe-San art of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is discussed in the first chapter of this thesis. In this chapter we seek to explain how and why rock art changes as the artists experience contact with incoming groups, be they African farmers or pastoralists or European colonists. I do not wish to suggest that change only comes about due to interactions with outsiders, indeed it is certainly possible that the art changed throughout the period when southern Africa was only occupied by hunter-gatherers; however, the most strikingly obvious changes can certainly be linked to contact with others.

The art typically changes in both subject matter and in technique. Concerning subject matter, we see cattle, shields and iron spears and firearms, broad brim hats and European-style clothing appearing in the art. As argued, this cannot be seen as the mere incorporation of new elements on the landscape into the painters lexicon. With the inclusion of items associated with African farmer communities, I have shown elsewhere
(Sinclair-Thomson 2016) that this seemingly related to a trade in medicines and protective magic to be used in warfare that was supplied by hunter-gatherer ritual specialists for their African farmer neighbours. The inclusion of firearms in rock art from the colonial era likely also speaks to beliefs and concerns pertaining to protection, as argued in Chapter Seven.

The other noticeable difference between pre- and post-contact (be that contact with farmers, pastoralists or Europeans) is the technique or manner of depiction. In Chapter Two, we note that there is a distinct move away from fine-line shaded polychrome images of small-grained natural toned paint to images that are not shaded but are painted in thick chalky large grain paint with either fine-line, rough brushwork or finger-painting, or a mixture of any or all of these. These changes have been noted before in a study of paintings pre and post contact with African farmers in the Caledon River valley (Loubser and Laurens 1994), but here we aimed to look at this on a much larger scale. Unlike this earlier study, we especially considered how the ethnic makeup of the painters was certainly changed by contact with incoming groups and that these changes in turn influenced the art. In doing so we note that the landscape was changed by others and that in many cases the pre-existing groups were marginalised and their trade routes were disrupted, another factor which likely affected the art as the trade in paint products suffered.

At no point is it suggested that the painters meekly acquiesced to any mistreatment, perceived or actual, by incoming groups. Indeed, this is particularly noticeable in the colonial period where the written record explicitly details the resistance of people, who we argue made the rock art discussed in this thesis, to the colonial project. The form of resistance with which we are particularly concerned is that of banditry as exemplified through acts of stock theft and destruction against the property of European settlers. We argue that this was an effort by dispossessed groups to halt and reverse colonial expansion.

Chapter Three: Trouble on the Tarka: the rock art history of bandit groups on the Cape Colony’s eastern border and the archive of their rock art


In this chapter I examine the history of the Cape Colony’s eastern borderlands and discuss the formation of groups of bandits. In doing so, I look at how both the written record and
rock art can be used to understand the socio-political forces present on the landscape. I particularly draw on the work of Eric Hobsbawm (1969), and related critiques, in explaining the formation of these bandit groups as well as their practices and beliefs.

The written record is useful for documenting the presence of various groups on the landscape surrounding the Tarka River valley (including the Great Fish River border) during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Here we find that, as the colony was expanding eastwards, European settlers increasingly came into contact with African hunter-gatherers, pastoralists and farmers. With colonial expansion, came the subjugation of these indigenous groups with the result that many turned to banditry as their lifeways were threatened and destroyed.

I outline the fact that, as Africans lost access to natural resources and land, many were forced to work for Europeans on their farms or alternatively (Penn 2017) as part of the colonial military. In these labour roles they frequently suffered abuse, breeding further resentment towards the colonists. Labourers often did not enter into this workforce out of their own volition, but were frequently taken by force by organised commandos consisting of European farmers and their farm-hands.

Many indigenes who could escape, did, and joined with others hiding in the mountains of the borderlands (Penn 1999). These multi-ethnic groups turned to banditry as both a resort for sheer survival and as resistance to the colonial project. They stole cattle, horses and firearms from the European farms in the borderlands. In doing so, those who had not been trained in firearm technology and horsemanship, soon became adepts at both.

Throughout this region we find rock art that appears to be concerned with the raids committed by these bandits. That these groups are historically attested as having had a Khoe-San contingent suggests that they made rock art images, especially as we find paintings that depict colonial-era subjects in the exact locations where they were known to hide. The art in question is of the rough-brush work type, as well as the finger-painted type (see Chapter Two) and is suggestive of the mixed-nature of these groups. Interestingly there are certain motifs, such as rain animals, associated with the earlier ‘traditional’ corpus, that also appear in this art, albeit in the later technique. This not only attests to these groups having a Khoe-San inflection, but also to the redeployment of earlier beliefs to suit the colonial context. It appears from the art and the ethnography used to explain the images that these beliefs related to the protective powers necessary for banditry.
Chapter Four: Runaway slaves, rock art and resistance in the Cape Colony, South Africa

Brent Sinclair-Thomson and Sam Challis in press. Submitted to the journal *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa*. Research was conducted equally by both authors. The section on the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’ is the work of Challis. The section on the Tarka banditti is the work of Sinclair-Thomson. The formatting and references are in accordance with the journal.

In this chapter we elaborate on one of the primary reasons why people turned to banditry, namely the institution of slavery and their escape from it. We examine the Indian Ocean slave trade which forced so many unwilling migrants to the Cape. Cape slave society did not, however, consist of only foreigners. There was also a local slave trade in indigenous populations, despite this practice being officially outlawed by the Dutch East India Company. In many cases local and ‘exotic’ slaves were kept together, their intimate relations producing a new colonial category of people, the so-called ‘Bastard-Hottentots’. Whenever they could, slaves often escaped and joined with other groups of Khoe-San and African farmers in the borderlands of the colony.

From the beginning of colonisation in the Cape, slaves were imported from other regions governed by, or otherwise connected with, the Dutch East India Company, including East Africa, India, Malaysia, Madagascar and Mauritius. The original reason for their having been imported to the Cape was that Cape colonists were not permitted to enslave the indigenous population. However, exotic slaves were expensive to buy and costly to transport, so many European farmers in the borderlands of the colony could not afford a slave workforce. Others were simply unwilling to buy official slaves when they could simply travel across the border and use their martial superiority to capture indigenous people, usually Khoe-San, and force them into slavery. This illegal slave trade was also capitalised on by groups of mixed descent, like the Bergenaars, who became slave raiders in their own right. Khoe-San slaves were typically passed off as belonging to an apprenticeship programme, which was legal under Dutch law, although the European masters abused this system, with the Khoe-San being kept and treated as slaves with none of the rights associated with apprenticeship.

Once held on the farms of colonists, Khoe-San came into contact with ‘exotic’ slaves. There was often intermixing between members of these different groups. The progeny that came about from these relations were recognized by the authorities as ‘Bastard-Hottentots’. They were technically supposed to have greater liberty than the slaves, but this
was often not the case and they too were kept as an unfree workforce.

Many slaves, indigenous, ‘exotic’ or mixed, managed to escape their workplaces and sought refuge in the mountains of the borderlands. Here they found other groups of indigenous descent engaged in banditry against the colony. With common goals, and in many cases a common heritage, the slaves were welcomed into these groups. In other cases, they likely formed their own groups in places of refuge. As discussed in Chapter Three, we find rock paintings in these areas. We also have historical accounts of the groups in these areas; these included runaway slaves among their number. Accordingly, this chapter looks at how this rock art was produced by communities that included runaway slaves in their number. In doing so, we get a more nuanced understanding into this rock art as resistance against not just an encroaching ‘other’, but against a system into which the painters were forced.

Chapter Five: Escape and Abscond: the use of Ostrich potency by 19th century rock artists, eastern Cape, South Africa.

Brent Sinclair-Thomson, submitted to Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa. The formatting and references are in accordance with the journal.

Fieldwork in the Zuurberg, Stormberg, Windvogelberg and south eastern Drakensberg revealed a surprising trend in rock art motifs that appear to be concerned with raiding (as argued in Chapter Three): the presence of ostriches. Historical sources attest to the late nineteenth-century domestication of ostriches, meaning that they were only commercially farmed only after these paintings were seemingly created. This suggests that when committing stock theft, bandits were not running off with ostriches as well as cattle and horses. Rather, it is necessary to focus on how ostriches fit within the painters’ ontologies (cf. Mitchell 2015).

An examination of Khoe-San beliefs about ostriches appears to shed some light on their appearance in scenes of stock theft. Ethnographically-recorded beliefs of extant Khoe-San groups in the Kalahari today coupled with archival Khoe-San accounts from the nineteenth century reveal a widespread belief in ostriches as master ‘escape artists’ and, accordingly, the employment of what I argue was ostrich potency to assist in matters of escape. It is particularly the legs of the ostrich that are significant. They enable the birds to outrun predators like lions as well as human hunters. Furthermore, they are able to leap over the nets used by Khoe-San to catch them. Khoe-San attached the tendons from
ostrich legs to their own legs to give them stamina when they tired. Ostrich eggshell was also used as the main ingredient in a fortifying tonic.

Taking into account the clandestine activities of the individuals who painted these images, the appearance of a symbol of escape in the rock art begins to make sense. Bandits would have relied on anything to assist them with escape following an act of stock theft. The very individuals who joined these bandit groups would likely also have drawn on ostrich potency to help them escape from their places of work prior to joining bandit groups in the mountains. Following on from Chapter Three, which is concerned with slavery, I examine in this chapter the predicament in which Khoe-San found themselves when working for colonists, either as farm-hands or in the colonial military. Harsh treatment at the hands of their European masters led many Khoe-San to escape and abscond from their positions. The brutal punishment that came with recapture meant that once they escaped, they had to ensure that they were never found again. The use of ostrich potency was one method that was believed to ensure this.

Chapter Six: The ‘bullets to water’ belief complex: a pan-southern African cognate epistemology for protective medicines and the control of projectiles

Brent Sinclair-Thomson and Sam Challis 2017, published in Journal of Conflict Archaeology 12(3): 192-208. The research and writing of the paper was divided between both authors. The sections on Mlanjeni, umabophe, and the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’ are the work of Challis. Sections on Nxele, shields and spears and interviews with informants on traditional medicines and fighting are the work of Sinclair-Thomson.

This chapter discusses the ritual response of indigenous southern Africans to the arrival of firearms. We show how when it came to beliefs in protection against the devastating effects of guns, indigenes drew on their pre-existing understanding of projectile weapons used in the late independent and colonial periods.

Before the importation of guns, southern Africans believed it possible to influence the trajectory of arrows and spears by ritual performance and traditional medicines (muthi). These means ensured that an enemy’s weapons would miss their mark when aimed at the person who had been doctored. In the colonial era this belief, now modified to suit the changing circumstances, was applied to firearms.
We mention two of the most well-known historical cases in which African war-doctors provided their armies with medicines that were believed to turn the settlers’ bullets into water. This belief was also informed by an ontology that held the ancestors to be present in mythical cattle who could be called upon to enact transformations, in this case the transformation of bullets into water.

Although these two case examples pertain to Xhosa society, it is also shown that this belief existed among ‘Bushman’ groups. Special focus is given to the AmaTola of the southeastern mountains. As war-doctors they were known to call upon water elements to protect themselves, in the same manner that African farmer war-doctors, who also served as rainmakers, called upon mist and rain to disguise their armies. The AmaTola did so when raiding cattle to ensure a successful escape as their enemies were confounded.

Importantly, these beliefs are present in the art of the AmaTola which features rain-animals. That these mythical beasts are also found in the art of the Tarka River valley, as discussed in chapters two and three, suggests the same belief was present among these groups. The belief in the manipulation of water and the enemies’ projectiles would have been called upon when committing stock theft.

Chapter Seven: Indigenising the gun – rock art depictions of firearms in the Eastern Cape, South Africa


In Chapter Six I focus on the beliefs held by indigenous southern Africans concerning protection against firearms as well as how water elements, be they storms, rain or mist, could be used to conceal and camouflage an army or group of raiders. In this chapter I focus on the beliefs regarding the offensive nature of firearms, rather than protection against guns.

I demonstrate here the problematic nature of looking at rock art depictions of people with firearms and assuming them to be Europeans, owing to the presence of material culture that was introduced to South Africa by colonists. I especially draw on historical accounts demonstrating that Africans acquired firearms shortly after these arrived in the sub-continent. Indeed, by the time these images were likely made firearm use amongst
groups of ‘Bushman’ bandits was becoming increasingly common.

This is not to say that southern Africans viewed guns in the same way as the Europeans who introduced them. I briefly look at examples from North America and Australia where indigenes acquired firearms but understood them according to their own ontologies, specifically linking understandings of the function of pre-existing projectile weapons. This recalls the same theme from Chapter Six.

I continue the theme discussed in Chapter Six in which beliefs pertaining to pre-existing projectile weapons were applied to firearms. Here, however, I focus on how the medicines were used to make the weapons fly straight and true to their target. These medicines came to be either used with guns either by keeping ammunition in the same pouches as the muthi, or by allowing the smoke of burning medicine to travel up the barrel of the gun.

I show that an indigenous ontology existed in which firearms were likened to thunderstorms. This is very important if we consider, as shown in Chapter Six, that there was a close link between rain-control and weapon control. Here I examine Khoe-San beliefs in the manipulation of lightning and thunderstorms to be used as weapons against an enemy.

I then turn to the rock art itself, where we find many paintings of people with guns. I suggest that these images were committed to the rock as a form of control by ritual specialists who in doing so demonstrated their capabilities to others in their group. I argue that by painting these images, these specialists were ensuring the success of the bandits in their endeavours.

Chapter Eight: Discussion and conclusion

The necessity for this project came about from noticing the lack of representation of the mixed groups of bandits in the eastern borderlands in southern African histories. Indeed, as explained in Chapter Three, many historians seem more concerned with the wars between the colonists and various Xhosa chieftaincies. Where Khoe-San are concerned, their material culture in the form of rock art is typically underrepresented. Cases where the rock art of the colonial era is discussed do not consider how the art related to the activities of these mixed groups, or even that it was painted by mixed groups in the first place, thereby accrediting the art to those of an essentialised San identity. I have
taken the written historical records and ethnographies and read them alongside the art to show how we can get both an emic and etic perspective on the socio-political processes during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. In doing so, I have sought to explain the formation, lifeways and beliefs of the ‘Bushman’ bandits of the borderlands.
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THE IMPACT OF CONTACT AND COLONISATION ON THE INDIGENOUS WORLDVIEW, ROCK ART AND HISTORY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA: ‘THE DISCONNECT’
The impact of contact and colonisation on indigenous worldviews, rock art and the history of southern Africa: ‘The Disconnect’

by Sam Challis and Brent Sinclair-Thomson

Abstract

The archaeological record undergoes a dramatic shift in appearance whenever indigenous peoples encounter incoming populations – whether in the form of economy, politics or identity. Rock art in southern Africa testifies to successive interactions between hunter-gatherers, incoming African herders, African farmers and, later, European settlers. New subject matter, however, is not simply incorporated into the pre-existing tradition. Without exception, the many rock arts that depict novel motifs are made differently from the ‘traditional corpus’, usually rougher in appearance (in both paintings and engravings) more dynamic, or with vivid and chalky paints. The drop in pigment quality is likely owing to the disruption and, ultimate decimation of, indigenous groups and the subsequent breakdown in trade and social communications – The Disconnect. The shifts in manner of depiction and the ways in which motifs are treated owes more, it seems, to the increasingly heterogeneous and creolizing membership of the art-producing people and the mixing of their cosmologies, albeit with specific cultural survivals. Pre-colonial contact images speak to a multitude of interactions and entanglements in ways that can inform the archaeological record, and colonial-era rock art constitutes a major component of the historical archive; an emic, agentive artefact that offers a reverse gaze from an indigenous perspective.

Introduction

Manner of depiction and subject matter vary across what used to be considered the hunter-gatherer or ‘San’ rock art tradition in southern Africa. This variance is seen geographically in terms of pigments and iconography. It is also seen temporally, the chronological changes charted by Harris matrices; indirect (e.g. Mazel 2009) and direct radiocarbon dating of

1 We reject any pejorative connotations associated with the words ‘San’ or ‘Bushman’ - a discussion of their origins and use forms a central part of our argument later in this article. We follow the modern orthography for the spelling of ‘Khoe’, except when quoting earlier sources.
painted images (to as much as 3000 cal. BP, Bonneau et al. 2017). Typically depicting wild animals and people with fine-line brushwork (and in engravings finely-pecked), we term this art the ‘traditional corpus’. Preference for animal subjects varies regionally (Hampson et al. 2018). The images perhaps most famously associated with the southern San are those of eland and other antelope painted in multiple colours, shaded to achieve an almost photographic likeness (e.g. Vinnicombe 1976; Figure 1a). This corpus is often superimposed by images that appear less ‘refined’ (examined later in this article). Noticeable changes also occur with the depiction of new arrivals on the landscape – domestic stock associated with African pastoralism, shields, spears and, much later, European paraphernalia; horses, hats and guns. The change is likely owing not only to shifts in economy undergone by the ‘Khoe-San’ artists, but also to the increasingly mixed cultural membership of such ‘Bushman’ groups (for San, Khoe-San and Bushman, see later discussion) following contacts of all kinds. Though Europeans did not encounter entirely ‘pristine’ indigenes, one of the main catalysts for the formation of mixed groups was the devastation of autochthonous communities, largely at the hands of colonial commandos. Far from representing a narrative of passive retreat, however, these images reflect (in indigenous idioms) the concerns of groups who actively negotiated their place in the subcontinent. Indeed the images were likely part of those negotiations - our intention here is to emphasise the blurring of boundaries between the socio-economic and socio-religious, as well as the ethnic associations that can mistakenly be attributed to any erroneously bounded categories. In calling attention to rock art images, we achieve something of the perspective, offered by this indigenous archive. Incoming African herders also have rock art associated with them (as we explore here, cf. Smith and Ouzman 2004) yet neither is it simply bounded.

2 Indirect dates of painted burial stones in South Africa date to c. 2000 BP (Pearce 20013), c. 4000 BP and (Thackeray 1983) and c. 10,000 BP (Thackeray et al. 1981) and painted plaquettes in Namibia, famously date (indirectly) to c. 27,000 BP (Wendt 1976).

3 The commando system was a paramilitary of frontier farmers and their servants, designed to counter stock theft (e.g. Penn 2005:115) which almost immediately became an institution abused by the Boers to supplement their labour force (Elphick & Malherbe 1989:45; Newton-King 1999).

4 African farmer rock art, though doubtless made during times of association with foragers and herders, remains discrete as far as we can tell; see Eastwood et al. 2016.
This article is a broad overview of the changes observable in images of contact – with a focus on the colonial era. It does not detail every aspect of every contact episode or type. Rather, it highlights particular examples in order to contextualise the sequence of contact experiences undergone in the subcontinent in rock art terms, that is to say, as seen from an indigenous point of view (on problematizing ‘contact’ see Paterson 2016). We do not claim that societal change is only brought about by contact with outside groups or that every instance of contact can be ‘seen’ reflected in rock art – only that we deal with those images depicting new arrivals which can safely be classified as ‘contact images’ (see e.g. Goldhahn & May 2018). Nor do we claim that The Disconnect was a singular event, rather that it progresses through the many ‘contacts’ outlined here and that it is particularly noticeable during colonisation before the cessation of image making. Further, we re-emphasise the observation of other writers – that whenever we use ethnographic accounts of southern Africans to interpret rock art, the results are always far from anything a western perspective might produce. The ethnographic approach, though contested (Dowson & Lewis-Williams 1994), has at least shown that the traditional corpus is overwhelmingly connected with visions of the San spirit world, accessed via the trance dance (Lewis-Williams 2019). As will be discussed, art created by those with a perceived connection with the San continued to exhibit evidence of visionary images (particularly clear in the presence of ‘therianthropes’ – the part-human, part, animal figures resultant of the ‘drawing on’ animal potency in the dance). This means that in terms of hunter-gatherers meeting others the resulting depictions, though sometimes ‘narrative’ in appearance, are never narrative in the Western sense (i.e. storytelling; cf. Hampson 2013). Thus we see images of ‘scenes’ that look like raids including people on horseback with domesticates, accompanied by baboons or ostriches and

Figure 1, from the same rock shelter in the southern Maloti-Drakensberg, a) Shaded polychrome of an eland antelope in the Traditional Corpus (oldest dated c3000 cal. BP, Bonneau et al. 2017); b) rendition of an eland in poster-like block colour, likely painted after the ‘disconnect’ from tradition that was brought about by contact.
‘non-real’ rain-animals – which put the lie to explanations such as ‘daily life’ or actual historical events (see e.g. Willcox 1963). These elements do, however, make sense within emic ontologies. We pay particular attention to those images created by mixed raiders – the Korana, the AmaTola and the banditti of the Tarka region. Therefore, while we are able to see many breaks with the traditional corpus throughout the millennia of contact, we also see something of a ‘maintenance’ of traditional beliefs, in one form or another, which survive and are redeployed to suit changing circumstances. The inclusion of elements ‘foreign’ to the hunter-gatherers is accompanied by changes in manner of depiction characterized by a loss of definition (becoming more ‘crude’ or simplistic), a drop in pigment quality (using ‘chalky’ poster-like paints), and a shift in colour palette (becoming more ‘vivid’). These shifts are explored by Jannie Loubser and Gordon Laurens in their 1994 (89, 102) examination of contact between foragers and farmers in the Caledon River Valley, as well as by Sven Ouzman in his analysis of contact rock art in the South African Maloti (Ouzman 2003) and Korana rock art (Ouzman 2005:106), examined later in this article.

Figure 2. Map of southern Africa with places mentioned in the text. Shading is based on carrying capacity for livestock in 2009. More than ten hectares are required to sustain a single livestock unit in the west while in the east less than six hectares are required per livestock unit (after Meissner et al. 2013 p291 fig. 1).
Although there are plenty of ‘crude’, ‘chalky’ and ‘vivid’ images that do not exhibit contact material, the likelihood is that they were painted post-contact because of their marked similarity to contact art, and for the reasons examined below – the causes and effects of contact. Admittedly, it is possible that there are traditional images produced post-contact that carry contact messages (see e.g. Blundell 2004) but these have not been proven. Rather, and as we explain later, there are ‘cruder’, ‘chalkier’ and more ‘vivid’ images of traditional subjects reminiscent of the hunter-gatherer past. First, however, we outline the arrival of other Africans (herders and farmers), then European colonists, before moving on to the effects of these contacts, the formation of hybrid bandit groups and the ‘reverse gaze’ resultant in their rock art.

The nature of contact

Prior to indigenous hunter-gatherers encountering Europeans, the subcontinent was populated by other Africans (herders and farmers) from 2000 to 3000 years ago. The indigenous foragers experienced the arrival of Khoe language-speaking herders, themselves the product of northern foragers meeting East African herders from 3000 years ago, and who later migrated south of the Limpopo c.1000 years ago (e.g. Güldemann 2008; for reviews and debate see Sadr 2008, 2015; A. Smith 2008; Smith and Ouzman 2004; Orton et al. 2013). Additionally, isiNtu language-speaking farmers entered the region from approximately 2000 years ago (e.g. Li et al. 2014; Parkington & Hall 2012). Hunter-gatherers (or foragers), herders and farmers make up the artificially-essentialised handles by which we must necessarily refer to these African economies – each one, of course, comprised of multiple language groups, nations, and peoples with their own historical trajectories. The fluidity of their lifeways we examine below.

Hunter-gatherer rock art appears to have been affected by the new conditions that these migrations precipitated, as was the rock art of the migrants themselves (see Morris and Hollmann examined below). However, the incoming economies, traditions, and peoples did not necessarily arrive as discrete packages; domesticates, particularly, seem to have spread southward in a process of diffusion (e.g. Sadr 2015). Domesticates, iron, pottery and other material culture (whether moving in advance of, or at the same time as, incoming groups) likely travelled with an associated suite of ideas pertaining to them. These understandings included practice and belief, which became entangled with those of the indigenes – so much
so that scholars David Morris (e.g. 2008; 2012) and Jeremy Hollmann (e.g. 2007, 2014) conclude that some rock art traditions are impossible to assign ethnic authorship.

Following Morris and Hollmann, we adopt the term ‘Khoe-San’ for such rock art traditions stressing that they, and/or groups that carried them, could be discrete, combined, or mutual partners in a culturally-coherent bricolage that developed over several millennia (on use of the term Khoe-San see e.g. Besten 2011:188-9). We use the term ‘Bushmen’ when referring to bands of mixed raiders in the late-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries – in an economic, not necessarily ethnic, sense (see Challis 2012, 2016, 2018). Further, we refer to ‘Bandits’ in the sense of an economic response to an oppressive system, groups of which were also mixed (Blok 1972; Hobsbawm 1969; Peires 1994; Sinclair-Thomson in press; forthcoming (a)). We return to this point later in discussing the phenomenon of hybridity.

When we speak of groups in terms of economy (e.g. forager), there is an implied ethnic association that we do not wish to treat uncritically. Ethnicity, as defined by the unifying concept that a people attribute to their shared ancestry, has currency. It is not determined by genetics or ‘race’, and is often asserted by performance (e.g. Clammer 2015:2159), and therefore neither bounded nor impermeable, but fluid. Although ethnicity may be maintained, and indeed emphasized (even ‘overdetermined’, Voss 2008:37) during contact, it may also be adopted or adapted in contact situations by groups forging new identities on the basis of old ones.

The nature of contact between African economies was such that foragers were marginalized by both herders and farmers, even when amicable relations meant favourable trading partnerships (e.g. Forssman 2014), and they usually had to remain in the interstices – mountains and deserts – where there was less desirable grazing (Mitchell 2013:480-81; Figure 2). This was observed by colonists on their arrival in such regions as the eastern Cape5: food-producing groups taking over the fertile river basins, and hunter-gatherers living in the highlands (e.g. Hall 1986:44). Not that such marginalisation meant that groups necessarily remained discrete. More common were economic categorisations governed by one’s perceived social standing – that is, whether one hunted, herded or farmed (cf. Marks 1972; Whitelaw 2009). The complex issues of ethnicity and its relation to economy we revisit later, suffice it to say that recent scholarship has found much evidence for mixing –

5 For historical references we employ the lower-case e in ‘eastern’, as opposed to the modern ‘Eastern Cape Province’
linguistic, genetic, economic and cultural – pointing to the great antiquity of the relationship between foragers, herders and farmers (Eastwood 2007; McGranaghan 2015; Traill 2002; Tishkoff et al. 2007). By the time of European colonisation few, if any, groups were unaffected by the millennia of interaction.

For our purposes the nature of contact between foragers and herders is examined most pertinently by Morris (2008; 2012) and Hollmann (2007, 2014) who find that it is typified by syncretic conceptions of the rain in the form of water snakes (for example at sites such as Driekops Eiland, Driekuil, Gestoptefontein; see also Lange 2011). For San- and Khoe-speakers this syncretism has its roots in their shared origins, which effectively meant that wherever they met thenceforth they were able to relate to one another using a fundamental precedent that had long been set (e.g. Barnard 1992; but see Güldemann 2008). From these deep-seated underpinnings, later Khoe/San interaction could be reimagined and reified.

The arrival of pastoralism and agriculture had effects that have been much discussed, most notably in the Great Kalahari Debate – in which perhaps the core contention is whether hunter-gatherers became subservient to, or even wholly subsumed within, more ‘dominant’ (economically robust) societies (e.g. Mitchell 2002: 224-5; Sadr 1997; Solway & Lee 1990; Wilmsen & Denbow 1990; ). The tendency to treat economies as distinct or even ethnically-determined obfuscates the complicated nature of the cultural entanglements that are more likely the result of contact. Earlier studies that have sought to explain contact between foragers and farmers in the south eastern mountains (e.g. Hammond-Tooke 1997; Jolly 1996; Mazel 1989) have unfortunately perpetuated the assumption that economies are tied to culture and that they remain discretely bounded entities, despite the converse being repeatedly demonstrated (Challis 2016; Hamilton & Liebhammer 2016:36, 39; Whitelaw & Hall 2016; Wright 2007).

While the nature of contact changes through time, it is important to stress that contemporaneous contact situations could, of course, be very different. Further, while the processes of contact between African groups were protracted, the contact between these and Europeans was relatively abrupt owing to rapid colonial settlement (e.g. Penn 2013).
Scales of colonial contact

When speaking of colonial contact it is important to note that the first interactions were different from those occurring throughout the following 350 years of colonisation. The following vignettes illustrate ‘culture contact’ (e.g. Paterson 2012) situations unfolding chronologically:

1. In 1657, shortly after the establishment of the Dutch garrison at the Cape in 1652, a Khoe interpreter named Doman was taken to the Dutch East Indies where he was exposed to the effects of colonisation. He learned how to use matchlock muskets and, following his return to the Cape, acquired a firearm during the Khoe revolt in 1659 and instructed his fellows as to its operation (Schoeman 2009:51, 61-3).

2. In 1739 the first ‘Bushman War’, sparked in response to illegal cattle raiding by Trekboers beyond the colony, was made all the more fierce by servants armed with muskets ‘deserting’ to the Nama (Khoe) and ‘San’ (e.g. Elphick & Malherbe 1989:26,33; Jolly 2015:52-3). Although many Khoe-San were employed on colonial farms, resistance had by this time become entrenched in the lives of the colonized.

3. In 1809 Colonel Collins, travelling to the north-eastern Cape, met two Boer farmers who boasted of their commando raids: one killing or taking (as slave labour) 3,200 ‘Bushmen’, the other 2,700 (Moodie 1838:7). Even if the figures were inflated they are nonetheless shockingly high considering the average hunter-gatherer band likely consisted of approximately 30-50 individuals (for Kalahari inference in numbers see Yellen & Harpending 1972).

4. In the 1820s, the settler Thomas Pringle (1835:233) recorded mixed bandits raiding farms in the Winterberg, exemplified by the activities of the ‘Bushman’ Dragoener. During service on a farm Dragoener was flogged for some misdemeanor and subsequently escaped, declaring eternal enmity towards the colonists. He became leader of a bandit group comprising wild (free) ‘Bushmen’, tame (farm) ‘Bushmen’, runaway slaves and military deserters – with muskets – from the Cape Corps (including Khoe-San, Coloured, Indonesian

---

6 An approximate length of time by which we imply the colonial period beginning with Dutch settlement in the 1650s through to the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910 – effectively ending official British colonisation – not to suggest that colonialism ended at this point.
and African slaves). His band also worked in concert with at least four Xhosa men (Theal 1905:48). They raided colonists’ livestock while hiding out, and likely painting, in the mountain rock shelters near Pringle’s farm (see figure 17).

5. In 1819 Nxele, the ‘wardoctor’ to Xhosa Chief Ndlambe, attacked Grahamstown (Peires 1981:63–64). He blended traditional African and Christian beliefs into a syncretic millenarian prophecy (Peires 1979, 56). He had given *mabophe* – a traditional war medicine cognate with Khoe-San materia medica – to his warriors which they believed would turn the settlers’ bullets to water (Hodgson 1986: 5; Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017).

6. In the 1840s John Shepstone (Wright 1971:107) noted that, when cornered in the Maloti-Drakensberg, ‘Bushmen’ are reported to have said that they would ‘never leave off harassing the Afrikaners’ [settlers] due to the harsh treatment they had received in the Cape. He also said they spoke ‘Dutch’ fluently. This instance highlights not only the movement of people over the landscape in the face of colonial expansion, but also the ‘sense of injustice’ (Gordon 1986; Hobsbawm 1969) that drove the resistance of bandits such as those discussed later.

These examples demonstrate the nature of contact changing temporally as well as spatially. To an extent they also chart the acquisition of guns and their conversion to the epistemology of indigenous southern Africans (e.g. Sinclair-Thomson 2019). Southern Africans took on certain elements of colonial culture while simultaneously rejecting others. At the same time they kept certain traditions alive by way of maintaining cohesion and a sense of identity (Blundell 2004; Challis 2016 *inter alia*). As is argued, the redeployment of particular indigenous symbols suggests a desire for continuity with a past from which they had been *disconnected*. We now turn to examples of how contact with other Africans, then colonists, uprooted the hunter-gatherer lifeway and how hunter-gatherers in turn influenced the incoming groups.

---

7 The Xhosa are a large African farming nation residing primarily in the eastern Cape (Peires 1981).
8 How modern groups descended from autochthonous peoples respond to the issues raised here is beyond the scope of this article, but for relevant scholarship see Ndlovu 2009; Prins 2009, and on the participatory project see Dyll and Tomaselli 2016; Ncapayi and Mayongo 2018
The effects of contact

With contact came change in subsistence strategies because others changed the socio-political landscape, and environment. Domestic stock consumed the veld to the extent that wild animals could not graze and wild plant foods could not be gathered (cf. Beinart 2002; Parkington et al. 1986). The incoming herders and farmers also hunted, thus depleting the game animals further (Mitchell 2002:227). Hunter-gatherers thus had little option but to remain in marginal areas. Andrew Smith (1986:40) suggests that the arid ‘Bushmanland’ region became ‘a refuge for hunter-gatherers under pressure from pastoralists using the riparian pasture’. The marginalized hunter-gatherers therefore adapted their foraging strategy to include the livestock of their neighbours (e.g. Kolb 1731:89-90) and in doing so invoked their own agency by taking from those who had taken from them. Foragers, therefore, found themselves adapting to a situation in which they had been disconnected from their native landscape and way of life.

On naming and association

The Bushmen called themselves *Saan*

(Somerville 1779-1801, in Raper 2010:175)

*Sān* (pronounced *Saan*) appears to have been an endogenous term that, among the Khoe, had come to mean ‘bandits’ or ‘vagabonds’ (Raper 2010:175-6; A. Smith 1997:11). Indeed, the name *San* (a contraction of *Sanqua*, earlier *Sonqua* or *Soqua*), ‘has been explained as “gatherers”, “outcasts, pariahs”, “servants, subjects”…’ (Raper 2010:168). These translations ought not to be taken literally but as the connotations they carried for their neighbours. They come largely from Khoe at the Cape and attest to the likelihood that San had earned a reputation as an underclass of thieves well before the arrival of Europeans (the Cape Council’s Diary in 1660 mentions ‘*Soqua*’ as ‘mostly robbers’, Raven-Hart 1971:72). Among colonists their notoriety only grew. Importantly, San was a meta-category that included subdivisions such as *Obiqua* (or *Ubiqua*, Cape Council Diary 1676, 1684 in Raven-Hart 1971:181, 254; although see Parkington 1984:164). It was almost invariably associated with economy which, more often than not, included stock theft.
How San and Khoe became ‘Bushman thieves’

There was much colonial confusion as to whether different groups encountered were ‘Khoe’ or ‘San’, and perhaps the main reason for this was that ‘Bushmen’ often had herds of cattle (Kolb 1731:76; Jolly 2007). Indeed, the archetypal nineteenth-century southern San group most frequently referenced by historians and anthropologists today – the |Xam – kept sheep (McGranaghan 2015).

Some scholars see ‘Khoe’ and ‘San’ not as strictly separate categories but rather as polarities along a fluid scale. Alan Barnard (2008:67) follows Shula Marks (1972:57) in suggesting:

…consider the possibility of San and Khoekhoe as cultural traditions that one opts into or out of, seasonally, when one has livestock or loses it, or according to choice. This does not mean that San and Khoekhoe are the same, but on the contrary, that they are opposites—poles to which individuals and groups gravitate, and about whose existence they are acutely aware.

It is this fluidity which has led to the adoption of the term ‘Khoe-San’ when examining and interpreting material culture and associated beliefs that occur among both groups (cf. Besten 2011).

The clientship the hunters often entered into placed them on a lower social standing (cf. Wilmsen 1989) and the same went for those Khoe-speakers who lost their stock, falling back as they did on extended family. Wealth being measured in livestock, the traditional way to recoup lost herds (and indeed the way in which they were commonly lost) was to raid. That herders engage in institutionalized raiding is well attested across eastern and southern Africa (Gray et al. 2003; King 2017). In southern Africa, once hunter-gatherers had been marginalized and impoverished, they also became willing raiding partners and thus economically indistinguishable (especially to an outsider) from herders. References to Sanqua, Sonqua, Ubiqua, Bosjesmans and Bushmen serving as ‘soldiers’ in such raiding parties occur throughout the archive (e.g. Kolb 1731:76).

The term ‘Bushmen’ begins to appear more frequently in the archive with the increased level of raiding – a result of cooperation between groups of dispossessed people who were perceived either to have been Khoe- or San-speaking. Kolb (1731: 89-90) notes that the banditti made up of outcasts from multiple groups of ‘Hottentots’, in which he includes hunter-gatherers (Sonqua), came to be known by the Dutch as ‘Buschies’, an
abbreviation of ‘Bosjesmans’ (cf. Raper 2010). Parkington (1984:165) observes that ‘…the Bushman life-style… was one led by former pastoralists and foragers as a result of increased Dutch disruption.’

These ‘Bushmen’ could comprise of ‘San’, ‘Khoe’ and African farmers as well as the aforementioned deserters and runaway slaves. Sometimes a new ethnicity was born – an ethnogenesis – of more- protracted hybridity, resulting in creolization as seen in the case of the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’ discussed later (e.g. Challis 2016, 2018). As we shall see, the rock art produced by multiethnic and creole bandits may be used as an historical archive in its own right – as evidence of their formation, activities and beliefs. Beforehand, however, it is important to consider the previous attempts by others to write histories from rock art. We do so to demonstrate that our approach is unlikely to meet the same issues as those preceding.

**Rock art as archive**

The idea that rock art might provide the reverse gaze to processes of contact has been entertained before now; a synthesis of endeavours to re-write ‘San’ history from an insider perspective in the Maloti-Drakensberg is offered by Ben Smith (2010). Although regionally specific, this debate has come to stand for the trend in scholarship in contact rock art more generally. Thomas Dowson (1993) critiques Aron Mazel’s (1992) suggestion that excavated evidence, combined with careful reading of ethnographic and historical accounts, will reveal a history as perceived by the ‘San’ themselves. Dowson argues Mazel’s approach is still overly-reliant on Western historical texts, thereby privileging outsider constructs. He suggests instead (1993:644) that ‘San’ rock art is in fact the primary source and has the potential to reveal the insider perspective (Smith 2010:346). Mazel’s response (1993:890) is that he had specifically focused on the last 150 years of ‘San’ history, and that without a reliable chronology for the art, it is impossible to say how much of it fits within this period. It would, therefore, be problematic to examine the art through an ahistoric lens for the express purpose of using it to construct such a history. Dowson rejoins (1994) with evidence that (he claims) shows an historical progression of change in ‘San’ rock art made in response to contact with outsiders. This goes further to include contact with herders and farmers over 2000 years. Following Colin Campbell (1986, 1987) Dowson (1994) argues that hunter-gatherer society begins to exhibit signs of stratification – ritual specialists coming to prominence as they receive kudos and payment for services rendered to farmers (healing,
rain-making). He sees depictions of human figures becoming fewer, yet increasingly detailed, through time, with traditional rock art supposedly showing ritual specialists as homogeneous within the egalitarian band, followed by a transitional period where fewer shamans are depicted in ‘consortia’ with more detail, to a final phase in which single shamans are portrayed in far greater detail and much larger than their fellows. Unfortunately, the supposed chronology – egalitarian, consortia, pre-eminence – is not demonstrable, and may indeed flow in reverse for all we know. This criticism has been levelled at Dowson by, for example, Mitchell (2002:407), Smith (2010:348) and Mullen (2018) who debunks the historicizing of rock art based on changes in subject matter without the aid of reliable dating techniques.

Another fundamental issue to be taken with Dowson’s work (and that of Campbell) is the assumption of ‘San’ authorship, as opposed to Blundell’s (2004) more-nuanced reading that entertains the existence of historically-attested hybrid groups. This issue may arise from the uncritical transposing of a timeless ‘San’ ethnicity onto that of the nineteenth-century Maloti-Drakensberg. A greater focus on ethno-historic texts (despite Dowson’s earlier protests), demonstrates the prevalence of multi-, mixed-ethnic as well as creolized ‘Bushmen’ (e.g. Challis 2012, 2018 *inter alia*). It is not, therefore, that reconstructions of the ‘San’ past in rock art are unachievable, but that one needs dates, or diagnostic features by which one can determine approximate age, as well as an awareness of the potential authors in the socio-cultural milieu.

**Herder contact: changes visible in rock art**

The arrival of pastoralism appears to have precipitated changes in the region’s rock art. Whether this can be described as a tradition that belongs strictly to herders, however, is the subject of much debate (e.g. Hollmann 2014; Morris 2012; Smith & Ouzman 2004;). Stemming, it seems, from east-central Africa, this art does tend to occur in the same regions as those occupied by ethnic Khoe-speaking herders – along major water courses – who arrived c.1000 years BP (Smith and Ouzman 2004; *cf*. Sadr 2015). It may also be associated, however, with the undoubted fusion, or sharing, of beliefs that accompanied domestic animals such as sheep as they were traded, or otherwise dispersed, among the hunter-gatherers of southern Africa 1000 years before this (e.g. Hollmann 2007; Morris 2008).
Further, it can be understood from both Khoe-speaker and San-speaker ethnographic perspectives (Hollmann 2007, 2014).

Widely referred to as ‘geometric’ art, it includes both paintings and engravings that appear non-representational to the outsider but actually represent material items and designs which are integral features in Khoe-San girls’ initiation ceremonies. Hollmann (e.g. 2007, 2014) points to a set of designs in body art, beadwork and aprons which are represented in so-called ‘geometric’ rock art motifs (see also Eastwood & Smith 2005; Morris 2012). These designs occur in the material culture of both San hunter-gatherer and Khoe pastoralist groups. Further, in rock art we see chains of finger dots and stripes as well as engraved cut marks that mirror body art (Hollmann 2007, 2014). In a tantalising reference, Theophilus Hahn (1881:140) noted:

…the Khoikhoi women on certain occasions anoint themselves with red ochre, and also for the purposes of worship make marks with red ochre (torob) on certain sacred stones and cairns.

![Figure 3](image)

*Figure 3. ‘Pecked design (a) resembles a design on a Khoe-San bag (b) (courtesy Iziko SAM) and design motifs on Khoe-San bags (c) (after Fock 1979: fig.144).’ Courtesy Jeremy Hollmann (2014:35 fig.8).*

Though the nature of forager/herder interactions remains somewhat opaque to us, perhaps the dialogue in the rock art traditions can shed some light. For example, fine-line and finger paintings are not always mutually exclusive. In regions such as today’s Free State Province
and the neighbouring Lesotho lowlands, as well as the Eastern Cape, finger paintings occur with fine-line art, and are often complemented, or augmented, by one another (figure 4).

Figure 4 (southeast Lesotho) Finger paintings – ‘geometrics’ and finger dots (in association with fine-line paintings) that have been augmented by fine-line painted additions. Image by authors.
Figure 5. Vivid and chalky ‘poster-like’ eland antelope painted after contact with herders as shown by its superpositioning on the finger-painted ‘geometric’. Note that the ‘geometric’ is augmented with fine-line white dots – further attesting to interaction and contact (cf. Smith & Ouzman 2004:504, fig. 3). The eland was likely painted by members of increasingly heterogeneous ‘Bushman’ bands who had perceived connections with earlier hunter-gatherers. North Eastern Cape. Image by authors.

Figure 6a and b. At a site in the Maclear-Tsolo region of the Eastern Cape, finger dots and stripes are found in conjunction with finger-painted figures on horseback with guns. Note the horseback figure bottom right in (a) is brush-painted – compare with figure 10b. Image by authors.
As well as the rock art arguably influenced by the finger-painted traditions stemming from east-central Africa, there is a fine-line tradition that occurs locally within southern Africa which depicts herding subjects – such as fat-tailed sheep, cattle and pack oxen. Whether this is an outgrowth of the hunter-gatherer fine-line tradition, or has a hybrid genesis, is debateable. Pastoralists were observed by Europeans to transport their belongings on the backs of their oxen, resulting in the term ‘pack oxen’ (e.g. Gordon 1988). They are depicted throughout the eastern Cape, and like the appearance of ‘geometric’ images at fine-line sites, speak to the results of contact between hunter-gatherers and herders. Indeed, they may be another iteration of ‘Khoe-San’ art. Despite being executed with a fine-line technique, these images of pack oxen are typically not shaded, being rather of the ‘poster-like’ manner – ‘crude’, ‘chalky’ and ‘vivid’ (figure 7).

![Figure 7. Fine-line brush-painted pack ox and ‘herder’ in the ‘poster-like’ manner. Note, however, the hunting bag and antelope-eared cap normally associated with the ‘San’ traditional corpus, as well as the lines from the nose of the ox – the way that San painters indicate trance-induced nosebleeds. A thousand years of forager/herder contact and fusion may well have produced societies whose artists espoused merged beliefs and economies. Image by authors.](image-url)
Non-San fine-line image

A key factor in southern African rock art that has been largely overlooked, and one which may pertain to equivalents worldwide, is that fine line painting need not denote ‘San’ or even hunter-gatherer authorship (Challis 2018:617). There are possibly several centuries of fine-line rock art including subject matter typically associated with herders (and farmers, see below) that were painted post-contact and which reflect, in many differing contexts, the Khoe-Sanness of mixed descendants as authors. The artists, partly descended from hunter-gatherers and therefore employing a fine-line technique, made images of themselves with their cattle or sheep, and the attendant concerns of cattle and sheep herders because they were, economically, herders.

Farmer contact: changes visible in rock art

Quite apart from the rock art made by African farmers (e.g. Namono & Eastwood 2005; Smith & van Schalkwyk 2002), there is rock art in the south-eastern mountains that portrays cattle, shields, spears and other accoutrements associated with farming peoples (Loubser & Laurens 1994). This rock art being fine-line (normally block colour in a limited palette) the tendency is to see it as ‘San’ representations of the ‘Other’, with a narrative or documentary function (e.g. Willcox 1963), or that ‘San’ simply ‘incorporated’ new materials and animals into their own lexicon (e.g. Campbell 1986). Closer analysis suggests, however, that either there was the sort of syncretism outlined previously that obtained in forager/herder mixing or, given the subject matter, farmers were more likely to have had themselves painted by the foragers on a commission basis (Sinclair-Thomson 2016, forthcoming (b)). Such commission possibly arose from extension of the clientship services the latter were known to provide in rain-making (e.g. Dowson 1998) and healing (e.g. Jolly 2000). This in order that farmers might gain an advantage in conflict by using forager protective medicines – administered to their bodies, weapons, shields and mixed in with the rock art paint itself (Sinclair-Thomson 2016). Recent research suggests that the inclusion of warriors from African farmer society in rock art is evidence for a trade in ‘war-medicines’ and ‘war-magic’ supplied and performed by hunter-gatherer groups for their farmer neighbours (Sinclair-Thomson 2016; forthcoming (b)). This argument stems from interviews with African informants, in the Matatiele region of the Eastern Cape, attesting to their forebears going to the ‘Bushmen’ for such medicines (Sinclair-Thomson 2016), as well as the historically-
attested phenomenon of foragers performing rain-making ceremonies for African farmers, evidence for which is clearly visible in rock art images relating to farmer contact (e.g. Dowson 1998; Hollman 2015; although see Mitchell 2002: 365). This accords with the inextricable link between protective war-medicines and rain-making (e.g. Challis 2014; Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017, figure 8a).

Adding to this there is a marked decrease in images of eland antelope, which feature prominently in the ‘traditional’ corpus, and an increase in cattle. Trade between hunter-gatherers and farmers saw many foragers becoming cattle owners themselves (rain-making was famously rewarded in payments of cattle, Stanford 1910:439). It has been suggested that there may have been a substitution in which cattle took on the ritual attributes of eland thereby usurping – sometimes represented by literal superpositioning – the wild antelope from their position as most potent subject matter (Dowson et al. 1994, figure 8b).
In another recent development, Hollmann (2015) describes an image in the northern KwaZulu-Natal uKhahlamba-Drakensberg that depicts the sacrifice of a bull with a crescent-shaped iron axe, arguably a feature of the Nguni-speaking agriculturalist ‘first-fruits festival’, and the associated fertility and rain-making practices (figure 9). The fine-line images are brush-painted in a restricted palette and are tentatively dated to between 1350 and 1800 (Hollmann 2015:510). Speaking directly to issues of contact between farmers and foragers, these paintings reflect changes in the concerns of the painters, now negotiating their place in a landscape occupied by iron-using agriculturalists. This occupation also precipitated a break with traditional materials and pigment quality.

**The Disconnect visible in pigment quality**

Loubser and Laurens (1994:102) hypothesise that the change to the ‘blocked’ or ‘poster-like’ manner of depiction was the result of the disruption of hunter-gatherer trade networks when African farmers settled the landscape. We suggest this to be one iteration of The Disconnect. Though their case study has its focus on the Caledon River valley, this shift can be seen across southern Africa. Evidence for the cause of The Disconnect, or break, in pigment quality comes from an examination of what Harinck (1969:160-7) sees as the
‘crumbling’ of Khoe society caused by the destruction of the ‘Xhosa-Khoi trade diffusion network’ – facilitating the flow of goods between themselves, the Xhosa and Tswana. The arrival of others on the landscape, including colonists and expanding Xhosa chiefdoms, led to a decrease in Khoe bargaining power as they lost their principal trade currency, their cattle herds. Encroachment into their grazing lands was enabled by the arrival of new features – associated with Europeans but quickly adopted by indigenes – horses and guns (cf. Challis 2012; Sinclair-Thomson 2019; Ouzman 2005). Therefore, when some Khoe and San groups ceased to exist – whether culturally or physically – their trade networks broke down such that the surviving groups seem not to have had access to certain trade items, one of which was undoubtedly high quality fine-grain pigment. Some localities may have had a few desirable pigments, but not all – hence the need for pigments to travel. It may be that emphasis on the need for particular qualities in pigment differed between groups, but Mapote makes plain that, at least for the southern Maloti, this desire remained into the 1930s (How 1970).

The break in pigment trade is a tangible proxy for the break in the beliefs that inform the subject matter of the paintings. Not only were Khoe-San bands being decimated by all of the aforementioned effects of contact but they would also have had difficulty sustaining ties with other groups. This must have led to a breakdown in the trade, or indeed maintenance, of ideas that had kept the traditional corpus vital – even while it was undergoing change during previous forms of contact.

Colonial contact: changes visible in rock art

One of the main factors in the shift in subject matter during the colonial era was the increased necessity for people of different ethnic origins to band together in self-defence. Some may also have come together as predatory groups to take advantage of those already in a state of turmoil (see e.g. Ouzman 2005). There are, of course, many terms pertaining to ‘degrees’ of mixedness in ethnically heterogeneous populations – some more contentious than others – though in any case it is appropriate to state that the creation of new collectives out of previously-distinct ones follows a course running from the ‘multiethnic’, through the ‘hybrid’, and into (in some cases) the culturally and physically creolized (Challis 2016, 2018). We now turn to three examples of innovative bandit formations – the Korana, the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’ and the Tarka ‘Banditti’.
Korana

Coming to prominence in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, the !Ora, (later Korana) claimed descent from an eponymous Khoe forebear in the Cape and settled the Upper Gariep (Orange) River around Philippolis (Barnard 1992; Engelbrecht 1936). Originally observed by early travellers to subsist much like typical Khoekhoe pastoralists, as the colonial frontier gathered speed, so they adopted horses and guns and placed them at the forefront of their economy and identity – becoming perhaps the most feared ‘raider nation’ (Ouzman 2005) of the Highveld. Having seemingly started out as an ethnic Khoe group, they were ‘skilled at coherent fragmentation and amalgamation’ (Ouzman 2005:102) such that anyone, including San, African farmers and even Europeans, could join and become Korana (Lesniewski 2010). Their art, arguably, retains elements of the herder finger-painted tradition, although altered to depict figurative images of horses, mounted by brush-painted men with guns (figure 10b). Ouzman (2005:110) stresses that Korana made rock art to call upon magical powers for assistance in their notorious raiding activities. The Korana raiders dominated the southern African Highveld for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, before disintegrating in the ‘Korana Wars’ of the 1870s (Ross 1975:562) or ‘laminating within’ Coloured, Griqua and Nama identities (Ouzman 2005:102).

Figure 10a. Korana horseman observed by Arbousset and Daumas in 1836 (1842, plate 3, flipped horizontally). Figure 10b. Rock art made by Korana; the horses are finger-painted in bright orange, the rider in fine-line black. Courtesy Sven Ouzman (2005:104, fig. 3).
Andrew Skinner (2017) observes the Korana through the eyes of the |Xam San informants to Lloyd and Bleek. He terms the Korana the 'apex frontier society' (Skinner 2017: 60), because the socially acquisitive nature of their identity allowed them to adapt to changing conditions and, when necessary, deploy elements of that identity in contact with other groups around them (including the |Xam). In shifting frontier conditions, this contact required negotiation, and the art provided a stable backdrop to these negotiations,

…[solidifying] their identities for long enough to provide a shared and intelligible history that could be referenced by either side of these interactions, or appealed to by others seeking to be party to the identities or agreements brokered in the process.

Skinner 2017:189

The motif primarily used to reference interaction and to broker this shared landscape was the horse, the material signifier of the most successful societies in these conditions (Skinner 2017:179-180); in the Strandberg, it is expediently scratched, or painstakingly incised, into the patina of the boulders so frequently that one cannot traverse this mountain without encountering horse images in their hundreds (Skinner 2017; cf. McGranaghan 2016). The way that these horses and riders were stylized, often with ‘swan necks’ links them to the Korana art identified by Ouzman (2005:106, fig. 9), and they can be found distributed across much of the central arid interior and into the Maloti.

**AmaTola ‘Bushmen’**

Described in 1850 by contemporary ‘Bushman’ neighbours as a nation of ‘Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves’ (Cape Archives G.H. 8/23:414-7), the AmaTola’s ethnic admixture appears self-evident (San, Khoe, and slave) though they also included Bantu-speakers; the expression was a colonial catch-all that stood for 'mixed'. Likely stemming from earlier groups of Khoe-San bandits in the eastern Cape, and incorporating dispossessed Xhosa from the frontier wars, the they moved into the Maloti-Drakensberg as ‘disruptive newcomers’ in the 1830s (e.g. Challis 2012 *inter alia*). They had acquired horses and guns through various forms of association with the colony and its borderlands (King & Challis 2017). They raided their ‘Bushman’ counterparts, African farmers and, particularly, European settlers. The region they operated from exhibits a concentration of rock art that shows their concerns.

![Figure 12](image)

*Figure 12. Creolized ‘Bushmen’ performing the San trance dance (note the bending forward postures) to access the protective powers of the baboon (and horse) attested in the human figures with baboon tails and heads as well as those with horse tails (i.e. part-human, part-animal therianthropes). Redrawing by authors.*

Figures with double-feathered headdresses such as those worn by Xhosa warriors, carrying spears and knobkerries (fighting sticks) as well as bows and arrows, are painted in dance postures typically associated with the San trance dance. Their mixed material culture attests
to their multiethnic origins, however, this particular group underwent an ethnogenesis, becoming culturally creolized, yet with a characteristic emphasis on the San practices of dancing and painting (Challis 2016, 2018). Moreover, they painted themselves with the horses with which they identified. While dancers sometimes morphed into horses (with horses tails and feathered ears), more frequently they took on the form of baboons (Challis 2014 *inter alia*).

Figure 13. A human figure with baboon head and tail dances with dancing-sticks while horsemen exhibiting mixed material culture (Brimmed hats with feathers, spears, muskets) ride together. Image by authors.

The baboon was associated with the protective medicine it used – a root known to Xhosa-speakers as *uMabophe* (the thing that ties-up), to |Xam San-speakers as *so-|oa, and Khoe-speakers as *|u-sõä* (Challis 2014). This root protected it from harm, and translated from the San into the farmer epistemology as something which would protect the user from projectiles and ‘tie-up’ their opponents. So strong and cross-cultural was the belief in its efficacy that it is still used today to confound one’s adversaries and turn bullets to water (Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017). The AmaTola derived their name from the Xhosa wardoctors (sing. *itola*, pl. *amatola*) who administered this medicine. An emerging community, they highlighted the San trance dance because it enabled them to harness the power of the baboon. Group members from farmer, herder and hunter backgrounds, therefore, shared a belief that became
a culturally coherent symbol of protection, resulting in a cultural creolization (e.g. Challis 2016, 2018). The AmaTola almost certainly became an entity in the early 1830s and were active until the 1860s when references to ‘Bushman raids’ (Wright 1971) in the Drakensberg ceased.

Images of baboons alongside human figures on horseback, seen so frequently in the art of the AmaTola, have recently been found at a site at the headwaters of the Mankazana River in the eastern Cape (cf. Ross 2014:99). This area was known to be the hideout of at least one of the groups of Tarka ‘Banditti’ (Pringle 1835:233-4) which, furthermore, had previously been hypothesized as one of the places of origin for the AmaTola (Challis 2012).

Tarka Banditti

Immediately prior to the removal of the AmaTola to the high Maloti-Drakensberg, resistance to colonisation was mounted by groups of mixed bandits along the colony’s eastern border in the region of the Great Fish River. We refer to these groups as the Tarka Banditti. Like the AmaTola, these groups too were described as comprising ‘Bushman, Hottentots and Runaway slaves’ (Napier 1849:226). The ‘imported’ slaves consisted of individuals from a mixture of Indonesian, Malay, Malagasy, Mozambican, Indian, Sri Lankan and West African descent, while the testament of Pringle (1835:233-4) specifies that these groups also included runaway Khoe-San from settler farms and the military. When the members of these different banditti (for there were many groups) absconded they typically took firearms and horses, as well as inside knowledge of the layout of their former work places. With these resources, they were better able to raid livestock from their previous employers (e.g. Barrow 1801:236). They joined other Khoe-San who found themselves trapped between the expanding colony to the west, the Xhosa chiefdoms to the east, the Korana and Sotho-Tswana to the north (e.g. Penn 2005:121). They fought a retreat that found them raiding out of the Winterberg, down the Tarka, Mancazana and Baviaans rivers of the eastern Cape (figure 14). Different Tarka Banditti appear most active in the colonial texts from the 1770s when the Tarka River Valley was settled by colonists (e.g. Gordon 1988 [1777]:11) until the 1820s when European settlement and commandos made it impossible to continue their raiding (Pringle 1835:356).
The groups who raided European farms in the Tarka river valley and surrounding localities thus consisted of multiple ethnicities including Khoe-San, and their heterogeneous nature is likely mirrored in their paintings. Unlike the AmaTola and Korana art, there are no clear conventions in manner or method of depiction. For example, horses at the same site, shown below, have quite different features, including placement of the mane (figures 15 a and b). At another site some horses are depicted in fine-line black pigment while others are finger-painted in bright orange (figures 15 c and d). Even when we allow that rock shelters occupied by such groups were likely painted over a number of years, those years were relatively few if we believe the texts cited earlier (e.g. Pringle 1835). These differences in manner of depiction, therefore, are probably owing to different painters, of differing ethnic and social backgrounds, each bringing their own influence. The differences exhibited in technique, however, can obscure the commonalities that run throughout – contact elements such as horses and guns – as well as continuities in the use of several pre-contact or ‘traditional’ motifs, including rain animals, baboons and ostriches, to which we now turn.
Cultural survivals and connections with the past

While everything else seems to have been changing – economically, socially and politically – some things in the artists’ lexicon would not have been out of place in the pre-contact ‘traditional’ corpus. Having undergone transitions throughout contact with other Africans, artists of San, or perceived San, descent continued to paint in a much altered idiom. One might say that the act of painting itself stands as evidence that the embers of indigenous cultural practices, if all but extinguished, were not entirely dead. As we have seen, the differing techniques of making paintings, often in the same shelter, are almost certainly a reflection of the heterogeneous membership of these bandit collectives.

With common means and common goals (Lightfoot & Martinez 1995) and a shared sense of injustice (Hobsbawm 1969), it is likely that members of surviving, increasingly mixed, groups would have noticed, and even highlighted, cultural congruence and coherence.
Among the three essential indigenous economies – forager, herder and farmer – many spiritual beliefs and practices were shared to varying degrees as a result of the millennia of pre-colonial coexistence.

With this in mind, and remembering that heterogeneous bandit groups survived by raiding, it is perhaps unsurprising that the beliefs evidently held in common and highlighted, pertain to violence, stock theft, protection and escape. This is not to say that these were the only beliefs shared cross-culturally in such groups, nor that these are the only beliefs reflected in contact period rock art – just that they are some of the most noticeable. Of these motifs, perhaps the most frequently depicted are rain-animals, baboons and ostriches. We now explain each of these entities and how they relate to the concerns of raiders, protection and escape.

Rain-animals

In the Khoe-San idiom, water or !khwa (in the extinct southern San |Xam language) in all its forms is a fearsome entity, one of whose manifestations is a dangerous beast, the !khwa-ka-xoro, ‘rain-cow’, ‘rain bull’, ‘water-bull’ or ‘rain animal’. It can take the form of a snake, or bovid beast under one category of ‘water’s things’ (Bleek 1933a and b; Challis et al. 2013; Hoff 1998; Jolly 1996, 1999; Orpen 1874; Schmidt 1979; Solomon 2008; figure 16). The rain-animal can be influenced or manipulated for a number of purposes; rain, water pools, rivers, mists and fog all being iterations of !khwa, as well as the things of water – thunder and lightning, hail stones and certain features on the landscape. As detailed earlier, the contact between farmers and foragers likely resulted in an equivalence between eland and cattle, so too the farmers held beliefs in water snakes. To complicate matters already discussed in the forager/herder contact material, Hollmann (2007, 2014) notes that the engraved sites of the Gestoptefontein-Driekuil complex were probably shared not only by San- and Khoe- speakers (Khoe-San) but also by Tswana- speaking farmers. Thus foragers, herdiers and farmers shared a degree of coherence in beliefs pertaining to water snakes – and probably contributed over time to their construction and perpetuation.
Figure 16. Fine-line rain-animal and water snake (top left) painted in association with each other, and with finger-painted bag or apron. Note the lightning emanating from the forehead of the rain-animal (which can ‘kill by lightning’ and has a ‘shining stone’ on its forehead (Schmidt 1979)). Note also the second rain-animal (bottom centre) surrounded by fish being dealt with in much the same way as the colonial-era rain-animal depicted in figure 17. Redrawing by Stephen van den Heever.
Following from the discussion of the nature of forager/herder/farmer contact, and the reverence in which the former were held in matters ritual, we notice that creatures ‘of the rain’ are depicted in rock art being approached or somehow harnessed by human figures (McGranaghan & Challis 2016). This attests to the San ritual specialists’ ability to influence the rain: the rain-animal can be ‘captured’ or ‘led by the nose’ from the waterhole (spirit world) to places where it is ‘cut’ or ‘killed’ so that it may ‘bleed’ rain (Bleek 1933a, 1933b; Challis et al. 2013; Lewis-Williams 1981; McGranaghan & Challis 2016). A corollary of the incorporation of Khoe-San members in heterogeneous bandit groups, therefore, was that the rain could be invoked to suit their ends: raiders would summon thick mists to conceal their approach and retreat, disappearing sometimes into blinding snowstorms (Challis 2012, 2014; Vinnicombe 1976; Wright 1971;). Moreover, pursuit was frequently abandoned because the tracks of stolen animals were washed away by rain. In one instance a raider group (probably AmaTola), finding themselves in danger of capture, gave a blast on an eland horn thus calling down a torrential downpour to thwart the chasing commando (Vinnicombe 1976:52). The horses, guns, cattle and sheep painted by the Tarka Banditti and the AmaTola are often painted with creatures best interpreted as rain-animals (Challis 2014; Sinclair-Thomson forthcoming (a)). Moreover, Korana art is partly characterized by images of water-serpents (Ouzman 2005:105-6, fig. 8a).
**Baboons and ostriches**

We have mentioned the way in which baboons, in Khoe-San epistemologies, were associated with protection through their use of *so-*|oa, the very root-medicine that was also used by foragers and warriors to ensure the efficacy of their weapons and protect the user from projectiles. Importantly, as with rain-animals, the baboon’s association with protection is something found across southern African societies, regardless of economy, making it an ideal symbol to draw upon for groups whose individual members were from different backgrounds (Challis 2014 *inter alia*).

The appearance of ostriches at sites portraying cattle theft may similarly signal beliefs pertaining to protection with emphasis on its endurance and its ability to escape. Ostriches are praised by Khoe-San groups in the Kalahari today as master escape artists because they can reach great running speeds and leap over hunters’ nets and traps using their powerful legs, which also serve as lethal weapons (Low 2009:72). Khoe-San are known to attach the tendons from ostrich legs to their own legs in order to combat fatigue (Low 2009:77) and to use ostrich eggshell as a fortifying medicine (Engelbrecht 1936:186; Low 2009:76). For those wishing to escape the Colony or a pursuing commando, the powers associated with the ostrich would arguably be most appropriate. Ritual specialists of newly forming multiethnic Banditti in the Cape appear to have looked to the ostrich for the strength to escape, as evidenced in their paintings (Sinclair-Thomson forthcoming (c)).

![Figures 18a and b. Painted in the same rock shelter in the Zuurberg, figures with guns, one mounted, are depicted alongside ostrich and baboon therianthropes – attesting to the artists ‘drawing on’ these animals’ potency and qualities for escape and protection. Image by authors.](image)
Discussion

Millennia of interaction between southern African foragers, herders and farmers precipitated shifts in economy, borrowings and syncretisms of belief in many forms, some of which are observable in rock art. One upshot of these protracted associations was that several symbols emerged as coherent between cultures, which later we see called upon by groups comprising members of all subscribing backgrounds (as well as others such as exotic slaves who wished for escape and protection). That there is fine-line art made during European colonisation suggests that the resisting ‘Bushman’ groups either included forager members, were descended from foragers, or at least had a perceived connection with them – a ‘San inflection’. The same could be said for where we find incised or scratched horses such as those on the Strandberg (Skinner 2017) or for the finger painted horses made by Korana (Ouzman 2005) who may have had perceived ties with Khoe – a ‘Khoe inflection’; perhaps something combined in a ‘Khoe-San inflection’. It would appear that they aimed to highlight certain aspects of the past, while the turbulent socio-economic conditions disconnected them from other traditions. Some of these aspects that were highlighted included the creation of rock art, the belief in rain control, and the harnessing of the supernatural potency inherent in different animals, according to their qualities, for different means (e.g. Challis 2014; McGranaghan & Challis 2016; Sinclair-Thomson forthcoming (c)). However, as we have demonstrated, these aspects took on new, or slightly altered, characteristics.

Many of these latter images are either super-positioned on earlier ‘traditional’ art or alongside the older paintings, which may speak to the desire to connect with their ‘San’ forebears, in the sense that |Xam informants spoke of contacting a dead rain-maker when in need of rain (Bleek 1933b), or ‘San’ descendants turning to the paintings while dancing, so that they might acquire the power of the images made by their ancestors (Lewis-Williams 1986:11). In much the same way that the artists of the traditional corpus built up reservoirs of potency in layer upon layer of images, we suggest post-Disconnect artists attempted to associate their own art with that of ritual specialists that had gone before.

To be clear, we do not suggest that change only occurs as a result of contact – just that it is most striking when subject matter incorporates new arrivals on the landscape. Of these new arrivals the category that seemingly exhibits the greatest shift is the rock art of the colonial era. This is not only owing to the extreme violence towards the art-producing communities, but also to the necessity to band together in groups of mixed ethnicity. The subsequent
highlighting of pre-existing (sometimes shared) symbols, and the creation of new ones, sees a progression in rock art production that exhibits clear and multiple breaks with tradition, most of which can be linked to the concerns, and beliefs engendered by a raiding lifestyle and therefore give us the reverse gaze onto processes of contact and colonisation.
References


Kolb, P. 1731. *Present state of the Cape of Good Hope: or, a particular account of the several nations of the Hottentots: their religion, government, laws, customs, ceremonies, and opinions; their art of war, professions, language, genius, etc. together with a short account of the Dutch settlement at the Cape*. G. Medley, trans. London: W. Innys.


Moodie, D. ed. 1838. The Record, or, a series of official papers relative to the condition and treatment of the native tribes of South Africa (Vol. 5). Cape Town: A.S. Robertson.


Sinclair-Thomson, B. Forthcoming (a). Trouble on the Tarka: the rock art of bandit groups on the Cape Colony’s eastern border. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*.


TROUBLE ON THE TARKA: THE HISTORY OF BANDIT GROUPS ON THE CAPE COLONY’S EASTERN BORDER AND THE ARCHIVE OF THEIR ROCK ART
Trouble on the Tarka: The History of Bandit Groups on the Cape Colony’s Eastern Border and the Archive of Their Rock Art

Brent Sinclair-Thomson

Published online: 29 August 2020
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2020

Abstract
Since Europeans first attempted to settle the region of the Tarka river valley in today’s Eastern Cape, South Africa, during the late eighteenth century they were opposed by Indigenous groups. The disruptive nature of the colonial project meant that people from different ethnicities sought safety together and launched a wave of attacks, characterized by stock theft against the settlers. This resistance often came with such a degree of success that the settlers were forced to flee the area and retreat within the colony. The different members of these raiding groups would have had a variety of reasons to turn to banditry. These included the loss of hunting, gathering, and pastoral land, mistreatment by their colonial employers and attacks by colonial forces on their kin – indeed many were survivors of these assaults. That some of these groups included people of San descent is evident in the appearance of fine-line rock art in the region dating to this time period. However, the images are not of the traditional shaded polychrome variety. Instead they are of an unshaded “poster-style” and also include rough brush work and finger painting, a likely reflection of the mixed nature of these groups. Indeed, the lack of conventions in depicting subject matter, like horses, is likely testament to the painters’ diverse backgrounds. These paintings show scenes that appear to be concerned with the raiding of livestock. Rather than being the mere depictions of raids, they are likely bound up within a suite of beliefs relating to protection and rain control that multiethnic bandit groups drew upon to assist them with their clandestine activities.
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In writing histories of the former Cape Colony’s eastern frontier in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, scholars tend to focus on larger narratives such as the frontier wars between the European settlers and various Xhosa chieftaincies (e.g., Milton 1983; Mostert 1992; Peires 1981). Where scholars have focused on the impact both suffered and inflicted by hunter-gatherers and pastoralists who turned to raiding and banditry little, if any, attention is given to the archaeology associated with these groups (e.g., Adhikari 2010; Newton-King 1999; Malherbe 1997; Penn 2013) – likely owing to the perceived absence of connections between written texts and material evidence. In this article I combine research from the written historical records with a reading of the rock art found within a region that was part of the old frontier for the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries: the western Winterberg mountain range – location of the Tarka, Baviaans, and Mancazana rivers. The reason for selecting this study area is that it was highly contested through much of this time period, with both foreign settlers and Indigenous Africans gaining, losing and regaining this environmentally desirable landscape and because it features regularly in contemporary written accounts (e.g., Pringle 1840). On subsequent survey of the area, we find that it is also the site of numerous historical-era rock paintings. I argue that the resistance of small-scale African groups to the colonial project is best understood from a perspective of Hobsbawmian banditry (however revised) and that this banditry is explicitly interwoven with the practice of rock art. I draw on five specific rock art sites in the region to demonstrate how these images may have mediated bandit activity until the effective cessation of raids by 1826.

In a close examination of the multi- and mixed-ethnic nature of these raiding groups, I show how the focus of rock art studies on later bandits, including the AmaTola (Challis 2012, 2016, 2018), the Korana (Ouzman 2005), and others in the Maloti-Drakensberg (Henry 2010; Mallen 2009), had precedent in the Tarka area from the 1770s to the 1820s.

A Regional History

The Tarka river valley and the nearby Mancazana and Baviaans river valleys formed a hotly contested landscape throughout the latter eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries due to their location in and around the Cape Colony’s border throughout this period (Giliomee 1989: 443; Gordon 1988: 110; Newton-King 1999: 111; Penn 2005: 133, 2013: 195; Saunders 1994: 73). Indigenous hunter-gatherers, pastoralists, and farmers would have begun to find themselves in trouble from European settler incursions from approximately 1770 as the colonists who had settled on the Camdeboo plains, beneath the Sneeuberg, began to graze their livestock as far east as the Great Fish River (Moodie 1838: 5). The Indigenes would no doubt have been well-aware of the earlier violence conducted by colonists against hunter-gatherers and pastoralists further to the west in the mid eighteenth century (Penn 2005: 113) and some were likely descended from refugees of the “Bushman Wars”.

The social and environmental conditions of the colony’s newly established eastern border – the Great Fish River in 1778 (Saunders 1994: 69) – were a crucial factor in the intensity of the resistance by Africans towards the colonists. The eastern border marked a significant environmental territory for hunting and grazing. It fell along the divide
between the summer and winter rainfall zones of the Cape to the east and west respectively. For pastoralists and hunter-gatherers adapted to this region, it was of absolute necessity to have seasonal access to both zones as they sought pasture for their animals and wild game to hunt (Penn 2005: 82). The arrival of European settlers with their concepts of “hard” frontiers or borders (Giliomee 1989) enforced severe limitations on human movement throughout the fragile landscape.

From a social perspective, the region was already heavily populated prior to the arrival of the European settlers. The two largest groups of Khoekhoe pastoralists between the Gamtoos and Fish rivers were the Gonaqua and the Hoengiqua (Giliomee 1989: 424). Travelling in 1752, Ensign August Beutler records the Winterberg region as being the location of hunter-gatherers known as *d’Gaus* (probably correctly spelled |gaua|; Crampton et al. 2013: 151). Although possibly a single ethnicity prior to the arrival of colonists on the landscape, we shall see that the Bushmen of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in this area were a very different collection of groups.

The Fish River was the location of the Rharhabe Xhosa from the 1750s following their split from the Gcaleka Xhosa further to the east (Giliomee 1989: 425; Peires 1981: 53). To the west of them were another Xhosa group, the Gqunukhwebe, with whom they were frequently at enmity Giliomee 1989: 425, 436; Peires 1981: 55). Other smaller Xhosa clans, such as the ImiDange, were also active in the region (Enklaar 1988: 89). It was these groups whom the trekboers first met when they arrived in the area in the 1770s (Penn 2005: 92).

It is important to note that the above-mentioned groups ought not to be viewed as discrete “tribes” (Hamilton and Leibhammer 2016; Landau 2010). The very nature of frontiers allows for groups and individuals to form and disband and reshape their identities depending on sociopolitical circumstances (Bhabha 1994; Kopytoff 1987; Landau 2010: 3), and what became the colony’s eastern frontier was no exception to this. To begin with, the Gonaqua were not descended solely from Khoekhoe groups, but were rather the result of protracted intermixing between Xhosa and Khoe individuals (Ross 1980: 261). The Hoengiqua had been formed by Kaptein Ruiter from various smaller Khoe groups in the region and also included members of Xhosa descent (Crampton et al. 2013: xxxvii-xxxviii; Paterson 1789: 85–86). The Gqunukhwebe, much like the Gonaqua, were also formed from intermixing between Khoe and Xhosa (although they were part of the Xhosa nation) as well as runaway slaves who, as we shall see, constitute part of many a raider band, from the colony (Giliomee 1989: 429). Not that these larger meta-categories (e.g., Gqunukhwebe, Gonaqua) ought to be seen as bounded entities either. Brubaker (2002: 167) argues that ethnicity is a process rather than a constant entity. Alleyne (2002: 3) adds that “Ethnicity and race are socially constructed, contextual representations that play themselves out at specific historical periods”. Individuals identify with an ethnic group based on commonalities and a desire to serve group interests (Alleyne 2002: 9).

Many beliefs and practices were likely mutually understood across ethnicities, language groups, and economies owing to protracted contact and mixing between different people throughout southern Africa. Evidence testifying to this admixture between hunter-gatherers and farmers is found in shared genetics (Marks et al. 2014: 3), shared terminology (Hirst 2005), and shared beliefs and practices observed in the colonial-era and recent past (Challis 2014; Jolly 1994: 43; Stanford 1910; Wright and
Mazel 2007: 94) as well as the presence of archaeological material culture associated with one group found at sites associated with another (e.g., Mitchell et al. 2008). Taken together, this evidence suggests that there is a deep antiquity to the contact and mixing seen in groups from the colonial era into the present. The commonalities which came about through this mixing would have been drawn upon to assert particular ethnicities as explained above.

The |gaua, mentioned previously, have been interpreted to be a group of San hunter-gatherers (Crampton et al. 2013: 151). Yet if we take into account the complexity of group membership described above, we must exercise caution in ascribing a discrete ethnicity – if at all. Although the very concept of “San” as a distinct ethnicity has been critiqued (see e.g., Wright 1996) I employ it in its common usage to describe hunter-gatherer populations indigenous to southern Africa (e.g., Lewis-Williams 1980). However, the protracted contact and intermixing between hunters and herders (e.g., McGranaghan 2015; Sadr 2003), in addition to the confusion of colonists writing the historic record in trying to categorize these individuals, makes the term “Khoe-San” a more useful appellation than “San”. Shula Marks (1972: 66) suggests that the Ubiqua who raided the colony in the 1670s included both San and Khoekhoe members. She likewise writes that the so-called “Bushman War” of 1739 was fought by Bushmen who were both San and Khoekhoe (Marks 1972: 71). Moving closer, geographically and temporally, to my research area, Elphick and Malherbe (1989: 27) note that the San of the Sneeuberg – who offered furious resistance to the Dutch settlers in the 1770s – likely also included Khoe-speakers among their ranks. Penn (2005: 127, 129) argues that in 1776, Khoekhoe, now employed as workers on settlers’ farms, were known to be deserting their stations with stolen firearms and joining San groups. A later iteration of this “banding together” was described by the 1820 settler Thomas Pringle (1840: 98). He wrote of a group comprising “wild Bushmen from the north-east…tame Bushmen… who had absconded from the service of the Boors …runaway slaves, and…several deserters from the Cape Corps, who possessed fire-arms” hiding out in the mountains around the Tarka river valley. This particular group was led by a man named Dragoener who fled to the Karoo, after being beaten severely by his master. He formed this cohort of bandits with whom he returned to raid his old place of employment (Pringle 1840: 98). To better understand groups such as the one mentioned by Pringle, it will be of use to investigate the common terminology of the time, and indeed a common catch-all expression Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves”.

“Bushmen” and “Hottentots” in Early Travel Texts, and Khoe-San

There appears to be much confusion in early traveller accounts concerning the terms “Bushmen” and “Hottentots”. Consequently, historians have cautioned against reading these terms as distinct ethnic categories signifying “San” and “Khoekhoe”. For example, Elphick and Malherbe (1989: 25) observe that the term “Bushmen” may have been used to refer to San, Khoe, or indeed, groups containing both. They likewise consider that the pejorative term “Hottentot” may have been used to refer to a Bushman in the early nineteenth century (Elphick and Malherbe 1989: 43; also see Challis and Sinclair-Thomson, forthcoming). A reading of colonial travel texts, however, demonstrates that
these terms were also used interchangeably throughout the eighteenth century (see e.g., Paterson 1789: 51; Sparrman 1785: 123).

It has been suggested that these terms ought rather to be understood as economic categories defining foragers (Bushmen) and pastoralists (Hottentots) (Marks 1972: 57). John Wright (1996: 26) likewise argues that the term “San,” adapted from the earlier term “Sonqua” was a Khoe term used specifically to denote hunter-gatherers, and not a distinct racial marker. He concludes that the “Sonquas” were actually “sonquas”. From this perspective, these categories were fluid and could be transgressed. It has been argued that the cosmologies associated with hunting-gathering and gathering and pastoralism are so vastly different they would act as a preventative measure to switching between these economies with ease (see e.g., Smith 1990). However, a growing body of archaeological evidence for the early arrival of domesticates in southern Africa (see Sadr 2015) alludes to the fact that whom we may traditionally think of as hunter-gatherers, were in fact able to comfortably accommodate beliefs concerning domestic animals into their worldview (McGranaghan 2015).

When examined in detail, the historic record appears to show clear evidence for this fluidity between economies. Travelling through the Eastern Cape in 1752, Ensign August Beutler records that many “Hottentots” had become “Bosjesmans” as they had had their livestock stolen and now lived by hunting, gathering, and thievery (Crampton et al. 2013: 83). Conversely, Kolb (1731: 76) had earlier noticed that there were groups of “Sonquas”, whom many colonists thought of as purely hunter-gatherers (e.g., Raven-Hart 1971: 72) who were keeping and grazing stock in the mountains surrounding the early Cape colony. A definite commonality between the “Bosjesmans” of Beutler and the Sonqua described by Kolb, is that both were renowned for stock theft. Challis (2012, 2018) has argued that the colonial meaning of the term “Bushmen” in many cases in fact meant a robber or thief who also lived by hunting and gathering – an economic rather than racial classification. A contemporary observer, Francois Le Vaillant (1972 [1790] 402, 404) wrote of the “Boshis-men” that “These vagabonds are not…a particular nation of savages…they are a collection of…mongrels of all kinds...resembling each other only in treachery and villainy”.

The term “Hottentot” is also synonymous in early traveler texts with someone in a working relationship with the colony. When Thomas Pringle (1840: 104) described “deserted Hottentots” hiding out in the mountains around the Tarka, he was specifically referring to individuals who had deserted from settlers’ farms and from the Cape Regiment, two colonial institutions. Adhikari (2010: 37) likewise notes that someone who was once considered a Bushman may have become known as a Hottentot after working on a colonist’s farm.

Historians have previously employed the term “Khoisan”, a term invented by Leonard Schultze in the early twentieth century, as a way of dealing with this issue of uncertainty concerning the identity of groups in the colonial period (e.g., Marks 1972). Adhikari (2010: 23) considers it an especially useful term for cases where San and Khoe were known to be working together, an opinion also held by Penn (2013). The use of “Khoisan”, however, has come under fire for homogenizing the San and Khoekhoen into a single group (cf., Besten 2011; Etherington 2001: 45; Hamilton and Leibhammer 2016). In investigating rock art that has no distinct authorship, Morris (2008) and Hollmann (2007) have adopted the term “Kho-San”. They argue that this allows for the artists’ identity to be either one or the other, or alternatively, a
combination of both (Hollmann 2007: 128; Morris 2008: 105). They note there is
a great deal of evidence demonstrating that even if we essentialize “San” and
“Khoekhoe” as distinct ethnicities, it is difficult to tell their material culture apart. I
believe, following Besten (2011), that this term has traction as a non-pejorative when
considering groups that were labeled “Bushmen”, “Hottentots” or “Bushman Hotten-
tots” by colonists, especially concerning the evidence which suggests individuals and
groups may have moved between these labels (Challis and Sinclair-Thomson,
forthcoming).

Taking into account the terminology used by Pringle to describe the group of raiders
in the Winterberg, we might consider that all of these members were Khoe-San. “Wild
Bushmen” (as employed by Pringle [1840: 98]) was typically used to describe those
Khoe-San who had had no dealings with the colony, except perhaps for livestock theft
(Voss 1982: 20–21). “Tame” Bushmen, raised from childhood on farms, were invari-
ably those whose parents had been killed by “punitive” commando raids and captured
by Boers and their retainers (Guenther 1980). The practice of capturing Khoe-San
children to be used as free labor had occurred since at least 1715 (Newton-King 1999:
269). That these individuals who were captured were essentially an illegal slave force
(Abrahams 1996) makes it likely, whether he knew it or not, that when Pringle referred
to “runaway slaves” he was also discussing Khoe-San individuals (Sinclair-Thomson
and Challis, forthcoming).

Bandits of the Tarka

Throughout much of the record where Khoe-San are mentioned by early European
settlers and travelers it is specifically within the context of stock theft. Indeed they are
often referred to as “banditti” (e.g., Pringle 1840; Somerville 1979: 45; Sparman 1786:
142; Theal 1902: 136). Taking this into account and reading these groups through the
lens of Eric Hobsbawm’s (1969) bandit theory provides an understanding of how and
why these groups came together and what sort of beliefs they may have espoused.

Hobsbawm (1969: 14) considers the “social bandit” to be a hero protesting the unfair
treatment of the peasant class by a ruling class in a pre-industrialized economy, thereby
exhibiting a “sense of injustice”. He believes bandit groups to be heterogeneous,
consisting of not just peasants but also the dispossessed within a society, including
military deserters, escaped prisoners and the down and out, who head out to the
frontiers where they can operate outside the law (Hobsbawm 1969: 27). This bears a
strong resemblance to the statement by Pringle (1840: 98) describing the formation and
constituents of the bandit group near his location in the Winterberg.

For Hobsbawm (1969), whether in Sicily, South America, or China, bandits are com-
monly seen relying on magical or spiritual assistance when conducting their illegal activities.
They may, for example, have items blessed by representatives of the church or local religion.
These items, it is believed, “make[s] robbers invisible and invulnerable, paralyse[s] their
victims or send[s] them to sleep” (Hobsbawm 1969: 43). Bandits may rely on magic in the
same way that they rely on their physical capabilities (Hobsbawm 1969: 44). Thus, the
bandit often relies on magic for protection when raiding. I argue that beliefs concerning
protection were a motivating force behind the rock art created by groups of bandits around
the Tarka.
Although Hobsbawm has been critiqued for romanticizing the bandit into a Robin Hood stereotype (e.g., Blok 1972; Crummey 1986), other scholars see his model as a useful lens for understanding how a “sense of injustice” motivates people to rebel, within their means, on a small scale against an oppressive force (e.g. Gordon 1986). For the Khoe-San bandits of the Tarka, this “sense of injustice” was without doubt the major factor that spurred them on to banditry against the colony.

The Fight against Injustice

Injustices suffered as a result of the colonial project are numerous. For the purposes of this section I will, however, limit myself to discussing five types of injustice that are known to have contributed to the formation of bandit groups.

The Commando System

To combat stock theft by Khoe-San or other Africans, the colony introduced the commando. This was a loosely organized military system which required frontier farmers to attend or to send a representative in their stead – usually a farm worker of Indigenous or mixed descent (Adhikari 2010: 30). Although sanctioned by the colony, these units fell under the command of a single European farmer. The first general commando occurred in 1774 along the colony’s borders. The eastern division was led by Veldcommandant Rudolph Gottlieb Opperman (Penn 2005: 116). This unit alone killed 265 Khoe-San and captured 129 – mostly women and children – who would have been forced to labor on settler’s farms (Penn 2005: 119). The first commando into the mountains around the Tarka was in 1778 (Penn 2005: 133). Just one year before this, in 1777, the Council of Policy declared that “Bushmen” may be shot on sight by settlers (Adhikari 2010: 38). In the years that followed, 100 Khoe-San were killed by a commando led by Klaas Smit in 1788 along the Tarka River (Somerville 1979: 45), Veldcornet van Wyk killed more than 80 Khoe-San around the Tarka in 1821 (Pringle 1834: 371), and in 1822 and 1823, 130 Khoe-San were massacred in the same region (Thompson 1827: 41–42). The official records state that between 1820 and 1824, 91 Khoe-San were murdered and 369 taken prisoner in commandos (Penn 2013: 198). However, if we consider that commandos seldom reported their activities officially and that there were many unofficial expeditions, this seems to be a gross underestimate. This is especially the case when we learn that between 1786 and 1795, 2504 Khoe-San were killed and 669 captured in the Graaf-Reinet district (which included the Tarka at this point) alone (Newton-King 1999: 112). Indeed, so brutal was this system that Thomas Pringle (1840: 137) noted that, after 1826, there were no longer any cases of Khoe-San banditry in his area. As remarked by John Barrow, the brutality of the commando system was a major factor in encouraging Khoe-San to attack the colony, as they literally fought for their lives (Penn 2013: 187).

Loss of Traditional Hunting and Grazing Land

What are you doing in my territory? You occupy all the places where eland and game are. Why do you not remain where the sun sets, where you first were? Koeriekei 1777 (Gordon 1988: 81).
These words were shouted by Koerikei, the leader of a group of Khoe-San bandits near the Koueveld mountain range, to Veldtwagtmeester Carel van der Merwe, the leader of a commando in 1777. The colony expanded greatly in the second half of the eighteenth century. To give an idea of the rate of settler expansion, from 1770–73 alone, 109 new loan farms were granted in the Camdeboo and the Sneeuberg (Penn 2005: 114). The region of the Tarka was settled shortly after this from 1777. That the first commando to combat stock theft in the region was in the following year (Penn 2005: 133) suggests just how quickly Khoe-San bandits resisted this new occupation. The intensive grazing implemented by frontier colonist societies wreaked havoc on indigenous ecosystems, as plant and water resources were devoured, and the colonists hunted out much of the game relied upon by Khoe-San (Adhikari 2010: 20, 27; Beinart 2002). Travelling through the Cape in the 1770s, Thunberg (1986: 223) was well aware that the Dutch had taken the land from the Khoe-San, and that the Indigenes had been forced further into the interior and into areas where the land was poor for grazing and living and Khoe-San were “obliged entirely to quit their beloved native land”.

**Mistreatment by Employers**

The loss in traditional hunting and grazing land meant that many Khoe-San were forced to find work on settlers’ farms in order to survive (Giliomee 1989: 430). Barrow (1801: 236) noted that many of these workers were mistreated by their employers. They would flee this servitude with stolen firearms and horses as well as take information about the settlements they deserted to their fellows in the mountains. With these arms and intelligence they conducted raids on the farms on which they once worked. This was certainly the case with Dragoener. He had been working on a farm in the Tarka when he was once nearly beaten to death by the farmer. Dragoener fled while he could and spent some time wandering the Karoo where he brought together a mixed group of bandits comprising “wild Bushmen…tame Bushmen…runaway slaves, and…several deserters from the Cape Corps” (Pringle 1840: 98).

Once strong enough, he returned to the Winterberg where he raided livestock and horses from European-owned farms until his death in 1825 at the hands of a commando led by Fieldcornet C.F. van der Nest (Theal 1905: 48–49).

**Slavery**

It is significant that Dragoener’s group of bandits also included runaway slaves (Pringle 1840: 98). The banding together of Khoe-San and slaves into rebel groups had previously occurred near the town of Swellendam under the Khoe-San leader Jan Parel in the mid 1780s (Viljoen 1994: 6). Although slaves were imported into South Africa from the beginning of Dutch settlement in the mid seventeenth century until the trade was banned by the British in 1807 (Armstrong and Worden 1989: 109), there was also an “internal southern African slave trade” (Sinclair-Thomson and Challis, forthcoming). Khoe-San who were captured in commandos were often traded illegally among colonists as well as other opportunist Khoe-San groups like the Korana and the Bergenaars (Barrow 1801: 404; Landau 2010: 36; Legassick 1969: 62), as since the Dutch first arrived in the Cape, settlers were banned from enslaving the Indigenous population (Landau 2010: 130; Worden 1985: 7). This meant that illegal Khoe-San
“slaves” may often have found themselves in confinement with other slaves from abroad, including Madagascar, Indonesia, India, and Sri Lanka (Armstrong and Worden 1989: 112, 116) as well as “Bastaard-Hottentots” – the name for the progeny of local and foreign slaves (Viljoen 2005: 56). It was to this internal slave trade, and the bloodshed that accompanied it, that the bandit Khoe-San leader Klaas Stuurman referred to when he told Barrow near Algoa Bay in 1799, “We have yet a great deal of our blood to avenge” (Barrow 1806: 395).

The Maltreatment and Desertion of Indigenous Military

The Dutch armed Khoe-San militia with guns to assist them in the war of 1779–81 against the Xhosa which occurred as a dispute over territory along the eastern frontier, including the Tarka (Storey 2008: 44). The use of Khoe-San fighting units continued throughout Dutch, Batavian and British rule at the Cape (Blom 1990; Dominy 1995; Freund 1972; Malherbe 1997). Khoe-San frequently complained of unfair treatment by their superior officers, which included corporal punishment. Adding to this, the various barracks were notoriously unhygienic and dysentery was rife, providing yet another reason to desert (Blom 1990: 30–31). Deserters did not leave empty handed. They took with them their guns, horses and knowledge of both. They typically joined the “enemies” of the colonists, usually either the Xhosa or other Khoe-San bandits (Blom 1990: 23; Challis 2012; Dominy 1995: 42; Marks 1972: 75; Storey 2008: 45). Members of the Cape Corps who deserted to Dragoeners group (Pringle 1840: 98) may have come from nearby Grahamstown where their unit had been based since 1812 (Elphick and Malherbe 1989: 36) (Figs. 1 and 2).

Bandit Painters

Where once we were able to access this history via text alone – and colonial text at that – now, we believe, we can see something of the history from the perspective of the colonized Khoe-San. This is portrayed in rock paintings that occur throughout the Tarka region and which contain subject matter – horses, hats, and guns – which reliably date the images to the colonial period. These paintings were not, however, the mere record of witnessed events but rather related to Khoe-San spiritual beliefs and practices that ensured protection and, therefore, success in resisting the colonial project. The rock paintings in question can be found (and indeed some have only recently been discovered) in the mountainous regions known to have been the haunts of such bandit groups. The first indication that the paintings discussed here are concerned with banditry is that they are all found where Khoe-San bandits were known to hide out. Further evidence for the relation of these paintings to bandit groups is the subject matter depicted.

Location of Paintings

With the exception of the site which came to the attention of Simon Hall (1986: 45, Fig. 2) and which he subsequently published in a study of cattle and sheep imagery, the sites covered here were unknown to the academy until two field trips in May 2018 and March 2019. These field trips were undertaken to survey for potential rock art sites
Fig. 1  Map of southern Africa. Shading is based on carrying capacity for livestock in 2009 (Meissner et al. 2013: 291, Fig. 1).

Fig. 2  The Tarka river valley and surrounding river valleys. The site pictured in Figs. 3, 5a, and 5b is found in the Tarka river valley (directly above WINTERBERG on map). The site pictured in Fig. 4 is the furthest east on the map. The site pictured in Figs. 5c and 5b is directly below WINTERBERG on the map.
hypothesized (Challis 2012, 2018) to have been the creations of bandits. These may well be the precursor to the better-known raider-painters of the Maloti-Drakensberg in the mid-nineteenth century – also referred to as “Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves” (Challis 2008, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018). This area along the Tarka River was effectively reclaimed from the colony when settlers had to abandon it first in the early 1780s (Saunders 1994: 73) and again in the early 1790s (Newton-King 1999: 111) due to Khoe-San banditry. It and the surrounding areas along the Great Fish river were again abandoned in 1799 during the Third Frontier War as the colony took on a combined Gqunukhwebe Xhosa and Khoe-San force (Storey 2008: 54). It later became inhabited again by Gqunukhwebe Xhosa before they were driven out in the Fourth Frontier war of 1811–12 (Giliomee 1989: 447–448). Despite there no longer being a strong Xhosa presence, Khoe-San bandits continued to be active in the area until 1826 (Theal 1905: 55). There arose, therefore, a situation where colonists settled this newly reacquired territory (taken from Gqunukhwebe Xhosa) and yet found their occupation directly contested by the small bands of Khoe-San and runaway slaves who remained – the bands who soon became “banditti.”

Figure 4 is found along the Baviaans River, where Thomas Pringle settled in 1820 (Pringle 1840: 33). Throughout the period from his arrival until 1826, Pringle (1840: 137) wrote of himself and his neighbors being robbed by bandits. Prior to this, the history of the Baviaans River is much the same as that of the Tarka just to the north of it. For example, in the Third Frontier War every single settler farm along the Baviaans River was attacked and burned by the Xhosa and Khoe-San (Enklaar 1988: 91). Earlier still, in the First Frontier War (1779–81) the Baviaans River was occupied by Xhosa who were raiding into the colony (Giliomee 1989: 434). Khoe-San bandits were also active in the neighboring mountains at this time (Penn 2005: 134) and it is likely that they shared territory with the Xhosa, a situation with which they would have certainly been comfortable, owing to a long history of interactions and mixing between the groups as explained above.

The site pictured in Figs. 5c and 5d and another site are both found on the Mancazana River, which runs parallel to the Baviaans River (see Fig. 2). That there

![Fig. 3 On the Tarka River. A large black rain-animal occurs above and superimposing the rider. Image by author.](image-url)
would be rock art here was predicted by Sam Challis (2008, 2012) based on his work on the AmaTola Bushmen of the Maloti-Drakensberg. Challis (2012: 266) suggested that the Mancazana was the location of the origins of the AmaTola based on historical observations of the so-called “Mancazana Band” comprising “Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves” (Napier 1849: 226), the same appellation used to describe the AmaTola. The archaeological evidence from the Mancazana - rock art depictions of riders on horses among troops of baboons and livestock - is also suggestive of a link between these groups and the AmaTola because the same subject matter is found in the art of the latter (Challis 2012, 2014). The Mancazana bandits used to raid as far as Fort Beaufort during the early nineteenth century (Challis 2012: 273; cf. Ross 2014: 99). This river was also recorded as one of the hiding places for Dragoener and his group, discussed previously (Pringle 1840: 98). Prior to this, around the turn of the eighteenth/nineteenth century it was, moreover, the location of a Khoe-San group led by Gqirhashe, a “Bushman” known to be at enmity with the Xhosa chief Ndlambe (Soga 1983: 163). Taking into account the fractious nature of bandit groups in general (Hobsbawm 1969) and specifically in southern Africa (e.g., Challis and Sinclair-Thomson, forthcoming; Wright 1971), it is possible that some individuals could have been members of all three of these bands.

**Painted Subject Matter**

A conventional analysis of the paintings in the Tarka river valley and surrounding valleys suggests that the images were painted by multiple artists and/or over different episodes and yet, because horses are so prevalent, they can only have been painted during a timeframe of at most 50 years. An examination of the depiction of horses reveals that there are no clear conventions in how horses ought to be painted. For example, in Fig. 5a a horse is shown with its mane standing upright on its neck. The tail is straight out and the hair on the tail is also erect. In Fig. 5b, the mane is depicted on the shoulder of the horse, rather than its neck. These two images are both from the same

**Fig. 4** From a site on the Baviasans River. Note the rider sitting in the bareback position, and the rain-animal in the bottom right of the panel. Photo by author.
site. At another nearby site (Fig. 4), a horse is depicted in the same pigment as the first two but it does not have a mane at all.

The manner of depiction is also inconsistent. For example, at a site on the Mancazana there is a fine-line painted horse in black pigment (see Fig. 5d). Yet at the same site there is also a finger-painted horse and rider in orange pigment (see Fig. 5c). This finger-painting may speak to a perceived connection with Khoe, rather than San, ethnicity as finger-painted images have been linked to Khoe–speakers (Mitchell 2002; Smith and Ouzman 2004). However, the protracted mixing between different language speakers and the fluidity of ethnicity makes it all but impossible to assign a specific ethnic category to the artist (cf. Hollmann 2007; Morris 2008).

The idiosyncrasies in painting techniques and conventions might be indicative of there being different painters within the same group and that each of these had their own ideas and cultural understandings on which they drew when creating these images. Another alternative is that these panels were created by different artists in different groups over the brief period of time. What is suggested by the lack of convention is the diverse nature of these groups as well as the volatile conditions in which they lived. That there is some conformity in subject matter (e.g., horses) alludes to the emergence of an agreed set of symbols among the members of these groups despite their diversity.

One similarity that does exist between these horse images is that the riders appear to be riding bareback. The riders are usually shown sitting far forward along the horse towards its shoulders. They seem to lean back while their legs hang low, un-stirruped,

![Fig. 5](image.png)

**Fig. 5** a and b. On the Tarka river, two very different looking horses appear in the same panel. Figure 5 c and d. At the headwaters of the Mancazana, at the same site are a finger-painted horse in orange pigment and a fine-line horse in black pigment. Images by author.
down the horses’ flanks (see Figs. 4 and 5a). This is a posture for which bareback riders are renowned (Foreman and Wyse 1983: 29–31). I suggest that this depiction links the horse thefts to bandits. It stands to reason if a bandit was stealing horses that were out at pasture, the horses would not necessarily have saddles, bridles, or any other riding equipment upon them. It is unlikely that a would-be thief would risk capture by attempting to sneak into the building where the riding equipment was stored, when they could simply make do without it.

Evidence for a perceived connection to the San, other than the existence of fine-line paintings, is the presence of rain-animals. Certain depicted bovids (see Figs. 3 and 4) closely resemble animals painted at other sites that have been argued to be rain-animals (Dowson et al. 1994; Pinto 2014). Within San cosmology, the rain-animal is captured and then “cut” or “killed” by a ritual specialist, who would be in an altered state of consciousness, and its blood is scattered across the landscape as rain (Bleek 1935: 32; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1990: 11).

We ought not to view the images of colonial-era subject matter and the rain-animals as separate. Among southern African groups, rain-making and traditional medicines associated with it play an important role in conflict (Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2017). For example, mist is called down to provide camouflage for warriors and heavy rainfall, likewise, to hide their tracks (Challis 2008, 2014; Vinnicombe 1976). Challis and I (Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2017; Sinclair-Thomson 2019) have elsewhere argued that rain would have been called on to oppose the firepower of muskets, which function poorly in wet weather.

**Conclusion**

Within the larger histories of the Cape Colony’s eastern frontier, there were many groups of mixed- or multi-ethnic bandits who resisted colonial expansion. This resistance came about as Khoe-San and others were subjected to the brutality of the colonial project. As their land was taken, their people killed or forced to work for the colonists in abhorrent conditions, these individuals acquired a sense of injustice that motivated their resistance. One of the primary forms of resistance was to steal the European settlers’ livestock. The horses that were stolen could be ridden by bandits to make their resistance that much more effective as they escaped from would-be pursuers. Details relating to stock theft are found not just in the records of European travellers and settlers, but also in rock shelters. Unlike earlier rock art traditions, there are no clear conventions in this art. This is possibly linked to the diverse nature of these groups. It is important to note that these images ought not to be read as a commonplace narrative of raids. The presence of rain-animals, and the historically attested reliance on rainy weather by bandits, suggests the rock art to be related to protection during clandestine activities.
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The protracted colonisation of southern Africa’s Cape created conditions of extreme prejudice and violence. Slaves, the unwilling migrants to the Cape, comprised a mixed group of individuals from the Dutch and British colonies: people with Malay, Malagasy, East and West African heritage. They combined to form the labour force for the colonial project, as well as indigenous Khoe-San trafficked within an illegal domestic unfree labour economy. Escaped, or ‘runaway’ slaves joined forces with groups of ‘skelmbasters’ (mixed outlaws) who themselves were descended from San-, Khoe-, and Bantu-speaking Africans (hunter-gatherers, herders and farmers). Together they mounted a stiff resistance that held up the colonial advance for many decades from the late eighteenth century until the mid-nineteenth century. Engaging in guerilla-style warfare they raided colonial farms for livestock, horses and guns. The ethnogenesis of such raiding bands is increasingly coming to the attention of archaeologists encountering the images they made of themselves in rock shelters, as well as the spiritual beliefs they held in connection with escape and protection. The ‘reverse’ or ‘entangled gaze’ provided by this painted record gives us the perfect opportunity to view something of the slave and indigenous resistance from outside the texts of the colonial written record.
Introduction

Rock paintings occur in the Winterberg and Maloti-Drakensberg of South Africa that date to the colonial era owing to the appearance of horses and guns, among other things. As opposed to the world-famous ‘traditional’ images of the hunter-gatherer spiritual experience - shaded to create an almost photographic likeness of, for example antelope - these later images differ in subject matter and technique. They are typically painted in a rougher manner than the refined earlier art, and they are painted with a reduced colour palette, the hues of which are unshaded and ‘poster-like’ (Loubser & Laurens 1994). In some cases the poster-like images of people with horses and guns seemingly raiding livestock, appear alongside rough-brush-painted, and finger-painted versions with the same subject matter (discussed later with figures 4 and 5). Given the short time frame in which they could have been painted it is likely they were made, if not at the same moment then in rapid succession of one another, speaking to the historically-attested heterogeneous nature of raiding bands in these areas. Importantly, the localities where the paintings occur are often the same as those described by colonial travellers and administrators, from the late eighteenth century to mid nineteenth century, as the hideouts of groups consisting of ‘Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves’ (Napier 1849: 226). In this study we examine aspects of the practice of slavery, both official and illicit, in South Africa, and resistance to this institution which was often enacted by running away and joining groups of bandits in the mountains adjacent to the colony. These bandit groups mounted further resistance by stealing livestock from European-owned farms, which in many cases were their former places of captivity. Drawing on ethnographic accounts, we are able to demonstrate that rock art in these localities appears to be concerned with those slaves’ understandings of escape.

For this contribution we incorporate by necessity the written record because we are conducting archaeological investigations in the colonial era, but we go beyond this by examining the archive of the colonised, particularly those involved in acts of resistance, in the form of rock art. We follow Worden (1982), Penn (1999) and others in attempting to show the plight and perspective of the oppressed: the ‘reverse gaze’ (Ouzman 2003) or ‘entangled gaze’ (McMaster et al. 2018). That is to say, in the almost unrecoverable archaeological signature of runaway slaves one can trace something in the rock art of a direct
voice (in the case of the indigenous) and an indirect voice (in the case of immigrant slaves) as well as the mixing of the two. We begin with the historical background – who the slaves were, immigrant and indigenous; in what ways they became embroiled in events; how they appear in the historical record (in the economy, in resistance, in escaping, in jails) and how they appear in southern African society (in indigenous and newly-formed African groups). The second part of the article turns to the rock art – often found in secluded mountain fastnesses or lookout points – where indigenes and unwilling migrants were hiding out.

Following Ross’ (1983:3) emphasis on the slave experience being one of ‘resistance, not acquiescence’ we stress that in southern Africa a search for large-scale slave rebellion is misrepresentative of slave treatment, where one finds better evidence in the phenomenon of desertion. Desertion in effect is the rebellion that some historians are looking for (cf. Ross 1983:5). The escape is only the beginning of the lives of those who offered resistance. But where others (e.g. Ross 1983) perhaps focus on the conditions of slavery and flight of slaves, we focus on the alliances forged between immigrant and indigenous slaves alongside free indigenes (cf. Alpers 2003:59). Runaway slaves or drosters comprise an unavoidable component of the colonial borderlands, being historically visible in recorded raids and materially visible (if less easy to read) in their places of refuge – where they made images of these concerns within their own belief systems. As Penn (1999:4) adroitly remarks:

“…fugitive gangs very often represented micro-societies in which oppressed people from a variety of backgrounds – slaves, Khoi, ‘Bastaard-Hottentots’ and Company deserters – grouped together in units of mutual support, sharing a common consciousness of oppression and developing a tenuous form of multi-ethnic solidarity”.

This phenomenon finds expression elsewhere, and later, as the colonial stranglehold on the Maloti-Drakensberg mountains tightened, in the ethnogenesis of creolized bands of raiders who included painting in a system of ritual observances to ensure escape and protection (Challis 2014, 2016, 2018).
Who were the slaves imported to southern Africa?

With the founding of the Cape Colony in 1652, the Dutch East India Company (VOC) forbade Governor Jan van Riebeeck from enslaving the indigenous Khoe, San, and African farmers (Penn 2005: 141). This meant that he had to look elsewhere for a labour force. Although the first two shiploads of slaves delivered to the Cape were from West Africa, later they predominantly came from Madagascar, Mauritius (see figure 2a) and Mozambique as well as the East Indies (now Indonesia), India and Sri Lanka\textsuperscript{iv} (Armstrong and Worden 1989: 111-112, 122-123; Allen 2010: 54-55, 62).

When we refer to indigenous slaves, we use the terms ‘Khoe-San’, who were illegally pressed into unfree labour, and ‘African farmers’ (Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho, Tswana and so forth, whose involvement increases later on in the history of colonial expansion; Morton 1992). Elsewhere we have explored the effects visible in the subcontinent’s rock art resulting from contact between indigenous hunter-gatherers (San and those ancestral to them), incoming African herders (ancestors of the Khoe) and incoming African farmers (isiNtu language- speakers) as well as contact with colonists and fugitives of European descent (Challis and Sinclair-Thomson \textit{in press}). Of course, this necessarily entails the entanglement (e.g. Der & Fernandini 2016) of runaway slaves escaping in the hinterland.
and finding refuge among peoples of all the above (Alpers 2003; cf. Lightfoot & Martinez 1995). In doing so we detailed the delicate matter of nomenclature (i.e. ‘San’, ‘Khoe’ and ‘Khoe-San’, see e.g. Besten 2011: 188-190) in the writing of southern African history. Suffice to say here that, though linguistically related, the two groups are often self-designated as quite distinct yet, in the archaeological and historical records, can be difficult to distinguish.

The historical record is muddied by the terms ‘Bushman’ and ‘Hottentot’, often equated with ‘San’ and ‘Khoe’ respectively, and the deployment of these terms rests unconvincingly on the early travellers’ grasp of perceived ethnicity and appearance. Importantly, today the hunter-gatherers of the Kalahari prefer to be known as ‘Bushmen’ (e.g. Barnard 1992), but the name is considered pejorative, with its counterpart ‘Hottentot’, in the Cape. Unfortunately, terms such as ‘Bastaard-Hottentot’ appear in the archive as a specific colonial category (in this case an exonym that becomes an endonym) that still serve as pointers in our investigations.

Escape: petit and grand marronage

Richard Allen (pers. comm. in Alpers 2003:52) draws attention to the distinction made between fugitives who remained close at hand – perhaps waiting for, or living off, their fellow, still bonded, slaves for a short time period (small or petit), and those who escaped more permanently and at a greater (grand) distance as to be able to live in relatively free Maroon societies. Alpers (2003:59) sees the integration of runaway slaves into frontier societies as a key feature of the period:

…sometimes individuals and small groups of slaves sought to escape enslavement altogether by seeking shelter with indigenous people…
[constituting] an important intermediary point along the continuum from petit marronage to grand marronage.

We would add to this that it is central to the formation of many such groups, particularly those labelled ‘Banditti’, or ‘skelmbasters’ (skelm from the Afrikaans ‘trouble-maker’ and baster from ‘bastaard’/mixed, Giliomee 1992:458), and whose identity (at least to the settlers) comprised ‘Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves’ (Napier 1849). These three
categories were not, however, necessarily distinct, especially as indigenous populations became enslaved illegally.

Figure 2a. Louis van Mauritius led a rebellion of 300 slaves in the cape in 1808. In National Heritage Monument sculpture *The Long March to Freedom*. Reproduced with permission of the artist Barry Jackson and the National Heritage Project Company.

Figure 2b. ‘Portrait of Júli, a Faithful Hottentot’ by William Burchell in *Travels in the Interior of Southern Africa* p 160. Reproduced with permission of the library of the University of the Witwatersrand.
How Khoe-San became slaves, runaways and mixed Banditti

With colonial expansion, the indigenous Khoe-San came to occupy a position that was akin to slavery, despite this being officially outlawed. Much controversy has centred on whether these individuals ought to be considered ‘true’ slaves or as another category of unfree labour (see e.g. Newton-King 1999; Penn 2005:140). For instance, Khoe peoples’ movements were far from free, as exemplified in the Caledon Code of 1809, which required them to carry passes and allowed officials to designate individuals, willing or otherwise, as labourers among the settlers (Crais 1990:206). Nigel Penn (2005:111) notes that Khoe were forced into servitude in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as Dutch colonists took both land and livestock. Crais (1990: 195) links this development of servitude with the growth in the production of commodities, especially beef farming, on the colony’s borders. Penn (2005:111) argues that although the Khoe at first received some benefits, namely wages and being allowed to retain stock on their employers’ land, this changed from the late eighteenth century with the development of the commando, or militia, system. These militias, consisting of local European farmers and their servants, themselves often of Khoe-San descent, became a powerful tool used by the colonists to enforce increasingly unfair obligations on the Khoe who were losing any remaining liberties. Because Khoe-San within the Colony were expected to, and relied upon, work, when unemployed they were considered idle or ‘vagabond’. The expression ‘Vagabond Hottentots’ came into use (Burchell 1822: 258) and those so classified were thrown in jail if they could not account for themselves. As Thomas Pringle (1835:179) observed in his inspection of the Fort Beaufort jail in 1822:

Others were merely Hottentots out of service, who had been apprehended by the field-cornets, and sent here until some white man should apply to have them given out to him on contract.

He also noted that thrown together in the gaol were Xhosa farmers, other Khoe-San as well as *wild* Bushmen, by which we know Pringle meant those who had not been brought up on farms (Pringle 1835: 179):

There were wild Bushmen, too… The offence for which they were in general confined was absconding from the service of the farmers, after having, under
the pressure of famine, sold themselves and their children to thraldom for a mess of pottage.

The Reverend John Philip (1828 vol.2:265-66) noted that Khoe-San children were passed from one family to another (for an illicit fee) so that they might not be traced. Thus the hunter-gatherer population was enslaved:

‘The greater part of the farmers being without slaves, their sole dependence for servants is upon the Bushmen, and other aborigines of the country.’

(Philip 1828 vol2:267).

Although the commandos were said to be a retaliatory measure against stock theft by indigenes, they were more often deployed to capture Khoe-San to be used as indigenous slaves in bonded servitude (e.g. Penn 2013). In many cases the men who were caught by a commando were massacred, while the children would be either kept by the members of the commando or sold into slavery (Penn 2013: 193). It is to this internal slave trade that the Khoekhoen leader Klaas Stuurman was referring when he told John Barrow near Algoa bay “We have a great deal of our blood to avenge” (Barrow 1801: 93-94).

There are many first-hand accounts from European travellers who encountered this trade. For example, between 1772 and 1776 the Swedish doctor, Anders Sparrman, met ‘newly captured’ Khoe-San on a farm in the lower Seacow Valley (Sparrman 1785a:354). He also met an elderly group of Khoe-San who complained that all of their young people were stolen by Europeans, so that now they had to look after themselves and their livestock (Sparrman 1785b:20). Later on, Sparrman (1785b:31) encountered a ‘Hottentot’ who was given a gun by the farmer he worked for to go and steal Bushmen – to work as slave labourers. Twenty years later John Barrow (1801: 235-6) related:

…such of the Bosjesmans as should be taken alive in the expeditions made against them, were to be distributed by lot among the Commandant and his party, with whom they were to remain in a state of servitude during their lives.

Yet it was not only the European settlers who participated in this system of kill or capture. Groups of Korana and Bergenaars, themselves of mixed ancestry comprising Khoe, San, slave and Europeans, were known to raid Khoe-San kraals and to sell captives as a cheap labour force to the Boers living on the frontier (Leśniewski 2010: 16). The Bergenaars grew in martial strength in the late 1820s as interior African slave traders, taking people
from groups of African farmers and hunter-gatherers (and, presumably, herders) whom they bartered with European settlers, which was illegal under colonial law, for arms and ammunition. Their numbers grew as they were continually joined by ‘outlaws and runaways from the Colony’ (Philip 1828 vol2:298).

From the eighteenth until the mid-nineteenth centuries, it seems Khoe-San were increasingly considered property as opposed to employees. As Theal (1904a:207) notes, the slave rebel leader Galant saying of his collaborators, Admiral Slinger, Moses and Andries, they were Khoe-San and yet they ‘were people belonging to’ the farmer Piet van der Merwe. Those able to escape this tightening net entered into various states of marronage, often returning to steal from the farms on which they had been employed. Owing to such stock theft in 1811, Khoe-San labelled ‘Banditti’ by the Commission of Circuit (cf. Newton-King 1999: 63; Sinclair-Thomson 2020) were put in chains and forced to labour on public works in the Graaf-Reinet District (Theal 1901: 338). Eventually the Khoe-San found themselves in a situation where they were treated worse than legal slaves. This is exemplified in the drunken comments, to a slave, of a farmhand who had killed a Khoe labourer – that while the Khoe had no rights, the slave at least had commercial value and therefore ought to be spared (Ross 1983: 43-44).

The time period with which we are concerned, namely the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, is one in which travellers frequently described encounters with runaway slaves who had turned to banditry (cf. Hobsbawm 1969). Importantly for our purposes, these numerous accounts describe runaway slaves appearing within groups of indigenes as well as the mixing between these peoples. In 1797 Barrow’s party was joined by three runaway slaves and three Khoe-San whom they found in a notorious raiding spot (Barrow 1801:96). In the nineteenth century, a ‘Bushman’ named Dragoener was known to have runaway slaves within his group of bandits, raiding settler farms in the Winterberg region (Pringle 1835: 98). While travelling through the Lower Roggeveld in the first decade of the nineteenth century, Lichtenstein heard of a settler family who had been killed by their slaves who were working together with ‘Bushmen’. Lichtenstein suggested that the slave had sought revenge after being mistreated (Lichtenstein 1928: 125-126). Travelling through the same region in 1811, Burchell learnt that farmers often abandoned their houses and took everything with them to avoid being robbed by ‘runaway slaves or Vagabond Hottentots’ (Burchell 1822: 258). A similar circumstance was observed by Thompson in the Sneeuberg in 1823 where
he learnt that runaway slaves and ‘Bushmen’ bandits robbed travellers (Thompson 1967: 46).

Although the circumstances and strategies of escape were varied, in most cases the fugitives joined groups of indigenous or mixed outlaws. In these situations we must always ask ourselves what options were open to such individuals (Challis 2012), and generally the best recourse was to flee from the settler farms in order to take advantage of them – ‘compelled to adopt a parasitic existence’ (Penn 1999:81). Thus, we find recorded examples of bandit groups hiding out in mountain refuges within striking distance for livestock raids. In some instances, the locations of the hideouts of these bandit groups are recorded. These include the Winterberg (Pringle 1835), the Bamboesberg (Barrow 1801), the Stormberg (Collins 1959 [1809]) and the Drakensberg (multiple primary sources in Wright 1971). These locations typically offer expansive views, thereby allowing bandits to keep an effective lookout for any would-be pursuers (cf. Bernard 2008: 338 for North American Chumash sites of a similar nature). Importantly these areas contain rock art that can be reliably dated to the time period under discussion and provides us with the reverse gaze (Ouzman 2003; Challis 2018), a counterpoint to the written record (cf. Paterson 2012).

**The material culture archive of painted images**

Evidence pointing toward the authorship of the images in question stems from several converging factors. First, there is the existence of heterogeneous banditti, as already outlined. Second, there are specific locations mentioned by colonial authorities as the haunts of said groups – sometimes named people in named places. Third, when we visit rock shelters in these locations and find images of horses and guns, we know, with a relative degree of accuracy, that they can only have been produced within a certain time frame: beginning with the arrival of these elements with European settlement and ending with the disappearance of the bandits. Fourth, the paintings themselves are not only mixed – some brush-painted (in different techniques), some finger-painted – but also display subject matter that pertains to spiritual beliefs concerning escape and protective power. We now turn to these factors in more detail.

It is important to note that the rock art images we describe here were likely performed by the aforementioned mixed bands and that their authorship is therefore similarly mixed.
This is to say that just because said bands included Khoe-San, the paintings (and sometimes engravings) were not necessarily made by San, or even Khoe, but probably by all members – not least, as we shall see, the Nguni-speaking African farmers as well as those who were multi-ethnic and creole. That said, we do find a preponderance of images that *are* relatable to Khoe-San belief and practice.

That there are rock paintings at all suggests that these bandit groups consisted of at least some Khoe-San members or were, alternatively, drawing on the cultural practices of the Khoe-San as producers of rock art (Blundell 2004; Challis 2012, 2014, 2016). Colonial-era rock art – arguably made by multi-ethnic groups appears to have some reverence for its Khoe-San antecedents in *some* subject matter. We do, however, see something of a *disconnect* between this art and that of the earlier Khoe-San painters (*sensu* Loubser & Laurens 1994; Challis and Sinclair-Thomson *in press*). As a result of the *disconnect*, the painting technique is notably ‘rougther’ and less refined; there is a drop in pigment quality; and the manner of depiction is somewhat simplified and performed with a smaller colour palette (see figure 3). We argue that these changes came about as a result of contact, experienced in a variety of iterations including intermixing in both genetics and ideology, with incoming populations. Change also probably occurred as groups lost their access to traditional resources and the knowledge networks necessary to create images akin to those painted prior to contact.

Figure 3. Painted in the same shelter, a) a Traditional Corpus eland depicted with shaded polychrome (oldest dated c3000 cal. BP, Bonneau *et al.* 2017); b) an eland depicted in poster-like block colour, likely painted post contact. Southern Maloti-Drakensberg.

The contact art is not entirely severed from the earlier traditions, however. We notice that certain motifs, including baboons, ostriches and rain-animals, continue to be used albeit
within new contexts as they appear alongside images of introduced animals and material culture, such as horses and guns. This is suggestive of at least some continuity in the recognition of these animals, mystical or otherwise, as subject matter pertinent to their changed circumstances. Therefore, although there are various iterations of the disconnect, in which indigenous groups were forced to adapt to the presence of newcomers, throughout the contact period, perhaps the most stark is that pertaining to European colonisation. Despite these changes, bandit groups, however mixed they were, held onto, and even highlighted, some specific traditional beliefs. Evidence for the art of former slaves is manifest in the rock shelters stretching from the Cape to the Maloti-Drakensberg along the ever-expanding borders of the colony.

The location of a band of mixed outlaws comes to us from the record of the famous 1820 settler, poet and abolitionist Thomas Pringle (1840:77), who noted that by 1824:

‘A band of native banditti had for some time past established themselves among the rocks and woods of the Neutral Ground, composed partly of wild Bushmen from the north-east, partly of tame Bushmen (as they are termed), who had absconded from the service of the Boors; and they were rendered more dangerous and desperate by having been recruited by one or two runaway slaves, and by several deserters from the Cape Corps, who possessed fire-arms.’

The ‘Neutral Ground’ that Pringle wrote of included, at the time, the valley of the Mankazana River in today’s Eastern Cape Province (Pringle 1840: 77). We recently undertook fieldwork in this area where we found rock paintings of horses and guns that can be reliably dated to approximately when Pringle was writing (i.e. the late eighteenth century when Europeans first settled the region until the early nineteenth century when banditry ceased in the Winterberg). That groups of bandits on the borders of the Cape Colony created rock paintings is well attested (see. e.g. Blundell 2004; Ouzman 2005; Challis 2008, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018; Sinclair-Thomson in press), yet these particular paintings have not previously been studied within this context. What makes these images all the more compelling as examples of the archaeology of slavery (cf. Stahl 2008: 38), is the historical testament of Pringle above.
That heterogeneous groups of bandits painted rock art depictions of cattle raids suggests
that raiding was a fundamental concern for these groups. If we have learnt anything from
the past several decades of southern African rock art research, it is that images are not
the mere depictions of what the artists saw around them. Rather, they are of what ritual
specialists see while traveling through the spirit world, access to which is achieved by
altered states of consciousness (see e.g. Lewis-Williams 1982). In the case of bandit
groups, the ritual specialist often performed the role of war-doctor. This position
was accorded great importance during times of conflict among many southern African
societies (Challis 2012, 2014; Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2017, and see below).
Consequently, we ought not to view paintings of raids as images of actual events,
recorded by artists either for fancy or historical documentation. If paintings can be seen to
be both a record of the process, and a part of the process, undergone by ritual specialists,
then we could do worse than look at the role of ritual specialists during times of conflict.

In a recent paper (Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2017) we examined beliefs across
southern Africa concerning the magical ability to influence the trajectory of projectile
weapons. This belief has been linked specifically to paintings depicting firearms (Sinclair-
Thomson 2019; cf. Robinson 2013 for examples of ‘polyvalent metaphors’ in rock art
in south-central California). It is argued that the ritual specialists within these groups of
bandits would have also exercised this power when in situations of conflict. The creation
of images on rock was one such iteration of this practice. Individuals who claimed
these supernatural abilities would have either occupied prominent positions within, or
headed, these groups and would likely have been sought out by runaway slaves in the
hope that they might be offered protection from punitive expeditions (cf. Etherington
2001). At the same time, fugitives would supply the bandit group with intelligence
concerning their former places of occupation which could be used to ensure a
successful raid (Barrow 1801:236; cf. Marks 1972).

Indeed the notion of supernatural protection was likely at the core of the creation of
paintings by bandit groups. Southern African rock art research (Jolly 1986; Lewis-
Williams 2019) demonstrates that the making of rock art was the domain of ritual
specialists. These are the very people who, in their role as war-doctors, also supplied
traditional medicines to ensure protection in dangerous situations, including cattle raids.
and the flight from servitude (Challis 2014, 2018; Sinclair-Thomson forthcoming). In one account from the late nineteenth century, the traveller Theophilus Hahn was explicitly told by his Khoekhoe guides that they painted on stone, and on themselves, as a form of protection (Hahn 1881: 140). These beliefs in supernatural protection were cross-cultural and were particularly pertinent to slaves, both immigrant and indigenous. For example, a group of Islamic Malay slaves who fled the colony and attempted to reach the Xhosa were caught with ‘talismans’ that were meant to guarantee a successful escape. These were supplied by an Imam in the Cape (Ross 1983: 20-21). Immigrant slaves would also approach local Khoekhoe to supply them with traditional medicines to ensure supernatural effects, such as the case of a slave from Bengal who acquired some ‘beans’ from a Khoekhoe man to stop other slaves from harassing him (Ross 1983: 46). This example is highlighted by Ross (1983: 46) as demonstrating that slaves would approach those most likely to be able to assist them, which we suggest was a common theme among the vast majority of desertions. That is to say that if immigrant slaves were to join a group of Khoekhoe bandits, they might recognise the necessity and meaning of painting as a form of protection amongst other ritual observances.

Khoekhoe runaways would have drawn on cultural practices, including painting, or at least the residual traces of this practice depending on the level of assimilation into slave society, to ensure a successful escape. On the other hand, Khoekhoe who were harbouring fugitives would also have engaged in protective practice to ensure the safety of their newly acquired members as well as to prevent themselves from being enslaved. Yet, as we have seen, many of these individuals did not escape with the intent of grand marronage but rather stayed within the borderlands of the colony from where they sought further retribution against the colony through the act of stock theft. The fear of (re)enslavement or death would have motivated recourse to ritual protective practices. The rock art images we discuss depict subject matter related to raids including armed riders and domestic livestock. It is telling that they also include motifs relating to protection during raids as can be seen in the appearance of certain animals, especially baboons and ostriches.
Baboons are associated with protection across Khoe-San and African farmer society owing to their use of a particular medicinal plant. The |Xam San of the nineteenth century claimed that the baboon chewed a stick of so-/oa, a root medicine which would alert the user, animal or human, to approaching danger and keep it safe from harm (Challis 2014). Among the Xhosa there is a cognate belief in uMabophe – arguably the same root medicine. Like so-/oa, uMabophe was also supplied by ritual specialists to those who wished to exert supernatural influence over projectile weapons, including the aforementioned turning ‘bullets to water’ (Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017; in other references the root was burned at its tip and pointed at the adversary in order to confound them). Challis (e.g. 2012; 2014; 2016; 2018) has argued that the baboon’s association with this protective medicine (as well as its practice of stealing baby goats and sheep), made its potency the ideal to draw upon for groups of hybrid raiders comprised of ‘Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves’ (Napier 1849) and something that acted as a catalyst in their cultural creolization. The rock art of the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’ of the Maloti-Drakensberg (Figure 4) consequently includes images of livestock raids, baboons and ritual specialists turning into baboons as they invoke its power. Importantly in the case of the AmaTola (and as their Nguni prefix ‘ama’ suggests) there was also a very strong African farmer presence – and this is detectable in the depiction of farmer
material culture (e.g. feathered headdresses, Challis 2014, 2016, 2018) – and further attests to the inclusion of the baboon and its association with *uMabophe*.

Another group of ‘Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves’ are recorded in an earlier reference to raiding on the eastern Cape frontier. In fact, it was hypothesised (Challis 2012) that this region was where the Tola-type creolized bands first formed, as loose-knit multi-ethnic fugitives. The survey of the Mancazana area to test the hypothesis revealed rock shelters that exhibit precisely these phenomena: images of horses, cattle and baboons.

Figure 5: From the Mancazana river, finger-painted and fine-line horses in the same shelter attesting to the mixed nature of these bandit groups as described by Pringle (1840: 77). Scale is indicated by the width of the finger painting. Note the baboons painted beneath the black horse. Images by authors.

Many of these images are painted with a fine-line unshaded technique, like that of the AmaTola, but there are also images that are finger-painted in a bright orange pigment (see Figure 5). Finger paintings of this sort have a distinctly Khoe-speaker inflection, and they bear a strong resemblance in technique to the art of the Korana raiders, to the north of the Colony, who were also known to include runaway slaves among their number (Ouzman 2005; *cf.* Smith & Ouzman 2004). Finger-painted images of people on horse-back with livestock and baboons also appear in another renowned hide-out for runaway slaves in the Western Cape, the mountains of the Bokkeveld. That particular site has been argued to have been created by Khoe farm labourers in the late nineteenth century (Hall and Mazel 2005). We argue, however, that the appearance of baboons in this context suggests that at least some of the Swartruggens (Bokkeveld) art was created by the historically-attested mixed groups of raiders, including runaway slaves, who were known to seek safety in this area throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (*cf.* Penn 1999).
Further into the hinterland, as if to mark the fighting retreat of bandit groups as the colonial frontier expanded, we discover sites in mountain rock shelters of the Stormberg and the neighbouring Zuurberg that exhibit yet more features of an indigenous resistance idiom. In the Zuurberg, for instance, is a rock shelter in which are painted images of people with horses and guns (Fig. 6a), as well as baboons (yet painted very differently) and with the inclusion of ostriches (Fig. 6b).

![Figure 6a and b. In a shelter in the Zuurberg, figures with guns, one mounted, are painted with ostrich and baboon therianthropes – attesting to the artists ‘drawing on’ these animals’ potency and qualities for escape and protection. Image by authors.](image)

The ostrich was recognised by Khoe-San groups as being particularly adept at escaping from danger. It could outrun most predators and leap over the nets of hunters (Low 2009:72). Khoe-San would, and still do, tie the tendons from ostrich legs to their own legs to stop fatigue (Low 2009:72). Ostrich eggshell was also recognised as a medicine that could be ground up and consumed as a fortifying tonic (Engelbrecht 1936:186). That this bird, as well as ritual specialists transforming into it (Fig. 6b), appears in the art of bandits illustrates that these groups were drawing on the powers of the ostrich to ensure their own escape, whether from their former captors or pursuing commandos following raids.

**Conclusion**

The sites, the Khoe-San beliefs as well as the African farmer idioms which underlie the substance of meaning in the images described in this article have been presented in far greater detail in the works leading up to this (e.g. Challis 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018; Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017; Sinclair-Thomson 2019; Challis & Sinclair-Thomson *in press*). What these previous papers have not focussed on is the relation of rock art to slavery and resistance in the Cape Colony. Although never officially recognised as
slaves, the Khoe-San, from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, were uprooted from their land and lifeways by European settlers and forced into bondage. This brought them into contact with sanctioned immigrant slaves, imported from elsewhere in Africa and from across the Indian Ocean. Although at first, in the early days of the colony, the immigrant slaves who escaped were less likely to find allies among neighbouring Khoe-San, this changed as the indigenes found themselves increasingly subjugated under the colonial yoke. In defiance of the harsh treatment they received at the hands of their European captors, many members of the unfree labour class fled and took refuge in the surrounding mountains. From these fastnesses they raided their former captors and other settlers for livestock and firearms. It was also in these rocky hideouts that they painted their concerns. The rock art of bandit groups is noted for being bound up with beliefs in the ability to call upon the protection of the supernatural. The animals – baboons and ostriches – which painted with images of livestock and people on horseback with firearms, were heralded for their associated powers pertaining to escape and protection while raiding. For runaway slaves, whether indigenous, immigrant, or indeed the mixture of the two, rock art was one of several crucial ritual observances performed to prevent the likelihood of ever returning to a life of oppression.
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Our definition of ‘slaves’ is explained presently.

Nomenclature deriving from high Dutch, Cape Dutch, Farm Dutch (Boeretaal) and Afrikaans all ultimately relates to Dutch occupation of the Cape in 1652 and subsequent colonisation. British colonists after 1795 adopted many such words, for example Boschiesman from which Bushman is derived.

The progeny of relations between the immigrant and indigenous Khoe-San slaves were known as ‘Bastaard-Hottentots’ [Newton-King 1999: 117]. As children, ‘Bastaard-Hottentots’ were usually raised similarly to their parents in unfree labour, from which they were legally entitled to leave after a certain period. This allowance of freedom, however, was not always observed (Penn 2005: 20) – yet further evidence of conditions from which one might wish to escape.

The exact number of slaves from each region is uncertain owing to missing records coupled with illegal slave dealing not sanctioned by the VOC (Armstrong and Worden 1989: 115). What is known is that during the period 1680-1731 48.5% of the 3283 imported slaves were from Madagascar, while 31.6% were from India and Indonesia. 19.8% were not identified (Armstrong and Worden 1989: 121).

Although pejorative, this term is useful for illustrating the interactions between immigrant and indigenous slaves.

The precise number of sites is at present unknowable because survey is still very piecemeal. In our fieldwork in the Stormberg region we found four painted rock shelters, and in the Winterberg region we found five shelters. Two additional shelters were found in the Windvogelberg to the east of the Winterberg. A single shelter was found in the Zuurberg. There are probably many more. This is not even taking into account the 100+ sites with horses in the Maloti-Drakensberg.
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Ostriches are depicted at rock art sites that appear to be associated with raiding in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. Taking into account the well-attested spiritual beliefs that relate to rock art made by past San hunter-gatherer populations and the understanding that the art does not depict scenes of daily life, it is highly unlikely that the artists were painting scenes of actual raids which somehow involved ostriches. An examination of indigenous beliefs concerning ostriches demonstrates that the depiction of these animals within a raiding context makes sense. This paper examines the historical significance of the Great Fish River region, as the former boundary of the Cape Colony and the location of frequent banditry, exemplified by stock-theft, carried out by mixed groups of ‘Bushmen’ bandits - comprising San, Khoekhoen, runaway slaves and military deserters- against European settlers. When such raids targeted European settlers, punitive expeditions were undertaken by commandos that included members of military regiments which themselves consisted of Khoe-San members. It was common for these members to desert their regiments and join up with the very bandits they were expected to combat, reasons for which are examined in detail. An investigation of San and Khoekhoen beliefs in ostriches, both past and present, reveals a reverence for this bird as an animal of great strength that is able to escape dangerous situations by means of its powerful legs. I suggest that these raiders painted ostriches as they were purposefully drawing on ostrich potency to enable their own escape from military service as well as from pursuing commandos after stock raids.

INTRODUCTION

Within the indigenous southern African ontologies of the colonial era (and likely before), the physical world was interlinked with a spiritual world that had just as much bearing on daily activities as the material culture used to perform those activities. Hence, when embarking on raids, bandits relied not only on their weapons, but also on powerful forces that could be called upon to guide those weapons and to protect themselves. This paper

1 Pastoralists who arrived in South Africa around 1000kya (Sadr 2015)
examines how one of these potent forces, that of the power of ostriches, was called upon as a protective force.

That this power was called upon is suggested by the appearance of ostriches in rock art panels that also include images associated with raiding, such as horses, guns and livestock, that appear in the region that was the colony’s border during the late eighteenth -and early nineteenth -century. An examination of the historical context in which these images were produced, as well as an understanding as to the magico-religious meaning of Khoe-San\textsuperscript{2} rock art, demonstrates that bandit groups which included Khoe-San\textsuperscript{2} individuals were likely calling on the power of the ostrich as a master escape artists to protect them during their raids as well as during their escape from colonial institutions.

In the late 1700s the burgeoning Cape Colony had expanded eastwards up to the Great Fish River (Penn 2005: 92). In this process indigenous hunter-gatherers, pastoralists and farmers were forced off their land and, subsequently, severed from their traditional ways of life. By 1778 the Great Fish River was the official boundary of the colony. However, many settlers ignored this border and continued to expand and settle eastwards beyond the river (Moodie 1838: 67; Saunders 1994: 69). The additional sudden spike in population in 1820 due to the arrival of 4000 settler families from Britain further exacerbated the strain on both the environment and the local people (Storey 2008: 57).

Prior to the arrival of the Dutch and, later, English settlers in this region, it was populated by San hunter-gatherers who relied on access to both the winter and summer rainfall regions of the Cape which lay almost exactly to either side of the Great Fish River. Hunter-gatherers who had adapted to these conditions would follow the game and plant foods according to a seasonal pattern, and much the same could be said of the Khoekhoen pastoralists (Penn 2005: 82), who by the time of Dutch settlement in the region were predominantly of either the Gonaqua or Hoengiqua chieftaincies (Crampton \textit{et al.} 2013: 75). Their herds required access to sweetveld and sourveld that flourished at different times of the year throughout the region (Elphick and Malherbe 1989: 422). At the time of Dutch settlement, the most westerly African farmers were the Rharhabe Xhosa under chief Ndlambe, who had moved to the area

\textsuperscript{2}I follow Hollmann (2007) and Morris (2008) in applying this term to rock art which may have been created by either Khoekhoen or San artists or both. I follow Besten (2011) in applying it to people in the colonial period who likely had both San and Khoekhoen ancestry as a result of protracted contact between hunter-gatherers and pastoralists.
for political rather than environmental reasons, and the Gqunukhwebe (Giliomee 1989: 425). Ndlambe had tried to wrestle control of the Rharhabe from his young nephew Ngqika, the rightful ruler, and in doing so had been forced to settle west with a following of rebel Xhosa (Saunders 1994: 41). The Gqunukhwebe, under chief Chungwa, were descended from both Khoekhoe and Xhosa, and actively sought to resist Ndlambe as he tried to assert himself as a paramount chief (Giliomee 1989: 436). It was into this environmentally and politically volatile situation that the colonists marched and tried to dominate.

Of the groups who lost their land, many also lost people as they were coerced into joining colonial institutions (Giliomee 1989: 431). Xhosa were usually not, under colonial law, allowed to work on European settlers’ farms. However, Khoe-San were either voluntarily hired or alternatively forced into a system akin to slavery, as farm labourers (Adhikari 2010: 34). Other Khoe-San who were found in the wrong place at the wrong time, usually wandering on a settler’s farm, were arrested and forced to join one of the newly instituted indigenous military units that served the colony (Malherbe 2002). Whether working on a farm or in the military, Khoe-San could expect a life of hardship and brutal exploitation.

Many Khoe-San, individuals of mixed race, and people from African farming communities resisted the colonists by turning to banditry (cf. Hobsbawm 1969). They would typically steal livestock and destroy farm infrastructures in an effort to halt the expansion of European power (Adhikari 2010: 28). For those who were working on European-owned farms or in military service, one of the first acts towards becoming a bandit was to abscond from their employment. They would often take the firearms and the horses that they had now been trained to use and put their skill towards raiding the farms and settlers for whom they used to work (Barrow 1801: 236).
STRUTHIO CAMELUS AUSTRALIS

The Cape ostrich (Struthio camelus australis) is an indigenous African bird species (Bezuidenhout 1999: 1). It is flightless and grows up to 2.75m in height, weighing up to 200kg (Peng et al. 2010: 235). The skin colour of the male ranges between red and scarlet depending on sexual activity while females are a light grey. The plumage in males is black and white and in females is a grey/brown (Duerdèn 1919: 163).

The eggs, the largest of any living bird, are around 15.5cm in length, 13cm in width and the eggshell is 2.2mm thick (Meo et al. 2003: 386). Both males and females sit on the eggs during the incubation period (Cooper et al. 2009: 1673). Despite being highly adaptable to different environments, ostriches have a preference for grasslands and semi-desert conditions (Cooper et al. 2009: 1675).

When threatened, ostriches will open their mouths in an aggressive gesture. This may be accompanied by a hiss or a loud call (Sauer and Sauer 1967: 579 & 583). Should an adversary ignore these gestures, ostriches can either escape by running away at speeds of up to 70 km/h or, alternatively, deliver a deadly kick with their powerful legs (Hollmann 2001: 72). Ostriches offer a diverse range of resources to those who wish to exploit them, particularly...
their eggs, feathers and hides. The human relationship with ostriches is best examined in the context of ethnographic observations and archaeological findings.


**Human exploitation of ostriches: past and present**

The significance of ostriches to hunter-gatherer populations can be seen in archaeological deposits in the greater region dating back to approximately 33kya (Stewart et al. 2020: 6453). Two sites, Sehonghong and Melikane, in the Lesotho Highlands, north east of the study area, included ostrich eggshell beads from the late middle stone age (Stewart et al. 2020). Further south, at Colwinton Shelter, approximately 80km to the north east of Dordrecht (where PRT001 is located), a small collection of ostrich eggshell beads were found among scrapers and bone fish hooks (Opperman 1982: 51-52). At Grassridge rock shelter in the Stormberg mountains, ostrich eggshell beads have been found from 13.5-11.6kya and from 7.3-6.7kya (Collins et al. 2020). Another site, Welgeluk in the Winterberg mountain range in the south of the study region (see Fig. 1), contained the graves of six people including two children who were associated with ostrich eggshell beads. The graves
date to approximately 4.5-6kya (Hall and Binneman 1987: 143-145). Ostrich eggshell beads continued to be significant for San populations throughout the historical period, as evidenced in deposits in the Seacow River valley dating to the time of contact with Europeans (Plug and Sampson 1996: 27). Taken as a whole, this evidence suggests that hunter-gatherers used ostrich eggshells to create beads for at least 33 000 years in the region.

Ostrich eggshell beads can be linked to both identity and economy. I turn to two sites outside the study region to illustrate this interpretation. Large beads were found at the herder site Kasteelberg, whereas deposits at Witklip, a hunter-gatherer site, include small ostrich eggshell beads (Boonzaaier et al. 1996: 17-18). Archaeologists have drawn on these two examples to suggest that herders made and used larger OES beads than hunter-gatherers (e.g. Tapela 2001: 60; Smith 1997: 11). These interpretations are based on the work of Leon Jacobson (1987) who examined ostrich eggshell beads at sites in Namibia and suggested that size might be linked with economy. This claim is, however, contested. For example, although different sized beads are found in different layers at Siphiso Shelter in Swaziland, there is no indication of a change in economy (Barham 1992: 46). Ostrich eggshell beads have also been found at sites associated with Tswana-speaking farmers in Rustenburg, South Africa (Mangoro 2018: 31) and in Botswana, where unfinished beads suggest that these farmers were making their own beads rather than trading them with hunter-gatherers (Tapela 2001: 60).

OES beads could well have been linked to a system of gift-giving, as observed in the Kalahari among the Ju|hoansi San in the twentieth century. The Ju|hoansi often include products made from ostrich eggshell as part of their hxaro, or gift exchange network, for maintaining social ties with one another (Wiessner 1977, 2002; Mitchell 2003). Wadley (1987) suggests that aggregation sites, where hunter-gatherers came together and, among other things, exchanged gifts, after a dispersal period, typically contain evidence for OES bead manufacture (Wadley 1992: 53) This is just one of the strands of evidence that she draws on to argue that Jubilee Shelter is an aggregation site (Wadley 1992: 52; although see Mitchell 2003). Stewart et al. (2020) likewise argue that ostrich eggshell beads found in the Lesotho Highlands may relate to a similar system of gift-giving. They (Stewart et al. 2020: 6459) note that within the hxaro system, gifts are often exchanged over a great distance (up to 200km in some cases). Using strontium isotope analysis Stewart et al. (2020) demonstrate that ostrich eggshell beads found at the Lesotho...
sites originated from elsewhere in southern Africa and, thus, were transported by people to the Lesotho sites. Ostrich feathers were sought by different groups in southern Africa, including foragers, pastoralists and Europeans. The birds were farmed, following their domestication towards the end of the nineteenth century, by European colonists who exported feathers for the international fashion garment trade (Van Sittert 2005: 271&273). Among pastoralists, ostrich feathers were used by Korana to signal to one another while out hunting (Engelbrecht 1936: 88). Ostrich feathers were also used by |Xam San to guide running game towards hunters by placing them in the ground so as to force the animals along a specific route, ensuring the prey ran within range of the hunters’ arrows (Bleek and Lloyd 1911: 109; Hoff 2011: 13). This practice was also observed among the San of the Sneeuberg in the eighteenth century (Gordon 1988: 87). Today in the Kalahari the Ju|hoansi and the Hai||om trade ostrich feathers, and ostrich eggshell beads, with other groups, including farmers, herders and other hunter-gatherers (Barnard 1992: 55& 217). This trade was observed to have existed previously among the historical ||Xegwi San of Mpumalanga (Barnard 1992: 86) and among the |Xam in the Northern Cape who hunted ostriches for their feathers which they traded with colonists for tobacco (McGranaghan 2016: 168; Skinner 2017). These examples illustrate the value of ostriches to hunter-gatherers, pastoralists and European colonists. I later demonstrate that indigenous southern Africans valued not just the physical, but also the spiritual properties of ostriches and that it is to these we must turn to in order to understand this particular colonial-era rock art.

SAN ROCK ART

The spiritual nature of San rock art, and therefore its meaning to the artists, has been best understood since the last quarter of the twentieth century. Prior to this, depictions of animals were seen as either the artist creating images of what they found pleasing to view or alternatively as a form of simplistic hunting-magic in which a hunter painted or engraved an image of an animal they wished to kill (e.g. Willcox 1963). Using San ethnography from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Patricia Vinnicombe (1976) and David Lewis-Williams (1980, 1982) significantly altered our thinking in terms of approaching southern African rock art research with an informed analysis that demonstrated a relationship between San ritual specialists and certain animals believed to have an inherent supernatural power, or potency. Known as n|um among the Kalahari
Ju|’hoansi and called !gi by the southern |Xam, this power can be harnessed by San ritual specialists and used to their own ends (Lewis-Williams 1981: 5-6). The use of San ethnography affords rock art scholars an insight into the worldview of the painters which includes an understanding of animals that is far more complex than the assertions of earlier, uninformed, interpretations.

Specific ritual specialists communicate with, and influence the actions of animals. This is achieved on the hunting ground using powerful medicinal substances, and in the spirit world by entering into an altered state of consciousness and exerting game-control in a ritualized manner (McGranaghan and Challis 2016). They achieve this altered state of consciousness (ASC) in a rite variously referred to as the ‘trance dance’ (e.g. Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2012), ‘healing dance’ (e.g. Low 2015) or ‘great dance’ (e.g. Blundell 2004: 82). While experiencing an ASC, the ritual specialists believe themselves to be travelling to a spirit world, wherein they may heal members of their group, exert influence over animals they wish to hunt, perform acts of rainmaking and other crucial tasks (e.g. Lewis-Williams & Dowson 1989; Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004). Recent research highlights ritual specialists’ performance of war-magic as well (Challis 2012; 2014; Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2016; Sinclair-Thomson 2019). It is the potency of the animal, accessed while in an ASC, which allows the ritual specialists to perform the task at hand. And it is arguably the qualities associated with the animal that made its particular potency desirable in a given situation (McGranaghan & Challis 2016).

I suggest that the painters of the panels with which we are concerned here were drawing on ostrich potency to assist them with their raids and other manners of escape.

**Ostriches in rock art**

One of the best known southern African rock art depictions of ostriches was of a site copied by historian George William Stow sometime in the 1860s-1870s. Stow’s copy shows a group of ostriches and a San hunter disguised as an ostrich stalking the birds (Tobias et al. 1992; Dowson et al. 1994). However, rock art researchers demonstrated that Stow’s copy was in fact a forgery and was based off an image of ostriches in the missionary Robert Moffat’s *Missionary Labours and Scenes in South Africa* published in 1842 (Tobias et al. 1992; Dowson et al. 1994).

Turning to real rock art, Simon Hall (1986) considers a panel at Brakfontein in the Winterberg, Eastern Cape, which appears to show a raiding scene with people armed with
spear, but not shields, seemingly chasing cattle. Integrated in the scene are ostriches who appear to be part of the raid (Hall 1986: 46). This painting doesn’t include any colonial imagery and may indeed pre-date the colonial period. If this is the case, it might speak to a history of using ostrich potency for raiding that occurred before the arrival of colonists (cf. Campbell 1986). Hall (1986), however, does not comment on the ostriches; his focus is rather on cattle in the painting and the relationships between hunter-gatherers, herders and farmers.

Jeremy Hollmann’s (2001) examination of ostrich therianthropes demonstrates that what appear to be human figures at Long March shelter in the Klein Swartberg, Western Cape, have ostrich legs. One way in which he achieves this conclusion is by examining ostrich anatomy and comparing it to the anatomy of the human leg. He shows that what appear to be paintings of disjointed human knees are actually the ostrich’s highly placed ankle joints. An ostrich’s knees are located much higher up, closer to its body. (Hollmann 2001: 72). Taking into account that ostriches can run up to speeds of 70 km/h and that they also use their legs as weapons by delivering a lethal kick to a would-be predator, Hollmann (2001: 72) believes that these powerful aspects of the birds’ anatomy were emphasised at Long March Shelter because this power also speaks to ideas about the ostrich being a bird with great potency. I examine San and Khoekhoen beliefs concerning ostriches and ostrich potency later in this contribution. Before I do this, however, it is important to gain an understanding of the people who likely made these paintings.

**BUSHMEN OF THE EASTERN CAPE**

The word ‘Bushmen’, or ‘Bosjesmans’ in Dutch, was first used in 1682 in the Cape. The early colonists typically referred to hunter-gatherers as ‘Sonqua’ or ‘Soaqua’, which they picked up from local Khoekhoen (Barnard 1992: 9). Although it is likely that these names were endogenous to these groups (Raper 2010: 175) they were often used by outsiders as a pejorative to mean ‘vagabonds’, non-herders, or bandit criminals (Barnard 1992: 8). When the term ‘Bushmen’ became more common, from the second half of the eighteenth century (Barnard 1992: 9) it was used to refer to an economic category of people rather than a perceived racial group (Gordon 1986; Ross 1996; Challis 2012) and people typically referred to as ‘San’ today, were usually labelled with the pejorative ‘Chinese Hottentots’ by the colonists (Le Vaillant 1972 [1790]: 80; Gordon 1988). Considered to be an economic status, it was possible for anyone to become a ‘Bushman’ and to take
up a life of banditry. In 1790, the traveller François Le Vaillant (1972[1790]: 402-404) made a particular observation that robber bands comprised ‘mongrels of all kinds’ including hunter-gatherers, pastoralists, farmers or even colonists themselves. Later on, the occurrence of multi-, mixed-, or creolised ethnic ‘Bushmen’ is quite visible in the Maloti-Drakensberg (Wright 2007; Challis 2012; 2018).

**Bushmen as bandits**

Taking into account the fact that Bushmen or Bosjesmans were so-named by the colonists due to their banditry, I believe it useful to work with a theoretical approach that focuses on this very activity. Eric Hobsbawm developed his theory of banditry from 1959, most famously in the 1969 book *Bandits*. He suggested that there is a specific class of bandit, the ‘social bandit’ (e.g. 1960, 1969), which can be viewed as a hero protesting the unfair treatment of the peasant class by a ruling class within a pre-industrial economy, and acting upon a ‘sense of injustice’ (Hobsbawm 1969: 13). Typically, social bandits do not prey on other peasants but, rather, purposefully go after those deemed part of the oppressing class (Hobsbawm 1969: 14). This gives the actions of the social bandit a political, as opposed to merely criminal, edge.

Importantly, bandit groups are often heterogeneous. While they typically include young male peasants, they also include the dispossessed within a society, such as military deserters, escaped prisoners and the down-and-out who head toward the frontiers where they are safe from the law (Hobsbawm 1969: 27). These are just the sorts of people who make up the ‘Bushman’ groups described by Le Vaillant in 1790.

Hobsbawm has been critiqued for romanticising banditry (e.g. Blok 1972), and ignoring cases of bandits preying on the poor and peasantry (Crummey 1986: 135; Peires 1994), but that is not to say that his approach is not useful. Gordon (1986) avoids the issue of whether a bandit group is social or antisocial by instead considering how the ‘sense of injustice’ motivated people to rebel, within their means and on a small scale, against an oppressive and disproportionately powerful force. This is something which certainly applies to the colonial era in southern Africa (Marks and Atmore 1971; Marks 1972, Dominy 1995; Malherbe 2002).

Hobsbawm observes that bandits may rely upon magical or spiritual assistance when conducting their ‘illegal’ activities. They may, for example, have items blessed by representatives of the church or local religion. These charms serve the bandits’
purposes and are believed to ‘make robbers invisible and invulnerable, paralyses their
victims or sends them to sleep’ (Hobsbawm 1969: 43). These beliefs are also found
in southern Africa where spiritual assistance is frequently called on in times of war or
conflict. In African farmer societies, the army was doctored by a war-doctor to ensure that
they were divinely protected (Challis 2014). The use of certain plant roots to protect
fighters and ensure the accuracy of their blows or projectiles is also found among
pastoralists and hunter-gatherers in southern Africa (Challis 2014; Sinclair-Thomson
2019). Bandits comprising members from these different backgrounds, or from the
progeny of relations between individuals across economies and ethnicities, such as the
creolised AmaTola ‘Bushmen’, likely highlighted the religious beliefs that they had in
common in order to draw upon them (Challis 2014; Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017).
Hobsbawm notes that bandits may rely on magic in the same way that they rely on their
physical capabilities (Hobsbawm 1969: 44). Thus the bandit relies on magic for protection
when raiding.

Since this territory was first settled by colonists in the mid-eighteenth century, local Khoe-
San resisted by conducting raids on settler-owned farms. From 1774, the first commandos,
militia consisting of European farmers and their assistants (often of Khoe-San descent
themselves) in the Sneeuwberg area, near Graaf-Reinet, were sent to attack the bandits
and reclaim stolen cattle (Philip 1828: 270). If the Dutch had hoped for a quick end to this
matter, they were sorely mistaken. A year after the first commando, Sparrman noted that
there were groups of ‘Bushmen’ sheltering in the Sneeuwberg mountain range and along
the adjacent Camdebo region (Sparrman 1786: 198). The Bamboesberg, south of the
Stormberg (see Fig. 1), was also recorded to be a hideout for ‘Bushmen’ who raided
around the Sneeuwberg during the 1770s (Moodie 1838: 543).

Despite colonists’ efforts to clear the Sneeuwberg of ‘Bushmen’, these mountains were still
inhabited by bandits who committed stock theft in the 1780s and 1790s (Barrow 1801:
234; Moodie 1838: 565). One of these groups based in the Bamboesberg mountains was
said to consist of 500 people (Barrow 1801: 307). Barrow notes that by the time of his
travels many areas around the Tarka valley had been abandoned by colonists due to
‘Bushman’ predations (Barrow 1801: 235). This was also the first decade in which
‘Bushmen’ and Xhosa were noted by colonial authorities to unite in raids on farms
(Moodie 1838: 556). However, given that the Gonaqua and Gqunukhwebe were of mixed
Khoekhoen and Xhosa descent (Peires 1981), it is likely that this raiding relationship had
occurred previously, albeit unnoticed by colonists.
In 1809 while on an expedition, to the eastern boundary of the colony, Colonel Collins found evidence of ‘Bushman’ bandits in the Zuurberg, Stormberg and the Bamboesberg. On several occasions his party found kraals that had recently been abandoned and which had horse hoof-prints around them (Moodie 1838: 3-4). He later met a farmer in the Bamboesberg who claimed that his horse had recently been stolen by ‘Bushmen’ (Moodie 1838: 5).

The second and third decades of the nineteenth century saw the end of ‘Bushman’ banditry on a frequent scale in this region. In 1816 there were a series of raids around Cradock (Philip 1828: 35). These attacks continued into the 1820s, and also arose in the Bamboesberg, despite the efforts of commandos, aimed at crushing resistance, and the subsequent death of many ‘Bushmen’ (Philip 1828: 41; Thompson 1967: 38). Resistance by banditry also occurred in the Winterberg. Thomas Pringle, one of the 1820 settlers, was warned about this when his family established their farm at Glen Lynden near this mountain range (Pringle 1835: 33). Pringle and his neighbours in the Tarka valley were often raided by bandits who hid out in the Bamboesberg and the Winterberg (Pringle 1835: 58 & 100).

The cumulative effect of commandos against Khoe-San began to take its toll on these bandits from the mid-1820s. Thompson (1967: 42) learnt that in one year a commando in the Tarka area shot and killed 100 ‘Bushmen’. By 1826 there were no further raids on Thomas Pringle’s farm (Pringle 1835: 137). Philip (1828: 269) notes that by 1825 the only Bushmen living south of the Orange River were either working on farms or were remaining up in the mountains to avoid being shot.

Khoe-San in the colonial military

Many Khoe-San avoided the worst of the colonial project by joining, usually under coercion, regiments in the colonists’ military. The practice of arming Khoe-San to fight against their own people occurred throughout the settling of European colonists in southern Africa. Here I focus on those regiments which were formed during the time period with which we are concerned, the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. The nature of these regiments, their rules, living spaces, and the work they were required to do, meant that many deserted to the enemy, often their own people, against whom they had been pitted.
The Dutch armed Khoe-San militia with guns to assist them in the war of 1779-1781 against the Xhosa – which occurred as a dispute over territory along the eastern frontier (Storey 2008: 44). The employment of indigenous fighters led to the formation of the *Corps Bastaard Hottentotten* in 1781 (Malherbe 2002). In 1793 the Dutch were under threat from the French. Fearing war in the Cape, the Dutch east India Company (VOC) created another unit, the *Corps Pandoeren*, also consisting of Khoe-San soldiers (Malherbe 2002). In 1799 the British continued in this tradition, forming the Cape Corps, a new force of Khoe-San trained to be effective soldiers as they were now drilled in British military patterns. Indeed, the British-style military training of Khoe-San soldiers was cited as one of the reasons the Graaff-Reinet Boers rebelled in 1799 (Newton-King 1999: 228). This force took on both rebel Boers who resisted the British takeover in Graaff-Reinet, and the Gqunukhwebe Xhosa, over land disputes in the eastern Cape (Storey 2008: 54). The incorporation of indigenes into military units serving the colony continued, therefore, despite changes in European powers at the cape.

In 1803 when the British handed over the Cape to the Batavian Republic as part of the Treaty of Amiens, the Cape Corps came under the authority of the new government (Freund 1972: 631). However, there was deep distrust between the Batavians and the indigenes who made up the division – with each camp fearful that the one would turn upon the other. To deal with fears of insurgency, the Batavian government decreased the size of the Corps (Blom 1990: 24). This may have caused further problems for the colony in that there were now a significant number of Khoe-San in the Cape who were trained in the use of firearms and suddenly unemployed. Despite originally reducing the size of the ‘Hottentot Corps’, the Batavian government soon made an effort to regrow it in 1803 when it became clear that war with Britain was imminent (Freund 1972: 640). The corps, now called the *Battalion Hottentotsche Ligte Infanterie*, was not allowed to return home, being forced to stay at their posts, throughout this period, breeding further resentment among the soldiers (Blom 1990: 28). In 1806 the British re-took the Cape at the Battle of Blaauwberg. Of the 2061 men who fought for the Batavians, 108 were Khoe-San from the *Battalion Hottentotsche Ligte Infanterie* (Blom 1990: 33).

Following their victory over the Batavians, the British government continued the practice of using militias of indigenous southern Africans. The Cape Mounted Regiment was formed in 1825 and remained in existence until 1870. It consisted of Khoe-San and ‘Cape Coloured’ members. One of its main purposes was to prevent the raids by ‘Bushmen’ on
the farms of the colony surrounding the Drakensberg (Wright 1971; Vinnicombe 1976; Dominy 1995: 41). However, many members of the regiment ended up joining and swelling the ranks of the very groups they were employed to combat.

There were desertions throughout the period when indigenous southern Africans were employed in the military. The members of the different corps frequently complained of unfair treatment by their superior officers which included corporal punishment. Adding to this, the many barracks in which the corps resided were notoriously unhygienic and dysentery was rife, providing yet another reason to desert (Blom 1990: 30-31). For example, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, Henry Lichtenstein became the surgeon for the corps. There was such an epidemic of dysentery that at one point ten men were dying every day (Lichtenstein 1928: vol 2: 183). Deserters did not leave empty handed. They took with them their guns, horses and knowledge of both with which to join the colonists’ enemies, usually either the Xhosa or ‘Bushman’ bandits (Storey 2008: 45; Blom 1990: 23; Marks 1972: 75; Dominy 1995: 42; Challis 2012, 2016). Desertion was also common among the European troops. For example, in the 1870s British soldiers who deserted were said to be
instructing the Zulu in the use of firearms (Guy 1971: 560). Desertions of both ‘Cape Coloured’ and British soldiers were clear cases of armed, well trained, individuals leaving the colony to make a living by raiding the colonists.

**‘BUSHMAN’ BANDITS AND ROCK PAINTINGS**

The paintings considered in this paper likely related to stock raiding by the very sorts of people thus far discussed – heterogeneous groups of bandits. Individuals who undertook these activities were known to paint. For example, a Thembu man named Silayi told Walter Stanford (1910) of how he had been a member of a multi-ethnic group of ‘Bushman’ bandits under the leadership of a San man Nqabayo in the mid nineteenth century (cf. Blundell 2004). This group lived in the Umqgazo mountains but raided colonists’ farms in the surrounding area, including all the way to Dordrecht (where PRT001 is located, Stanford 1910: 435). Silayi described to Stanford how Nqabayo made brushes for the paintings his group created (Stanford 1910: 439). Unfortunately, Silayi did not discuss the subject matter nor the meaning of the paintings.

Another group of ‘Bushman’ bandits in the late nineteenth century were led by a man named Soai. Soai’s group, who were based at Sehonghong shelter in Lesotho, had a close relationship with the BaPhuthi who were also notorious raiders (Mitchell 2010; King 2018). A woman named Elisabetha ‘Malékétanyané Môhanôë described how she once visited Soai at his hideout in Sehonghong shelter along the Senqu River with a party of BaPhuthi including the chief Moorosi. She claimed that at the time of their arrival the men of Soai’s group were busy painting the walls of the shelter (Mitchell 2010: 156). Unfortunately, once again we are left without a description or in-depth information concerning the paintings, although there are depictions of cattle, horses, warriors and baboons, the animal linked with the raiding activities of another nineteenth-century group, the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’ (Challis 2012, 2014).

It is almost certain that the AmaTola bandits of the Maloti-Drakensberg also created rock art. Sam Challis (2012, 2016) draws on historical sources to situate this creolized raiding group in the mid-nineteenth century in an area where a specific tradition of paintings is found. These paintings include images of human figures dancing the trance dance while seemingly transforming into baboons. The figures ride horses and wear items like bandoliers associated with Nguni farmers and some also wear African headdresses.
and European-style hats (Challis 2012: 266). Challis (2012, 2014) argues that the reason for the appearance of baboon therianthropes in the art is that the AmaTola were drawing on baboon potency to assist them with their raiding activities. The baboon had acquired this reputation due to the fact that they are known, by African farmers, to steal crops and juvenile livestock. They had also been observed by |Xam San to chew so-|oa. This powerful root was believed to alert the baboon to danger which is why baboons who chew it are notoriously difficult to kill, and it was believed by the Xhosa (who called it uMabophe) to guide one’s projectile weapons while protecting the user from arrows, spears and bullets (Challis 2014, 2016, 2018; Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017).

It can be seen that it is the baboons’ behaviour which informed indigenous epistemologies concerning its raider characteristics – baboons could raid and escape unharmed. I argue likewise that ostrich behaviour, specifically their jumping and running capabilities, substantiated the indigenous understanding of them as master escape artists.

SAN AND KHOEKHOEN BELIEFS CONCERNING OSTRICHES

Taking into account the likely heterogeneous makeup of these groups of ‘Bushmen’, it is important to consider what ostriches meant within San and Khoekhoen belief structures. Through examining each of these, we are likely to find which beliefs in particular were being highlighted (see Challis 2014) by the painters of the rock art. Although I examine multiple beliefs pertaining to ostriches among indigenous southern Africans, I suggest that, in considering the historical events and processes that occurred when these paintings were likely made, it is with beliefs associated with raiding and escape that the painters were most concerned. Indigenous southern Africans who were disconnected from their traditional lifeways due to the impact of colonialism, banded together and drew on any powers they could, including ostrich potency, to assist them with their resistance against settler incursions.

Ostriches continue to play a significant role in San beliefs in the Kalahari today. Given the vast similarities between Kalahari San and colonial-era San of South Africa (see Lewis-Williams and Biesele 1978; Barnard 1992), some of these beliefs may be applicable to the groups who created the paintings with which we are concerned. For example, among the Kalahari San the ostrich is believed to have been the custodian of the first fire (Eastwood2008: 135). A myth tells of how someone named Piisi|koagu stole the fire from
the ostrich while he and the ostrich were picking fruit together. The ostrich reached up for high fruit and Piisi|koagu grabbed the fire hidden beneath the ostrich’s wing before escaping with it (Tanaka 1996: 26).

One of the paintings considered here, BEG001, includes a panel of human figures in colonial dress standing next to an ostrich (see Fig. 4). Specifically, the human figures are dressed in colonial military uniforms. The bird’s legs and the soldiers’ legs are painted in white. They all have black bodies and the ostrich’s white neck mimics the white bayonets attached to the soldiers’ guns on their backs. The Haiiom San are known to compare ostriches to people in suits due to the ostrich’s colouring (Low 2009: 72). The Ju-]|’hoansi San describe the ostrich as being overly proud of itself due to its strutting gait with its chest puffed out (Low 2009: 72). When applying these beliefs to BEG001, it might be seen that the artist was commenting on the proudness of the soldiers in their smart uniforms. However, such an interpretation does align with what we know about San rock art the spiritual beliefs that produced it.

Fig. 4: BEG1. Note the human figures in military uniforms. The ostrich is just to the left of these figures. Its neck and head rise up between the two human figures on the left. Its body is badly faded but its white legs can be seen to the left of the legs of the human figure on the furthest left. Photo by the author.

A stronger interpretation comes from examining beliefs about ostrich legs. As mentioned previously, the structure of the legs allows the ostrich to run fast and escape from predators
(Hollman 2001: 72) In the Kalahari today, ostriches are also said by the Damara to be experts at escaping the nets of hunter by using their powerful legs to jump over the traps (Low 2009: 72). The |Xam also noted that ostriches were extremely difficult to catch and McGranaghan (2015: 169) adds that even following the adoption of firearms and horses these birds were still an elusive prey.

The ostrich is praised by both Khoekhoen and San groups in the Kalahari today as being a strong bird that contains much potency. Ostrich fat is rubbed on those suffering from fatigue and it is also believed that tying ostrich leg tendons to one’s own legs reduces pain and fatigue and induces strength in the limbs (Low 2009: 77). Many groups in the Kalahari today also grind ostrich eggshell into a powder to give to sick children (Low 2009: 76). This practice also occurred among the historical Korana (Engelbrecht 1936: 186) who, although commonly found just to the north and west of the study area, were known to range over enormous distances and to have had many interactions, including mixing, with ‘Bushman’ groups (McGranaghan 2015; Skinner 2017).

Among the |Xam San, in a myth entitled “The Lion jealous of the voice of the ostrich” the |Xam describe how the lions were roused to jealousy when the women praised the ostrich’s voice while mocking theirs. The lions note that it is because of the ostrich’s lungs that it has such a fine voice and so they resolve to kill it and to eat its lungs (Bleek and Lloyd 1911: 52). The |Xam informants claim that they too had been taught that if they were to eat an ostrich’s lungs raw, like the lions did, they would also have the voice of the ostrich (Bleek and Lloyd 1911: 53). This correlates with the belief and practice connecting ostrich legs with speed and stamina: the body part is used so that one may be imbued with the associated qualities.

Ostriches were also associated by the |Xam with resurrection. A myth tells of how the still-bloodied feather from a recently killed ostrich was blown into a waterhole and grew into another ostrich (Bleek and Lloyd 1911: 55). In this myth and in “The Lion jealous of the voice of the Ostrich”, the ostrich’s feet are praised as powerful weapons with which to kick its enemies (Bleek and Lloyd 1911: 53 and 56). In the following discussion I suggest how these beliefs concerning ostriches as powerful animals may apply to the rock art created by ‘Bushmen’ bandits.

Although the paintings under discussion do not include the mixed material culture from farmer and pastoralist and hunter-gatherer origins which Challis (e.g. 2014) draws on to
demonstrate the Nguni admixture of the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’, it is useful to briefly consider how African farmers viewed ostriches. I suggest this as it was known that in the study region Xhosa farmers and Khoe-San occasionally worked together to raid European farms. Although Xhosa material culture is not necessarily present in these paintings, there were Xhosa members present in these groups, making it likely that their beliefs about ostriches also influenced how the potency of this animal was used by raiders.

Among Xhosa today, the *iMpundulu* is a mythical bird that is said to resemble an ostrich. Traditional herbalists sell ostrich body parts as *iMpundulu* and it is believed that witches can use these parts to kill people (Simelane and Kerley 1998: 124). If these beliefs were present during the colonial period, it is possible that Xhosa believed that mixed groups of bandits were calling on the power of the *iMpundulu*, personified as the ostrich, to assist them in their deadly attacks on colonists’ settlements.

**DISCUSSION**

The paintings I consider were likely painted by groups of heterogeneous ‘Bushmen’ who may have included members of San, Khoekhoen and, to a lesser extent, African farmer ancestry, or indeed a mixture of any of these. People from different ethnic backgrounds often banded together during the colonial-era to fight a common enemy, the European colonists and to resist the colonial project (Hobsbawm 1969; Lightfoot & Martinez 1995; Blundell 2004; Challis 2018). That there are fine-line paintings at all, a specific technique of painting traditionally used by the hunter-gatherers (e.g. Parkington and Manhire 2003) suggests that these groups either had a Khoe-San contingent, or alternatively were drawing on Khoe-San practice.

This makes it important to consider the paintings within the overall context of Khoe-San rock art which, as discussed previously, has convincingly been demonstrated to be related to religious belief and practice (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1982; Dowson 1998; Hollmann 2014). For example, depictions of animals are likely concerned with the relationship between ritual specialists and that particular animal or species of animal. When looking at images of ostriches it is important to acknowledge this relationship. I suggest that, of the polysemic (see Lewis-Williams 1998) meanings of ostrich, it is those that may relate to raiding and desertion with which these images are concerned. An important concept relating to these activities is that of escape. As we have seen, Khoekhoen and San groups, past and present,
revere the ostrich as an escape artist and powerful runner. It is the ostrich’s power to escape which I believe these painters and ritual specialists were drawing on.

Rock art has been understood to be related to the achievement of an altered state of consciousness caused by dancing as seen in many ‘San’ groups. However, there is also evidence for Khoe groups performing a ‘trance’ dance as seen among the Damara (Low 2012: 83) and the Korana (Jolly 2008; Ouzman 2005: 111).

There are a group of finger-painted figures at RIO001 which are depicted in a long line, all joined at the hands. These are much like images seen in paintings attributed to the Korana by Sven Ouzman which he considers “dance-like” (2005: 107). I suggest that this is a dance scene and that the inclusion of therianthropes (see Fig. 5b) demonstrates that these ritual specialists danced to invoke the potency of the ostrich.

For San- or Khoe-speakers escaping the colony, whether from commandos or from the military, perhaps the ostrich appealed in such times of desperation. The belief that ostriches helped treat fatigue, imbued one with strength and were associated with the concept of escape fits well with these practices. Deserters may have drawn on the potency of ostriches to assist them in escaping their military posts. The punishment that came with recapture made it necessary for deserters to completely remove themselves from danger, and thus to draw on anything within their means, including the spirit world, to escape colonial authorities just as the ostrich is able to escape from predators and hunters. If the ostrich possessed powers that could be drawn upon then the co-occurrence of these birds with uniformed soldiers, as seen at BEG001, begins to make sense. It is likely that these are the soldiers from a Khoe-San unit who have recently deserted and have drawn on ostrich potency to assist with their escape.
The same may be said for groups of ‘Bushmen’ bandits. Following a raid, it was important for them to remove themselves from the area as quickly as possible to avoid being captured, and likely killed, by punitive commandos. It seems likely that the painters of RIO001, TVL1 and PRT001, which all appear to show imagery concerned with stock theft, were raiders who painted ostriches in order to draw on their potency to help them get away from any would-be pursuers.

Fig. 6: PRT001. Two human figures with firearms (A and B) stand among a group of livestock and ostriches (C, D and E). Photograph by Neil Lee. Image courtesy of SARADA.
CONCLUSION

The Cape Ostrich (*Struthio camelus australis*) has been exploited by southern African hunter-gatherers for its feathers and eggs (and likely meat) since the end of the Pleistocene. More recent San and Khoekhoen pastoralist ethnography demonstrates a plethora of spiritual beliefs associated with ostriches. Taking into account the spiritual nature of fine-line rock art, it is likely that when we see images of rock art, it is these spiritual attributes that the painters were concerned with, rather than the mere depiction of animals they saw around them. It is pertinent that these animals are sometimes depicted in scenes that can be reliably dated to the colonial era, due to the appearance of material culture – hats, European clothing, and guns and horses – that were introduced by European colonists. These paintings appear to have been created to assist with the raids that were undertaken by the painters, heterogeneous groups of ‘Bushmen’ bandits (including San, Khoekhoen, runaway slaves and military deserters), as acts of resistance against colonial expansion. Considering that many beliefs concerning ostriches, held by these different indigenous groups, revere these powerful birds as swift runners and as escape artists, I suggest the bandits who painted these images were drawing on ostrich potency to assist them in escaping from punitive commandos following their raids and in deserting their posts in the colonial military.
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ABSTRACT
Remarkable similarities across colonial encounters where Africans believed projectiles could be influenced by ritual practices (medicines, behaviours, observances) demand enquiry into their conception and trajectory. Although suggestion of pan-subcontinental phenomena may elicit suspicion of a generalisation, here evidence is examined from the late-independent and colonial periods that shows that a general belief, held cognate between groups, may indeed have existed. The focus is on precolonial southern African beliefs in the manipulation of projectiles and how these may have affected ritual responses to firearms during colonisation. At least a millennium of interactions between hunters, herders and farmers appear to have resulted in commonly held beliefs, albeit with differential emphases. From first contact, and into sustained colonisation, it became necessary for Africans to highlight and/or adapt indigenous beliefs as mechanisms by which to cope with firearms and settler aggressive expansion.
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Introduction

By their very nature, colonial accounts begin on the moment of first contact and not before, thereby rendering precolonial beliefs largely opaque to the present day. It is possible, however, to catch glimpses of indigenous African beliefs in the accounts of colonial observers who witnessed practices which must have had pre-contact precedents, and those who spoke to indigenes, finding long-held traditions, mythologies and religious philosophies. In looking for the effect that guns would have had on the...
thinking of African populations, there are certain parallels between beliefs developed following interactions with firearms and beliefs that have long-held precedence before the gun’s arrival. Such indigenous beliefs, it appears, pertain to other ballistics – arrows, spears; the efficacy of their flight or trajectory, as well as protective measures taken against them.

Importantly, there are also parallels between cultures – which suggests a cognate epistemology between hunters, herders and farmers (or San-, Kho- and Bantu-speakers). It is perhaps not surprising that such cross-cultural convictions obtain in cultures that have shared a landscape for over a thousand years. This millennium (in some cases two, if not three) resulted in farmers adopting features of the San-Khoe languages, which famously contain clicks (Traill 2002). For example, click sounds appear in one sixth of Xhosa words (Peires 1981, 24). The clicks of the San language are also believed to have influenced the Southern Sotho language (Gump 1980, 107). African farmers of the subcontinent typically revere (even when marginalising) the San1 ‘First Peoples’ to whom they go for healing and rainmaking, and a high degree of cultural borrowing is in places clearly evident (Hammond-Tooke 1997, 1998, 1999; Jolly 1996, 2000, 2015). The magical control of projectiles is but one iteration of such exchange, which becomes particularly visible in times of conflict and strain, and thus is found in colonial texts. Crucially, however, it is also seen reflected in the archaeological record: in rock art.

This work brings together pre-existing material and new data, drawing on contemporary observations – ethnohistories; historical interpretive work, both ours and others; archaeological and anthropological evidence. New fieldwork – 19 individuals interviewed around Matatiele in the Eastern Cape – yielded evidence that these beliefs persist today (Sinclair-Thomson 2016).

**A millenarian phenomenon**

Widely held beliefs which surface occasionally in popular ‘millenarian’ movements – usually uprisings against colonial conditions – exhibit a pattern of principles that bullets could be rendered impotent. Indeed, similarly held beliefs in ‘bulletproofing’ (e.g. Wenzel 2010) can be found occurring globally from southern to eastern Africa (Warhurst 1978; Wipper 1982; Lan 1985, 158, 215; Suttner 2003, 315; Greenstein 2010; Mchunu 2015), West Africa (Hultin 2017) and beyond to Afghanistan (Edwards 1996), India (Carstairs 1955), Melanesia (Worsley 1968; Wenzel 2010, 10), New Zealand (Winks 1953, 229) and the Native American Ghost dance movement (Carroll, Nieves Zede, and Stoffle 2004, 136 & 139).

In southern Africa, the general public were most recently reminded of the persistence of this phenomenon with the tragedy of the miners’ strike at Marikana, North West Province in August 2012, in which police gunfire killed 34 mineworkers and wounded 78 more (Alexander 2013, 605; Bond and Mottiar 2013; Magaziner and Jacobs 2013). Miners striking against working conditions felt they could confront armed police in the belief that they would be unharmed in the event the latter opened fire. This belief, founded on the ancient precedents to be examined later, maintains that certain traditional medicines protect the user from projectile weapons. It is important to note that the failure of the medicine to act was attributed not to the medicine itself but to its incorrect application. As can be observed as far away as Matatiele in the Eastern Cape:
At Marikana the healer did his work, but the guys didn’t follow his rules. That’s why they got shot (Informant 3: 30/09/2016).

**War magic and medicine**

Conflict in southern Africa is common both in the institutionalised warfare of the past and in the acts of resistance in the colonial, apartheid and post-apartheid eras (e.g. Guy 2005; Flint 2008; Mchunu 2015). Just as common is the participants’ understanding that the outcome of conflict can be altered with the assistance of traditional medicine and ritual practice. Where Westerners might draw a (questionable) line between the sacred and the profane in warfare, the indigenes in question make less distinction – though the violence is no less real. Further, combat is not necessarily confined to male ‘warriors’, but involves both male and (most likely) female ‘wardoctors’, whose medicines affect these situations as they unfold (see Challis, 2008).

The necessity to employ traditional medicines (*muthi*) and ritual observances in combat has its foundation in a suite of beliefs that cross-cut ‘ethnic’ boundaries (and indeed could be said to bind them in some instances, see, e.g. Challis 2014), which can be traced back through historical incidents in the twentieth and nineteenth centuries and, will become clear, very probably beyond. This suite includes medicines that confer invulnerability on the user while confounding their adversary – the former rendered unnoticeable or invisible (as well as ‘bullet-proof’); the latter bound up, tied to the spot, blind, sleepy or weak. Moreover, the projectiles of the protagonist will fly straight and true while those of the adversary will miss the mark and/or be turned to water. So important was this ‘doctoring’ on the battlefield and in other conflicts that Mchunu (2015) posits:

> Wars were fought not only with weapons but also with the use of muthi. ‘Strengthening of warriors’ and ‘doctoring of wars’ were regarded as more important than any weaponry.

Mchunu finds that such doctoring practices are well-attested in ‘precolonial’ antiquity, yet these sources (Bryant 1966; Flint 2008) are largely restricted to the colonial-era Zulu. Here, the intention is to attempt to pull together some (by no means all) evidence for both the late-independent and colonial periods, and from geographically disparate sources.

The most commonly known ‘meta-category’ of war medicines is surely *inthelezi* in the Nguni language group and *mohlabelo* in southern Sesotho. For instance, the *inthelezi* of the Bhaca includes a collection of burnt herbs, the *intsizi*, which was rubbed onto their hands and spears to make them formidable in battle. A divination ritual was also performed to assess how the army would fare in the battle. This ritual involved looking into the foam that was caused by stirring medicine in a pot. The ritual specialist may also have called on the services of the jackal buzzard, the *indlazonyani*, with the aid of a medicine called *ubulawu*, to blind the Bhaca’s foes (Hammond-Tooke 1962, 222–223). As will become evident, this is commensurate with the general principle of confounding one’s adversary – and rendering their actions impotent.
Lesuku, matitibana and lesira, so that you will be invisible to the enemy. They mix together to make you invisible and the opponent or enemy will feel tired and dizzy. Can’t fight, no strength or energy to fight (Informant 16: 02/10/2016)

Mohlabelo – the war medicines of the Sotho – would be rubbed onto spears during times of conflict (Ashton 1943, 20). One example of mohlabelo is a plant called lira-ha-li-bone (the enemies don’t see). Other substances in this category include parts of lion, buffalo or other dangerous animals, as well as human flesh (Ashton 1943, 21). Interestingly, one might also use the hair from a hornless ox, worn in the warrior’s hair, and the skin of a frog over the chest. These are said to contain the power to avoid capture as is found in the animals from which they come: while the frog is slippery and agile, the ox with no horns cannot easily be lassoed (Casalis 1861, 272).

Most common, however, is a category of root medicines central to the ‘doctoring’ of warriors prior to battle. Though by no means identical, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the efficacy of such medicinal roots or ‘sticks’ were cognate across Bantu-, Khoe-, and San-speaking groups. These medicines could be used in a stick or fist fight, a clandestine cattle raid or in a large-scale battle.

Stick-fighting medicine

A part of the medicinal suite of inthelezi is still used to this day to assist in conflict. In a less antagonistic scenario than warfare or raiding, the boys of the villages in Matatiele (the Bhaca, Hlubi, Xhosa and most famously the Sotho) make use of medicine when they meet to fight with sticks.

In this stick-fighting sometimes there will be a group coming from another village and the young men from this village will get beaten by two people and the people from this village will say ‘how is it that you were beaten by two people when there were more than twenty of you’. It’s because of that muthi (Informant 8: 01/10/2016)

Akin to the war medicine, this is also applied to one’s weapons, the sticks or the body (Informants 1 and 2: 30/09/2016). It also seems to have a similar effect to the war medicine: ‘It makes your opponent dizzy and tired’ (Informant 2: 30/09/2016). It must be noted that this does not mean the medicine used in stick-fighting is the same as that used in warfare, where death is likely. Informant 12 (01/10/2016) says ‘It’s a different thing for playing. There’s certain inthelezi when you play and there’s certain when there’s war’.

Cattle-raiding medicine

While the inthelezi used in stick-fighting is part of a game, the medicine used by cattle thieves from outside the area is viewed as dangerous as it allows their enemies to destroy people’s livelihoods. Informants believe that this medicine makes the cattle owners and their dogs fall into a deep sleep, which allows the thieves to commit their crimes undetected (Informants 2, 3 and 6: 30/09/2016; Informants 7, 10 and 12: 01/10/2016). There are, however, other effects that are very similar to that of the war medicine already discussed. ‘Sometimes you try to shoot them but the bullet doesn’t hit them’ (Informant 1: 30/09/2016). The theme of protection occurs frequently with this medicine. The same can be said for
invisibility: ‘They will come and steal your animals but you will never see them’ (Informant 8: 01/10/2016). Informant 7 (01/10/2016) explains how this may occur: ‘Sometimes there will be a fog, like a cloud, that covers them and so you won’t see them’. That this suite of beliefs persists to this day is further reflected in a recent news article covering a murder case in Springs, Gauteng, in which protagonists went to a Sangoma (traditional healer) to procure medicines that would make them ‘invisible’ to the police (The Times Live, 28 June, 2017).

Writing in the 1930s, Soga (1930, 174) presents the common trait of the cattle thief in using such root medicines to incapacitate the cattle owner in their homestead. The medicine he mentions, uMabophe, which we examine presently, is a root worn on a string around the neck, bitten, chewed and spat out in a spray to both protect the wearer and ‘tie up’ the victim. The same medicine, process and procedure, was used by warriors on the battlefield under the guidance of the ‘wardoctors’.

**Wardoctors**

The wardoctor (itola, pl. amatola) was a powerful figure among farming groups. He performed rituals and also supplied the warriors with war medicine that was used on the shield, spears and body of the warrior. In the colonial period, following the acquisition of firearms by indigenes, guns and bullets were also doctored. In the Anglo-Zulu war of 1879, guns would be held over the smoke of burning muthi, so that it would rise up the barrels, to ensure the bullets flew accurately at the mark (Flint 2008, 74; Webb and Wright 1982, 296). Further evidence from this conflict was found in the form of doctored, and poisoned, bullets (poisoned with unspecified muthi; Flint 2008, 74; Brown 1883, 10), recalling the notorious poisoned arrows of the San (e.g. Wiessner 1983; Bradfield, Wadley, and Lombard 2015).

Wardoctors were usually those whose peacetime profession was that of ‘rainmaker’ (e.g. Peires 1981, 136) and, as we shall see, the association with the control of water is key to understanding the importance of these ritual specialists and the medicines they employ. uMabobhe ‘the thing that binds’, enabled the wardoctor to ‘tie up’ (ukukafula) the enemy’s regiments – making it impossible for them to pass over a certain place (Peires 1981, 137). It was intimately connected with the power to control water in the form of rivers, rain, mists and snow.

The wardoctor could hold up the flow of a river to allow the army to cross; they could call down a mist – to conceal the army from view until they were upon their adversary and bring down rain to disguise their tracks (Soga 1931, 174–175; Peires 1981, 137). In at least one instance, a Bhaca paramount, Madzikane, in his role as wardoctor was said to have brought down a snowstorm which killed the Zulu king’s army in the mountains of Mount Frere (Makaula 1966).

Before proceeding, however, it should be noted that two of the most well-known wardoctors of the Xhosa-speaking peoples, Mlanjeni and Nxele, were also millenarian prophets. They administered medicinal roots in the mabophe category and drew heavily on the associated traditional beliefs, yet each had at different times received Christian teachings. With results that were to echo down the ages with the Great Xhosa Cattle Killings (under the prophet Nongqawuse, e.g. Peires 1989), they both predicted that the colonists could be defeated in a final apocalypse if warriors followed their instructions.
These included the use of war medicines that would preserve them in battle because settlers’ bullets would be turned to water.

**Mlanjeni: the wardoctor of 1850**

Umlanjeni… was a wizard… He was said to give ‘charm sticks’ to warriors which would make them immune to musket balls (Thomas Baines c. 1851, quoted in Kennedy 1964, 207)

Scholars of South Africa’s nineteenth-century history will be familiar with the millenarian predictions of the Xhosa prophet Mlanjeni. Sir Walter Stanford, reminiscing in the vignette offered earlier, outlines the principle that an entire nation of people could be convinced to invoke traditional beliefs in order to counter colonial expansion.

Mlanjeni, ‘The Riverman’, was a prophet who became wardoctor to the Xhosa (Mabona 2004, 301–303). He kept himself pure by spending much of his time in a river pool (Ngubane 1977, 118; Mabona 2004, 305) and thus close to the ‘River People’, an ambiguous category of spirit-being whom some believe are ancestors (Hammond-Tooke 1975, 29). Rather than killing witches according to custom, Mlanjeni purged people of their witchcraft or *ubuthi* (evil substance) with his dancing, giving those thus cleansed a twig of *mabophe* (the root of *Plumbago auriculata* or associated plant in this category) to protect them from evil (Peires 1989, 3). It was believed that ‘When he danced, the drops of sweat falling from his body would cause the rain to fall’ (*ibid*). His close association with the water, the river people and the rain, went further when he commanded ‘the witches’ to leave somebody: ‘Phuma Bolowane’ – Come out!/Get out! Bolowane! (Mabona 2004, 306; Peires 1989, 3).

Mongameli Mabona (2004) believes that the word Bolowane is of special import. In Xhosa mythology, it is one of the names given to the cattle of the first creation, the foundation, or royal, herd – *ezase bukhosisi*. They were cattle of the ancestor spirit (Mabona 2004, 186). Indeed, today there is still a breed of Xhosa cattle called the Bolowana which is believed to be an ‘animal of the river’ (Department of Arts and Culture, n.d.) confirming this connection with the ancestors and with water. As ‘the witches’ were called out using the word Bolowane, Mabona (2004) believes Mlanjeni was evoking the powers of creation, and that ‘the witches’ were called upon to enter into a new and purified creation.

When the War of Mlanjeni (Eighth Frontier War 1850–1853) broke out, Mlanjeni gave instructions for the Xhosa warriors to be made invulnerable. They had medicines rubbed into incisions in their skin, they were given roots of plumbago, and of pelargonium either to wear around their necks, carry in their bags or carry in their bundle of spears. Stanford (quoted in Macquarrie 1962, 5) recounted the instance of Xhosa warriors’ deployment of ‘sticks’ of this medicine with the shout of ‘Bolowane’ to turn the colonists’ bullets into water.

Thus, it appears that the invocation of the powers of creation – ‘Bolowane’ – could call upon the bullets to enter into a new, and purified, creation as water. However, the roots or ‘sticks’ of plumbago and pelargonium were not merely ‘pointed’ at the enemy. As Peires (1989, 10–11) observes, it was custom to ‘…rub their bodies with the juice of this root and, on attacking the enemy, they were to chew on the stick…’. This chewing was followed by spitting out the pieces of root (e.g. Challis 2014). Bite marks in the
charm sticks were observed on bodies on the battlefield in the 1870s where the dead warriors also bore black paint on their foreheads:

The warriors had all been ‘doctored’ before the fight; they had the usual war charms round the neck, and the paint on the forehead. I took off one of these charms, consisting of two short pieces of wood fastened round the neck with a string: the wearer had evidently felt his courage flagging, for he had made two deep bites into the wood (Norbury 1880, 140)

Warriors were supposed to be ritually cleansed in a river, sprayed with roots mixed with water and have a black mark painted on their forehead before they were ready to take the field (Soga 1931, 67). Moreover, there was a similar practice in the Zimbabwean resistance struggle of the 1970s where wardoctors ‘gave us some snuff which they call bute which we rub on our foreheads. This means that the enemy is quite unable to see us wherever we may go’ (Lan 1985, 158). Understanding these procedures as ordered by the wardoctors will help illuminate the common perceptions held by the Nguni, the Khoe and the Bushmen.

**Nxele – the wardoctor of 1819**

The phenomenon of turning bullets to water had precedent in the form of Nxele, who served as wardoctor to Ndlambe’s Xhosa in the early nineteenth century (Peires 1981, 63–64). Nxele came from a Christianised background, having grown up on a Boer farm in the Cape Colony. As a young man he displayed bizarre and paranoid behaviour with regard to food and testaments on the impurity of humankind. This was recognised as the characteristics of a diviner-to-be. Nxele saw it as a calling by Christ. He would go on to blend Christianity and African spirituality into his own distinct prophecies (Peires 1979, 56). Nxele led Ndlambe’s forces into battle against the British at Grahamstown on 21 April 1819. He had doctored the warriors with mabophe and told them that the settlers’ bullets would turn to water when fired at them (Hodgson 1986, 5). After Nxele’s death in 1820, Mngqatsi took over his position as wardoctor. Crucially, Mngqatsi was also a rainmaker (Peires 1981, 71). The role of rainmaker and wardoctor was often shared by the same person among Nguni and Sotho-Tswana groups (Peires 1981, 137; Ashton 1943, 2). The significance is that at this date, colonists’ guns were bound to malfunction during rainy weather, so rain thus afforded a good opportunity for the Xhosa to engage in combat (Peires 1981, 143). The wardoctor may also have created a mist during battle to camouflage their troops (Peires 1981, 137). Adding to this, informants claim that wardoctors may call on forces of nature not just for disguise and protection (Informant 2 30/09/2016), but also as offensive weapons: ‘They can make rain and then strike someone with the lightning’ (Informant 5 30/09/2016); ‘Sometimes he will make the hail, and lightning, and thunder to strike the opponent’ (Informant 10 01/10/2016). Many informants (Informants 2 and 5 20/09/2016; Informant 8 01/10/2016; Informants 16 and 19 02/10/2016) claimed that rainmakers and wardoctors could be one and the same. Certainly, this was the case with Mlanjeni, Mngqatsi and Nxele. Interestingly, Nxele had two San wives whom he married around 1817 (Peires 1981, 70). It is possible that his wives may have had some influence on him as a wardoctor.
San beliefs in supernatural control of projectiles

San Bushman beliefs in the ways projectiles might be influenced come down to us from several sources, not least of which is the well-known Lloyd-Bleek archive recorded in the latter half of the nineteenth century (e.g. Skotnes 2007). Crucially, the medicine most closely associated with projectiles, so|-oa, was also used, like mabophe to confound one’s adversaries (LL.II.36.3242; De Prada-Samper 2007, 4–8; Challis 2014). The parallels between the uses to which these medicines are put have led to the hypothesis that they were in fact cognate, forming part of a category of root medicines widely acknowledged across southern Africa to assist the user in times of conflict (Challis 2008; Challis 2012, 2014; Sinclair-Thomson 2016).

|Xam Bushman informants, including ||kabbo, Diä!kwain and |haŋ≠kass‘o, detailed the uses of the plant category known as so|-oa as used in hunting (fooling the springbok to make them ‘approach nicely’ LL.II.36.3276–3278; Bleek 1936, 151), when they fought one another in fist fights (Bleek 1936, 148–149) and as used in combat by their aggressive neighbours, the Khoe-speaking Korana. Both San and Korana would rub so|-oa into incisions in the wrists or hands in order to strike the victim (animal or person) most effectively and powerfully, whether using their fists or their arrows – at the same time sapping their energy, causing confusion and dizziness. Indeed ||kabbo, the Bushman healer, recounted a passage relating how so|-oa confounds the springbok:

He quickly burnt a stick; he pointed at the springbok with it; the springbok were coming. He said ‘my so|-oa here I point at the springbok, that are coming, that they may run gently; for my stick which bitter is’. He puts out the so|-oa’s fire. He makes a line with the burnt wood between his eyebrows (Bleek 1936, 144-148)

Crucially, the pointing of the so|-oa stick mirrors the pointing of the mabophe stick, and the drawing of the black line between the eyebrows recalls the line of black paint on the foreheads of the Xhosa warriors, as well as the freedom fighters in Zimbabwe.

San associations between medicines, projectiles and water can be seen highlighted in a myth recounted by the Bushman Qing to Joseph Orpen in 1873 (Orpen1874). The trickster deity Cagn (|kaggen) encounters an eagle with whom a fight ensues. The eagle throws assegais (spears) at |kaggen who, in the form of an eland antelope, uses ‘charms’ (medicines) which cause the spears to fly wide of the mark:

...it threw an assegai, which passed it on the right side, and then another, which missed it, to the left, and a third, which passed between its [the eland’s] legs...(Joseph Orpen 1874:9)

That the medicine causes the spears to miss their target bears striking resemblance to the widespread belief we find remembered today. In Matatiele, our informants volunteered information to this end:

The medicines were used very much. There were those traditional doctors who make some marks and put the medicine in the body. Cutting. Sometimes they will make the medicine and sprinkle it so that your opponents’ spears miss you. (Informant 2 30/09/2016)

It protects the soldiers. When you throw the spear it doesn’t go straight. It goes around. They take makakene [inthelezi] and they put it into water. Then they put all the shields together and spill makakene onto the shields and the rest they wash their bodies with (Informant 13 01/10/2016)
Taking the elements of the myth further, not only had the ‘charms’ caused water to run down the rock upon which |kaggen was exposed, but as soon as the eagle lands on |kaggen, it is stunned by falling hailstones – enabling |kaggen to kill his adversary (Orpen 1874, 8–9).

Here, we are reminded of another passage in the Bleek-Lloyd archive where Diä!kwain explains that !khwa – the embodiment of the rain – when invoked by a girl who wishes to be left alone, causes rain, lightning and ‘rain’s bolts’ to fall among those who have spoken to her (Hollmann 2004, 134–135; LL.V.22.5806–5807). Both Hewitt (1986, 284) and Hollmann (2004, 135) note that the rain’s bolts are black pebbles thrown by the rain (!khwa) – and that the |Xam Bushmen explicitly link rain and such bullet-like projectiles in this way.

Moreover, the |Xam San believed that baboons had special powers relating to projectiles – which derived from its use of the same root with which they themselves influenced the outcome of hunting and conflict – so|-oa. Diä!kwain related the conviction that, if a hunter shoots an arrow at a baboon, it may well take the hunter’s arrow and shoot it back at him unless certain observances are followed (LL.V.20.5920–5922; Hollmann 2004, 22; McGranaghan 2012, 194). It is not killed by the arrow that hits it because it is believed baboons do not get sick. This, in turn, is because the baboon doctors itself with a piece of the so|-oa root that it keeps in its cheek pouch, which forewarns it of attack or approaching danger (Bleek 1931, 167–170; Hollmann 2004, 12).

The San’s understanding of war magic was encompassed within their main communal ritual, the trance dance, in which all manner of spiritual tasks were undertaken. A contemporary ethnohistorical account describes the San performance of a trance dance (mokoma or ‘dance of blood’) said to be held through the night prior to battle, in which they would entreat the deity |kaggen for assistance (Arbousset and Daumas 1846, 253; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1994, 211).

Additionally, the Khoe-speaking Korana were known to have performed at least one pre-conflict ritual, in which the ash of a burnt crow’s heart was loaded into a musket and fired at the enemy to induce fear (Schapera 1930, 355).

**African farmer perceptions of the power of San bushman medicines**

Ethnohistoric and ethnographic archives repeatedly mention the close association (for Bantu-speaking farmers) between rainmaking rituals and the San or ‘Bushmen’ (BaTwa, Baroa). African farmers appear to have cultivated a long-standing belief that the San, as First Peoples and thus connected with the land, held the ultimate power by which to control the elements (indeed they had specialised rain makers or !khwa-ka !gi:ten). They routinely entreated the San for rain-making services (e.g. Dowson 1995; Jolly 2000; Whitelaw 2009). This led to many Nguni purposefully employing San rainmakers or, alternatively, those who had a close connection to the San. Before the nineteenth century, these positions within a larger Xhosa society were often occupied by Khoi-speakers, yet they were usurped from this role by Mfengu people following their arrival in the Eastern Cape while seeking refuge from the repercussions of the Ndwandwe-Zulu conflict (Wright 1995). The reason for the perceived superior power of Mfengu rainmakers over that of the Khoe was due to the Mfengu having descended from the
mountains where the San lived, and which lay in the direction from which the rain came (Peires 1981, 65–67).

Further, the present research programme has discovered that in current memory, some African farmers believe one used to be able to visit the San in order to obtain other medicines (intimately associated with the rain) such as ‘war medicine’ or inthelezi. It should be noted that, as with much of South Africa, San communities became all but culturally extinct by the end of the nineteenth century, although some farmer groups still claim San descent (Prins 2009; Ndlou 2009; Francis 2009). Informants corroborated that farmers would have commissioned San to assist them with war magic. Indeed, 62.5% of all informants agreed that this trade in war medicine occurred between San and farmer groups. Informant 2 (30/09/2016) suggests that the San would teach the farmers, ‘Some of the people would go to the San to be taught or to get this muthi, especially the doctors’.

It would seem that not just anyone could procure this medicine from the San. ‘You need to be brave enough to go to those guys’ (Informant 2 30/09/2016). Informant 3 (01/10/2016) explains further:

One of them [the San] will go around the house and at the other side there will come a lion. They try to test if you are really brave. If you are you won’t run away. After a few minutes it will disappear and you will see [the San] people again. After this if they see that you are brave they will give you the muthi. They will give you the strong medicines, the one you can use in fighting. For protection.

Informant 7 (01/10/2016) spent some time living with members of a San community from Botswana at a mine. He had a similar story to that of Informant 3,

Sometimes after they’ve given you the muthi, sometimes you see the lion, lying somewhere, then if you run away the muthi will never work. That lion is a San man changed. It’s their trap to see if you’re brave enough.

It would seem then that in dealing with strong medicine, a specific test and etiquette must be adhered to, in order to render the medicine effective – as we observed in the case of the miners at Marikana in 2012.

War medicines appear, then, to encompass a suite of substances (some like Plumbago auriculata more common than others) which require ritualised practice to ensure their efficacy. One such iteration in which such ritualised practice occurred in the past was in a ‘Bushman’ group that incorporated members of both San and farmer descent in a new and creolised ‘nation’ of outlaws. Known as the AmaTola, they perceived themselves to be wardoctors (amatola) and, emerging as they did in the nineteenth century, used war medicine to protect themselves from the ballistics (bullets, spears and arrows) of those they raided (e.g. Challis 2012, 2014, 2016, 2017).

The syncretic belief system they espoused stems from ideas held by San-, Bantu- and Khoe-speakers which had developed in tandem over the preceding millennia of interaction between these somewhat permeable cultures (Challis 2014). Importantly, these beliefs highlight the San understanding that there is an intimate connection between the wild baboon and the root medicines it uses. Baboons were said, for example, to use the root so-/oa, a cognate with mabophe, to sense approaching danger, including projectiles (Bleek 1931, 167–70; Hollmann 2004, 12 & 22). This belief is mirrored in
Bantu-speaking farmer communities whose diviners (especially Mfengu and Xhosa) often received power from a baboon spirit-guide or isilo. Further, diviners with such a guide can be observed wearing baboon skin caps and employing baboon parts (bones, skin, hair) to ward off evil (Challis 2014, 261; Broster 1982). To this day, diviners and initiates carry sticks of plumbago for this reason (e.g. Broster 1982).

Rock art evidence found in the region inhabited by the nineteenth-century AmaTola attests to the hybrid nature of ritual practice invoking the powers of these medicines. The trance dance is seen adapted by these creolised ‘Bushmen’ to frontier conditions where, instead of harnessing the potency of eland or rhebok antelope, healers took on the potency of the baboon and its associated protective qualities. Figure 1 shows a rock painting which depicts a dance where people are shown changing into baboons – usually exhibiting the head and tail. It is thought that such rituals were performed in advance of cattle- and horse-raiding expeditions to ensure the protagonists escaped unharmed, and perhaps following these missions, to evade retaliation and capture. Figure 2 shows a raider on horseback, galloping alongside his isilo spirit guide, the baboon.

Figure 1. A rock art panel painted in black and white paint showing human figures with projectile weapons (bows and arrows, spears) and many in classic San trance dance postures (hand-to-nose, arms-back, bending forward). Several figures exhibit baboon features (head and characteristically kinked tail). Dotted lines indicate parts of the panel that have been brought closer together to fit the page. Figure traced and redrawn by Challis.
The findings presented here exhibit clear links between current beliefs (apparent in the media and in project interviews) that traditional medicines can turn ‘bullets to water’, and those observed in the late-independent and colonial periods. The latter were held by San-, Khoe- and Bantu-speaking groups, as well as hybrid ‘Bushman’ groups that comprised all of these and others. The circumstances in which these beliefs were employed, and the practices that have been shown to be parallel from one cultural group to the next, clearly demonstrate that the epistemology was, and is, cognate across parts of the subcontinent, although allowing for variance in its iterations. The power to affect the efficacy of projectile weapons was attributed to medicines (muthi) provided by wardoctors. These influential figures were believed to ensure success in conflict and played a central role in any skirmish or large-scale battle. Thus, they commanded respect and fear, and could rise to prominence in the political sphere – as we have seen in the cases of millenarian prophets Mlanjeni and Nxle. Equally, the individual could also make use of these muthi in order to gain ascendancy in a stick fight, or to make themselves ‘invisible’ and invulnerable while raiding livestock. Cognate beliefs can be seen to have existed in antiquity (though first observed, of course, post-contact), and when firearms were encountered by indigenes, new medicines were not necessarily invented ex nihilo; rather, pre-existing beliefs were adapted and applied to muskets, rifles, and their ammunition. Once firearms were adopted, the same conceptual suite of muthi appears to have been used to ensure or prevent the bullet’s deadly course.

Figure 2. A horse and rider gallop alongside a baboon (note the distinctive kink in the baboon’s tail). Painted in the region occupied by the AmaTola ‘Bushmen’, the rider carries what are likely muskets and a powder horn.

Conclusion

The findings presented here exhibit clear links between current beliefs (apparent in the media and in project interviews) that traditional medicines can turn ‘bullets to water’, and those observed in the late-independent and colonial periods. The latter were held by San-, Khoe- and Bantu-speaking groups, as well as hybrid ‘Bushman’ groups that comprised all of these and others. The circumstances in which these beliefs were employed, and the practices that have been shown to be parallel from one cultural group to the next, clearly demonstrate that the epistemology was, and is, cognate across parts of the subcontinent, although allowing for variance in its iterations. The power to affect the efficacy of projectile weapons was attributed to medicines (muthi) provided by wardoctors. These influential figures were believed to ensure success in conflict and played a central role in any skirmish or large-scale battle. Thus, they commanded respect and fear, and could rise to prominence in the political sphere – as we have seen in the cases of millenarian prophets Mlanjeni and Nxle. Equally, the individual could also make use of these muthi in order to gain ascendancy in a stick fight, or to make themselves ‘invisible’ and invulnerable while raiding livestock. Cognate beliefs can be seen to have existed in antiquity (though first observed, of course, post-contact), and when firearms were encountered by indigenes, new medicines were not necessarily invented ex nihilo; rather, pre-existing beliefs were adapted and applied to muskets, rifles, and their ammunition. Once firearms were adopted, the same conceptual suite of muthi appears to have been used to ensure or prevent the bullet’s deadly course.
Notes

1. For discussion of what constitutes precolonial vs colonial era (owing to ethnohistories’
beginning with the latter), see Hamilton and Leibhammer (2016), 13–48.

2. The term ‘San’ is used as the ethnonym most widely accepted in academic studies. It is
acknowledged that it is preferable to use the individual group names rather than a
collective term, and where possible this has been done. However, much of the literature
fails to provide that level of detail about group identity and in these cases, the collective
term ‘San’ has been used.

3. These interviews were conducted with the assistance of a translator, Ntate Puseletso
Lecheko who speaks both SeSotho and isiXhosa. Ethics clearance has been granted for
these interviews by the University of the Witwatersrand. Interviewees were predominantly
men aged 64 and above. Warfare is a predominantly male activity; thus, most interviewees
were men excepting the case of traditional healers where we interviewed two women
(Sinclair Thomson 2016, 25). Owing to the sensitive nature of some of the material dis-
cussed, we preserve the interviewees’ anonymity. We do not venture into the moral
propriety of the use of such medicines for any purpose (see e.g. Ashforth 2005).

4. For the Maphumulo/Bambatha uprising, see Guy (2005); for the Bulhoek massacre, see
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ABSTRACT
Recent studies in southern African rock art demonstrate that we cannot take for granted that human figures holding guns in painted images are in fact depictions of Europeans. The acquisition of firearms by various ‘Bushmen’ groups in the Eastern Cape Province as well as their history of painting, makes it more than likely that in many cases the artists were really depicting themselves, not colonists. Yet one cannot claim that these artists viewed firearms in the same manner as the Europeans who initially introduced them. This is based on the well-attested practice that in colonial contexts the colonised often repurposed the material culture of the colonisers, thereby giving it new meaning in the process. As firearms became adopted by ‘Bushmen’ and entangled within their world view it is likely they were awarded spiritual attributes, making them worthy of inclusion in their sacred art.
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Introduction

“... black lightning is that which kills us...it resembles a gun...”

(Bleek and Lloyd 2001, 48)

The indigenous Khoe-San of South Africa’s Eastern Cape Province mounted furious resistance to the colonial project (Marks 1972; Westbury and Sampson 1993; Newton-King 1999). This area, including the Bamboesberg and Stormberg mountains near today’s towns of Aliwal North, Molteno, Dordrecht and Steynsberg, contains rock art depicting human figures with the material culture of the colonial era (see figure 1 study area). This paper considers how one of these items, the gun1, became entangled (Der and Fernandini 2016, 11) within Khoe-San ontologies so as to warrant being included as subject matter in their sacred art (figures 2 and 3).

This area was settled by European farmers from the mid-eighteenth century onwards and marked the eastern boundary of the, initially Dutch then British,
colony and the settlement of farmers was the ‘hard’ frontier between the European settlement and the African farmers on the other side of the Fish River (Giliomee 1990).

Figure 1. Map of South Africa. Study area is in the grey oval. (Map: author).

Figure 2. Human figure with a gun over shoulder on horse. Site RSA PRT001. Dordrecht, north Eastern Cape. (Photograph: author).
We are fortunate in that there is an abundance of ethno-historical sources produced by European travellers pertaining to the area during the time of settlement (Sparrman 1786; Barrow 1801, 1804; Campbell 1822; Philip 1828; Pringle 1835; Moodie 1838; Raper and Boucher 1988). These are extremely valuable in understanding the socio-economic climate of the time (late eighteenth until mid-nineteenth centuries), where the paintings occur. It will be seen that this may best be understood as a time of resistance to violent colonial expansion and genocidal repercussions suffered by Khoe-San seeking to disable the colonial project, with travellers recording the use of firearms by both colonial forces and the Khoe-San resistance. Precisely who these indigenous combatants were is explored later in this paper.

Most ethno-historic sources, however, are not as useful when it comes to understanding the ontologies and epistemologies of the rock artists. Fortunately, some of these beliefs are captured by verbatim texts including interviews with Khoe-San individuals from the mid-nineteenth century as well as twentieth- and twenty-first-century ethnographies from the Kalahari Desert (Lewis-Williams 1982, 431).

In this paper, following current research, I make a distinction between San and ‘Bushman’ (cf. Challis 2012, 2014, 2017; King 2018, 124). These terms have often been accepted by scholars to refer to the same people; autochthonous hunter-gatherers. Yet when the term ‘Bushman’ was first used by colonists it was to refer to an economic, not racial, category of people who lived beyond

Figure 3. RSA CYP005. Figure on horse with a firearm over shoulder, riding behind a sheep Aliwal North. (Photograph: author).
the confines of the colony and subsisted by hunting, gathering and, most importantly, raiding for livestock (Gordon 1986; Ross 1996; Challis 2012). Those whom we may think of as ‘ethnic’ San today were typically, in the late eighteenth century, referred to as ‘Chinese Hottentots’ (Le Vaillant 1972, 80; Raper and Boucher 1988) as opposed to ‘Bushman’ or ‘Bushman Hottentot’.

The pejorative ‘Hottentot’, now replaced by the ethnonym ‘Khoekhoe’ (Khoikhoi in earlier orthographies) has been used by some later scholars to refer to pastoralists (e.g. Strother 1999, 2) who initially migrated into South Africa approximately 1000 years ago (Sadr 2015) and who spoke a related language to the San. Moreover, Khoekhoe and San are often grouped together under the linguistic term ‘Khoisan’, though the term has fallen out of use somewhat for its propensity to homogenise cultures (cf. Etherington 2001, 45; Hamilton and Liebhammer 2016). I follow Hollman (2007, 128) and Morris (2008, 105) in using the term ‘Khoe-San’ which acknowledges that they can be quite different, but that some of their material culture and some associated beliefs can be indistinguishable. Distinct again, though not essentialised, are the iron-using agropastoralists who arrived in South Africa approximately 1700 years ago (Maggs 1994, 173).

If we take the term ‘Bushman’ in its original usage, as an economic category, it can be seen that Khoe-San- and agropastoralists could become ‘Bushmen’, as could European deserters from the colony and runaway slaves (Le Vaillant 1972, 402–404; Challis 2012, 2017). Indeed, in a letter dated 15 September 1801, a member of the Court of Justice, P.J. Truter, states his fears of the Namaqua, a Khoekhoen group, becoming ‘Bosjesmans’ (‘Bushmen’) and taking up banditry if they were deprived of their livestock by European traders (Theal 1899, 199; cf. Marks 1972). This means that ‘Bushman’ groups could be made up of either San, Khoekhoe or agropastoralists or indeed any combination of these, and others.

When trying to understand indigenous ontologies it is important to remember that these groups held many beliefs in common, especially those relating to firearms and conflict – a result of at least a millennium of precolonial interaction (for more on the fusion of San- Khoe- and African farmer beliefs see Wilmsen and Denbow 1990; Solway and Lee 1990; Hollmann 2007; Morris 2008; Challis 2014).

I retain the words ‘San’ and ‘Khoekhoe’ in certain cases. For example, I use ‘San’ when referring to specific San-speaking groups, such as the |xam, several of whom explained their beliefs to the German linguist Wilhelm Bleek and his sister-in-law Lucy Lloyd in the latter half of the nineteenth century (Lewis-Williams 1980). The terms Khoee-speaker and Khoekhoe are used for groups who were known to self-identify as such, for example, the Goringhaiqua and the Korana (Marks 1972; Lesniewski 2010).

That there are rock paintings of firearms at all suggests that these ‘Bushman’ groups consist of at least some San members or were, alternatively, drawing on the cultural practices of the San as painters of fine-line rock art (See figures 2, 3 and 4) (Blundell 2004; Challis 2012, 2016, 2017; Mallen 2009; Henry 2010).
Colonial-era rock art – arguably made by multi-ethnic groups appears to have some reverence for its San antecedents in some subject matter, as well as in the choice of rock-shelters. This is the subject of a forthcoming article (Sinclair-Thomson and Challis forthcoming) and the San connection makes it necessary to first examine the significance and meaning of San rock art.

The work of Patricia Vinnicombe (1976) and Lewis-Williams (1982 inter alia) ushered in a new era for studying San rock art as these scholars drew on San ethnography to inform their research. Lewis-Williams, in particular, sought to explain the rock art by using an archive of material recorded from San sources in the 1870s; a testimony by a San man in the 1870s Maloti-Drakensberg; a testimony from a San descendant in the 1980s; ethnography from the Kalahari San in the mid-twentieth century; and the field of neuropsychology (Lewis-Williams 1982; Lewis-Williams 1986; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1988). Using these strands of evidence, Lewis-Williams convincingly demonstrated that the art is concerned with San religious beliefs, and that this religion is at its core shamanistic – that is to say one in which ritual specialists travel to a spirit world to perform tasks for the betterment and well-being of their community.

Hybridity and firearms in rock art outside of South Africa

In taking a postcolonial approach to rock art depicting items of European material culture it is important to note that the divide between coloniser and colonised is not always so clear-cut. Homi Bhabha (1994) observes that the
colonised may certainly adopt the material culture of the coloniser, but that it can receive new meaning. This leads to a process of hybridity which can be seen in both material culture and group identity (cf. Blundell 2004). This means that one ought not to approach the epistemology and ontology of firearms among the colonised as one would do among the colonisers. A gun is never just a gun. The following two studies are cognisant of this process.

Indigenous Australians, in Arnhem Land, became gun owners as assistant hunters to Europeans within the buffalo hunting industry in the nineteenth century (Wesley 2013, 237). These muskets were less effective than spears in indigenous hands and instead became interpreted as markers of prestige and status (Wesley 2013, 244). Following a ban on Indigenes owning firearms in the early twentieth century, many weapons were confiscated by authorities. Indigenous Australian men who retained ownership of firearms (muskets or rifles) used their guns as symbols of authority (Wesley 2013, 245). Wesley acknowledges that depictions of firearms in Australian rock art are likely related to these associations; however, he also claims that there is a deeper understanding to this art from an indigenous point of view that is not accessible to non-Aborigines as the indigenes regard this information as secret (Wesley 2013, 246).

An indigenous ontology of firearms can also be seen in the case of the Blackfoot rock art of Writing-On-Stone, Canada. Michael Klassen suggests that depictions of guns likely relate to warfare and raiding ‘coups’- which refer to the items procured by warriors during war or raids (Klassen 1998, 46). Klassen believes that the gun, much like the shield before it, came to symbolise a powerful object that is imbued with potent medicine and links the indigenous understanding of guns to that of bow-spears due to them both being powerful and destructive weapons (Klassen 1998, 49). The acquisition of an enemy’s gun during a raid was no mean feat, and by doing so a warrior gained prestige as well as spiritual power. Klassen (1998, 50) therefore cautions against interpreting images of ‘raids’ and caches of arms as mere records of events or tallies of spoils. There is, rather, a deeply spiritual nature to these paintings and engravings.

The works of both Wesley and Klassen demonstrate that it is possible to gain an understanding of indigenous ontologies and epistemologies of firearms when we consider concepts of ownership and prestige, as opposed to any concern with recording the event in western terms. For the Blackfoot, at least, firearms took on attributes of the precolonial material culture (bow-spears) while also being defined within the changing colonial world in a way that is certainly not European.

In southern Africa, one can find similar, and possibly more, instances where one can draw parallels between precolonial and colonial-era beliefs and practices relating to the use of weapons which aid in deciphering their conception in the indigenous idiom. A brief consideration of southern African rock art
studies demonstrates that while colonial-era paintings have been the focus of much scholarship, few attempts have been made to truly grapple with depictions, and meaning, of firearms.

**Firearms in southern African rock art**

Simplistic studies have it that, during the colonial period, San came into contact with Europeans, and so they painted images of these new arrivals, with their firearms, on the landscape (e.g. Smits 1973, 36; Willcox 1978, 60). One could argue that these studies took it that the new material culture was merely absorbed into the art (for critique see Challis 2017). Such interpretations are not informed, however, by the abundant ethnographic and ethnohistoric source material that is available.

There have, however, been notable exceptions to this oversimplification of recent South African rock art. Colin Campbell (1986) draws on San ethnography and situates paintings including ‘contact’ elements within the artists’ world view. He interprets the paintings as images of Europeans re-imagined by San rock artists as the malevolent spirits-of-the-dead (Campbell 1986, 265). Conversely, Loubser and Laurens (1994, 111) are among the first to suggest guns and horses do not necessarily denote Europeans. They examine a panel in the south-eastern Free State which they argue contains depictions of San ritual specialists with firearms and lions in a combative situation in the spirit world. Sven Ouzman (2005) and Sam Challis (2012, 2014) suggest that paintings of people with horses, hats and guns are likely to be depictions of the artists themselves: drawing on historical evidence for Korana and ‘Bushman’ raiders using these items of ‘European’ material culture and situating the paintings within a wider tradition of war-magic that was practised by these groups (for war medicines see Challis 2014, 252–255; Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2017).

**Magical practice and precolonial projectile weapons**

In order to understand how precolonial spiritual beliefs and firearms became entangled during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is important to touch upon the ways in which precolonial projectile weapons were conceived within Khoe-San belief systems. In doing so I follow the approach of Klassen (1998) and Wesley (2013) discussed previously. Khoe-San beliefs held that it was possible to influence the trajectory of projectile weapons by magical means involving ritual observances and the supernatural powers of medicinal substances (e.g. Hollmann 2004, 277; Challis 2014, 255). So-/oa is a medicine from an unspecified plant root that the |Xam San men used for either hunting or warfare (Bleek 1936, 151; Challis 2014, 255–256). It is smeared on the skin, chewed and spat out or alternatively rubbed into cuts made on the user’s face.
It makes targets move slowly and also makes one’s own arrows fly straight (Hollman 2004, 277; Bleek 1936, 144–148). A similar practice is still found in the Kalahari today where hunters use ash from medicinal plants, which is rubbed onto the body prior to hunting (Katz 1982, 51). This medicine is seen to have a supernatural power which guarantees the success of the Bowman (Bleek 1936, 144–148).

The capacity to protect oneself with medicines against projectiles can also be found in Khoe-San thought. The San man Qing, guiding the magistrate Joseph Orpen through the Maloti-Drakensberg in 1873, told the myth of |kaggen, the trickster deity, asking an eagle for assistance with getting honey (Orpen 1874). When |kaggen tricks the eagle and steals the honey, the eagle throws many spears at him. None of these actually hit |kaggen. This may be put down to his use of medicine (‘charms’, Orpen 1874, 8) which he used earlier in the same story to contact his wife. In order to defeat the eagle, |kaggen calls down a thunderstorm. The hail from the storm stuns the eagle so that he can kill it (Orpen 1874, 9; Lewis-Williams 2010, 8). Lewis-Williams (2010, 12) believes it is important to note that when |kaggen is deflecting the spears, he has transformed into a bull eland antelope. He interprets this to mean that |kaggen used eland potency to protect himself from these dangerous projectiles (Lewis-Williams 2010, 12).

In another myth (this time concerning the |Xam San) a wildebeest attempts to prevent a striped mouse from having a successful hunt by blunting the mouse’s arrowheads and replacing the bowstring with his own (the wildebeest’s) intestines, thereby exerting control over the bow (Lewis-Williams 2013, 245–246). These myths are important as they demonstrate the Khoe-San belief in the ability, via magical means, to render one’s enemies’ projectile weapons useless.

Magical practice and firearms

During the colonial period, this practice of manipulating projectile weapons by magical means was applied to firearms. That indigenous beliefs concerning the use of firearms come to us largely from Khoe-speakers, or those of mixed descent, should be no surprise, because it was these people who had the most prolonged contact with colonists at the cape – from whence the gun first came (Elphick 1977).

The Korana were said to have a war-medicine which they put into their pockets and into their ammunition pouches with their bullets. This medicine was believed to make their ammunition hit their enemies while the enemies’ bullets would not hit them (Schapera 1930, 355–356). Another form of Khoekhoe war-magic involves burning a crow’s heart, loading the ashes into a gun and then firing the gun. It is believed that their enemies would flee like crows (Hahn 1881, 90). It is interesting to note that in this example the gun takes on the role of being a ritual tool, thereby further reinforcing the argument that
indigenous southern Africans did not share the same understanding of firearms as Europeans. Rather, they had a spiritual, as well as a practical, relationship with these weapons that was foreign to the Europeans who introduced them.

The Korana also used the so/-oa root medicine discussed previously (although termed/u-soa) and used it for aggressive pursuits including shooting and fist-fighting; it was burnt and its ashes rubbed into cuts made on the hands and wrists of the user (Bleek 1936, 144–148; Challis 2014, 253–254). Unfortunately, it is not stated whether the shooting referred to is with bows or guns. Despite this, it is clear that because the Korana stored their ammunition with medicines there was some continuity between beliefs in traditional, and adopted, projectile weapons.

The storm connection – lightning control

Pre-existing beliefs relating to weapons were not all that informed and shaped the understanding and experience of firearms for these ‘Bushmen’ of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They also looked to the destructive power of nature within Khoe-San ontologies to situate firearms within their world view. Notably, a link emerges between storms, lightning and firearms.

One of Bleek and Lloyd’s informants, |hankass’o, told of a myth in which Kagara, a shaman, took his sister, whose name is not recorded, from her husband, !haunu, also a shaman. Kagara and !haunu then got into a fight in which they each controlled lightning, using it to strike one another. !haunu’s nose bleeds after sneezing during the fight, suggesting a link to a trance state (nose bleeds occur in the dance performed by San ritual specialists entering the spirit world, e.g. Hewitt 2008, 154, 216). Kagara eventually kills !haunu by using black lightning, which is said to be very powerful and ‘resembles a gun’ (Bleek and Lloyd 1911, 49). The statement that these two figures were able to control lightning suggests that they were both powerful rainmakers, as rain control and lightning control were both attributes of the rainmaker (Lewis-Williams 1980, 473). That this black lightning is likened to a firearm is a clear link that, within the San framework, lightning and guns shared similar characteristics.

Another of the informants, ||kabbo, was a rainmaker. He explained that the ‘He-rain’ was dangerous and was identified by its thunder and lightning. It is associated with death. When confronted with the violent male ‘He-rain’ ||kabbo would perform a rainmaking ceremony to make the female ‘She-rain’, which is gentle and nourishing for the landscape and the people in it (Bleek 1933, 306–312; Deacon 1997, 24).

Rain, among the southern San, is associated with the deity !khwa. He sends ‘He-rain’ when he is angry. !khwa is said to be able to shoot thunder and lightning and rain bolts. These bolts are small black pebbles. Dialkwain explained that these bolts are able to pierce human flesh and possess the person magically and that the rain does this when it wants to kill (Bleek 1933,
298–299; Hollmann 2004, 135). It could be argued that these bear a strong resemblance to musket balls and may further entrench the link between ‘He-rain’ and firearms. When *lkwa* instigates a thunderstorm he is said to *di/a:* which means ‘make a fight’ (Bleek 1932, 339–342; Hollmann 2004, 126).

These beliefs in violence within the spiritual realm may well have been applied to the material world too, culminating in the violence ushered in by the appearance of firearms. In looking at ||kabbo’s statement we see in the San ideology that it was possible for the rainmaker to change the rain from something dangerous to something safe. It was also possible for San people to protect themselves from lightning using a magical substance. This was done by painting red stripes on the body with haematite (Hollmann 2004, 131; Hewitt 2008, 209). I would argue then that the existing San beliefs relating to projectile weapons inspired the ways in which firearms were incorporated into belief systems and the rituals that became part of their use. Bullets could be made more accurate through magical means and those on the other side of the firearm could find some protection in ways inspired by ‘He-rain’ beliefs (Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2017).

**Towards an interpretation of firearms in rock art**

Firearms gave raiders a marked advantage over those without guns. Raiding would have increased in danger when coming up against foes with guns, and so ‘Bushman’ groups likely relied on spiritual assistance to increase their odds of success in raids. I argue that it is possible to gain an even better understanding of the spiritual nature of this ‘Bushman’ rock art by turning to a significant attribute of rock art regarding rain-control.

Earlier I considered the links between rain-control, especially relating to lightning and thunderstorms, and the control of projectile weapons. Rain-control is considered to be one of the principal themes of San rock art (Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004). This can typically be identified in paintings by the appearance of bovid-like rain animals or rain snakes (Dowson 1998; Challis, Hollmann, and McGranaghan 2013). Taking the links between projectile weapons and rain-control, in indigenous southern African epistemology, into account (Sinclair-Thomson and Challis 2017), I suggest that the painting of firearms in rock art was another form of control, one which sought, by incorporating new material culture into existing epistemologies, to either ensure, or defend against the effects of gunfire.

Many of the rock art sites which contain depictions of firearms also have finger dots (Figure 4) and small finger-painted crosses. This has been hypothesised as the art of Khoekhoe pastoralists (Smith and Ouzman 2004, although for an opposing view see Hollmann 2014). While authorship is not certain, today the residents of Matatiele in the Eastern Cape describe the cross-shaped markings as offering the painter protection against lightning (Challis pers.
Indeed, first generation San descendent living in the Eastern Cape named Manqindi Dyantyi (Jolly 1986, 6) said – expressly of the finger-painted lines – that they were for protection, particularly from lightning. Further, while travelling in the cape during the late nineteenth century, Theophilus Hahn noted (1881, 140) that Khoe-speakers painted crosses on themselves and on rocks as protection against lightning, recalling the San practice, discussed earlier, of painting haematite stripes on the body to serve the same purpose.

While acknowledging the obvious issues surrounding differences in time and distance from these recent interpreters and the sites, it is worth noting that the finger-painted markings at the contact rock art sites under study may also be linked to protection against lightning. Having demonstrated the connection between lightning and firearms, I suggest that these finger-paintings were added to painted panels that already included images of people with firearms, or alternatively the gun iconography was painted at sites where the finger dots and crosses occur, in order to draw on – and fix in place – beliefs pertaining to the control of both lightning and guns.

**Conclusion**

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, multi- or mixed-ethnic groups of ‘Bushmen’ painted images of people with firearms in the rock shelters of the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. These were not, however, the mere recordings of the arrival of European newcomers to the landscape. In fact, it is likely that the artists were depicting themselves, because many ‘Bushmen’ acquired their own firearms. While they adopted guns, they did not necessarily adopt European understandings of guns. Instead, they worked this new material culture into their own ontology. This included a history of being able to manipulate the trajectory of projectile weapons through magical practices and ritual observances. The link between lightning, rain-control and firearms in Khoe-San epistemologies and the reverence for earlier practices of magic would suggest that this art drew on the nature of existing epistemologies – particularly those of protection and control. This protection was especially sought-after on the socio-cultural landscape as the gun reshaped experiences of conflict.

**Note**

1. I use the terms ‘gun’, ‘firearm’ and ‘musket’ interchangeably throughout this paper for referring specifically to flintlock muskets.
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DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
The focus of this thesis is the rock art made by bandit groups in the eastern borderlands of what was the Cape Colony in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Here I discuss my findings from the previous chapters. In doing so I draw on historical sources – the writings of early European travellers and settlers – that show that these groups consisted of members from different backgrounds. Their commonalities included a sense of injustice as they were subjugated by the colonial project. In looking at the rock art itself, it is clear that these groups had a Khoe-San inflection (cf. Skinner 2017). This is demonstrated by the techniques used in painting as well as the inclusion of imagery related to Khoe-San beliefs.

To explain these beliefs I draw on the ethnographies and testaments of Khoe-San from the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries collected by linguists, travellers and anthropologists (cf. Vinnicombe 1976; Lewis-Williams 1980, 1982, 1986, 2010, 2013; Jolly 1986, 1996, 2008; Dowson 1998; Hollmann 2001, 2004; Blundell 2004; de Prader-Sampa 2007; Challis e.g. 2008, 2014). Post-colonial studies which demonstrate the phenomena of creolisation and hybridity in borderland scenarios provide a framework for how these different groups came together and drew on common beliefs. In looking to bandit theory I show that the beliefs which were most strongly expressed were those that pertained to protection in raiding. Far from being created \textit{ex nihilo} during colonialism, historical and archaeological evidence, including rock art, shows that these beliefs had existed in antiquity but were re-formulated and re-understood within the context of the changing socio-political landscape.

\textbf{The Disconnect’}

The art that was certainly produced on the ‘borderlands’ of the expanding colony in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries contains few similarities with that of the well-studied ‘traditional’ corpus. However, it would be naïve to suggest that the San painters had been creating shaded polychrome paintings until contact with Europeans, abandoning their previous technique and subject matter then suddenly painting images of Europeans and their accoutrements in a vastly different technique and manner. Indeed, it would likely be incorrect to suggest that the painters were ‘San’ at all, or indeed that the images are of European colonists.
In Chapter Two (The Disconnect) I examine the hypothesis that fine-line rock art is typically associated with hunter-gatherers (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1982) and that finger-painting is thought to be the work of pastoralists (e.g. Smith and Ouzman 2004). ‘The Disconnect’ takes a more nuanced approach in showing how southern African rock art changes over time due to contact with others, be they pastoralists, African farmers or European colonists. The general trends include a move away from the shaded polychrome art made by hunter-gatherers to paintings created with a limited colour-palette in brighter hues and in a chalkier, larger-grained pigment. Subject matter changes according to contexts of contact.

Since 2004 there has been a greater focus in rock art research on the mixed component of ‘San’ groups that had previously been thought of as ‘pristine’ Bushmen. These include Geoff Blundell’s 2004 thesis, Sven Ouzman’s 2005 paper on the Korana, Sam Challis’s thesis in 2008, Lara Mallen’s MSc dissertation in 2008 and Leila Henry’s 2010 MSc dissertation. Challis has notably explored this theme further in many papers and book chapters published over the last decade (see e.g. 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018). All of these studies draw on written historical accounts which describe the multi-ethnic nature of ‘Bushmen’ groups known to colonial officials through their bandit activities.

These publications show that the rock art itself also stands as an archive in demonstrating this mixed nature. In this chapter, soon to be published, the manner of depiction, painting technique and, importantly, the subject matter are drawn on to show that when the social landscape changes (as African farmers or pastoralists, or European colonists arrive on the landscape) there are changes in the art. It is argued that these changes come about as introduced items and animals are redefined within an indigenous epistemology and that as they became part of the ontological experience of the artists, so too were they painted into that world view, on the artists’ terms, whose beliefs were ever-changing as a result of that contact.

Loubser and Laurens (1994) note that the ‘poster-style’, in which images are painted with bright, flattened pigments rather than the more naturalistic shading of the traditional corpus, appears to come about in the Caledon River valley due to interactions between San and Sotho farmers. As the San lost their land to the farmers they were forced into the interstices and their trade routes were disrupted. This disruption meant that it was no longer possible to acquire the paint ingredients necessary for producing art of the traditional corpus. Loubser and Laurens (1994) identify this change owing to interactions
with the Basotho as there are depictions of warriors in the art holding Sotho accoutrements, notably the anvil-shaped shield, as well as cattle. I contend that this change was far more expansive than the Caledon River valley.

Indeed, throughout the Eastern Cape where we see images of human figures with items associated with African farmers they are painted in the unshaded technique (e.g. see Chapter Two Fig. 8a). That there are no certain images, which have been found, painted in the shaded polychrome manner of the traditional corpus which include elements associated with African farmers (or pastoralists) suggests that the ‘flattened’ images of the colonial era had precedent in an earlier era of contact. This would mean that instead of an abrupt shift between the ‘traditional corpus’ and later colonial-era images, painting had previously changed over time owing to contact with other incoming groups. Therefore, by the time colonists arrived, the artists’ ontologies were already different from that of the artists of the traditional corpus.

There are also notable changes in southern African rock art that appear to be associated with the arrival of pastoralists. Although these herders likely introduced their own finger-painted tradition, we also see fine-line images of people and cattle with the travelling *matjeshuis* (mat-house) across the backs of the beasts of burden. However, as with the images of people with farmer accoutrements, these images are also unshaded and painted in bright colours that differ from the more naturalistic traditional corpus (see Chapter Two Fig. 7). This too, may have related to the destruction of trade routes between indigenous hunter-gatherers as the landscape was changed by pastoralists seeking the best pasture and water sources for their herds, as discussed in Chapter Two.

**Interactions between hunter-gatherers, farmers and pastoralists**

The interactions between hunter-gatherers, farmers and pastoralists are many and varied. Although in the above section I mentioned hunter-gatherers being forced off the landscape, there were also more amiable contacts. For example, recent work (Sinclair-Thomson 2016) demonstrates that in the Matatiele region of the Eastern Cape, African farmers approached hunter-gatherers for assistance with medicines that could improve one’s odds, by ensuring protection and efficacy of weapons, in conflict. This practice is likely related to the depiction of human figures with the tools of warriors – shields, spears and knobkierries in rock art. Indeed, this art always appears concerned with farmer conflict; scenes of cultivation or pot-making are entirely absent (the only farming-related panel known to us...
is the ‘first-fruits’ sacrifice of the bull (Hollmann 2015), as noted in Chapter Two).

Another form of interaction, which we know from DNA analysis (Marks et al. 2014: 3), oral histories sources (e.g. Stanford 1910) and contemporary texts (e.g. Paterson 1789: 85-86), was that there was much intermixing between these groups. This phenomenon is something which has been particularly explored by Challis (2012, 2014, 2016, 2018) who looks at how cultural creolisation occurred in the Maloti-Drakensberg with special reference to the AmaTola (and Tola-type groups) of the nineteenth century. We also find many examples of hybrid groups forming as people from different backgrounds came together to accomplish shared goals, often, as demonstrated throughout this thesis, exemplified by turning to banditry. Some of the better known cases of creolisation and hybridity include the Griqua (Ross 1975), Korana (Ouzman 2005), Gonaqua and Gqunukhwebe (Peires 1981: 28 & 30). Indeed this intermixing, especially in the contexts of borderlands (King and Challis 2017), is the norm rather than the exception.

Perceived connections of painters to the Khoe-San

In Chapter Two I argue that the reason these mixed groups who inhabited the colonial borderlands painted at all is suggestive of either Khoe-San membership or at the very least a perceived connection to the San and Khoe. This is based on the established painting traditions of those groups. Indeed, it is telling, as explained in Chapters Two and Three, that the paintings of the later groups include elements of earlier San and Khoe art.

Groups who were descended from hunter-gatherers might have continued to paint in a fine line technique as an expression of the recognition of their ancestors, or simply as inherited practice, but they painted themselves with their own cattle as they themselves now lived a pastoralist life owing to centuries of contact (I continue this point in relation to colonial-era material culture below). This recalls the work of Elphick (1977), Marks (1972) and Barnard (2008:67) who note that it is likely that ‘Khoe’ and ‘San’ were polarities on an economic scale with hunter- gatherer at one end and pastoralist at the other.

On the pastoralist side of the scale, we find that herders are often thought to be the authors of a finger-painted tradition (see e.g. Smith and Ouzman 2004). Following this argument, Ouzman (2005) suggests that the Korana were drawing on their perceived herder heritage when they made finger-painted rock art in the colonial era. Others, notably Hollmann (2007) and Morris (2008), argue that the assignment of authorship of finger-painted
images to pastoralists is problematic as the art depicts patterns and accoutrements that were used by both hunter-gatherers and pastoralists.

In recognition of this, they term the art ‘Khoe-San’ as it may have been created by people who were of either, or a mixture, of the two categories. Following Besten (2011), I suggest this to be a useful term when describing the finger-painted element in rock art made post-contact, especially in the colonial period (of which there is a particular efflorescence in late nineteenth-century Nomansland. Mallen 2008; Henry 2010).

Taken together, this evidence suggests that the creation of painted rock art is a Khoe-San practice. Admittedly, there is a tradition of finger paintings at boys’ and girls’ initiation sites among the Northern Sotho-speaking farmers, as outlined in the ‘Disconnect’ in Chapter Two, (see also Namono and Eastwood 2005), and engraved rock art among other African farmer groups (see e.g. Maggs 1995). The farmer tradition is, however, vastly different, being finger paintings used in initiation ceremonies or thick pecked engravings, from the paintings considered in this thesis, and it does not occur in the same region. I suggest, then, as in Chapter Two that the creators of the art in this study were either Khoe-San or had a connection, direct or perceived (see ‘Disconnect’ Chapter Two), to the Khoe-San, and that this connection was being drawn on by the creation of rock art.

Trouble on the Tarka: mixed and multi-ethnic groups in the historical record

The painted record accords well with that written down by early European travellers and settlers attesting to the presence of mixed groups in the borderlands. The phrase ‘Bushmen, Hottentots and runaway slaves’ was used to describe both the bandits of the Mancazana River valley in the Winterberg as well as the AmaTola raiders of the Maloti-Drakensberg (Cape Archives G.H. 8/23:414-7; Napier 1849:226). Challis (2012, 2016, 2018) focuses on how this catchall description, when read alongside the art of the AmaTola, speaks to the creolised nature of this group. The AmaTola, accordingly, are described throughout this thesis.

However, as mentioned above and in Chapters Two and Three, the bandits of the Tarka seem to have been less creolised, more of a hybrid sort, comprising multiple ethnicities. This suggestion is based on the appearance of the Tarka art displaying no clear conventions, as well as the written reports of different people coming together to raid the
European settlers of their livestock.

*What brought these people from different backgrounds together into bandit groups?*

It is impossible to say what exactly motivated each specific member of these bandit groups to turn to raiding, however, there are clear themes of subjugation which I focus on in Chapter Three. We are fortunate in that, on several occasions, Khoe-San individuals explained to colonists that these forms of oppression were instrumental in their turning to banditry. In order to understand these issues, I have drawn on historical accounts to explain what life was like for many indigenous southern Africans during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the time period, as explained in Chapter Three, in which these images were likely created following intensive contact with European settlers until the crushing of Khoe-San resistance in this area.

One of the initial troubles faced by groups of indigenes was the taking of land by European settlers. As described in Chapter Three this affected hunter-gatherers who lost much of the territory needed to follow their lifeway, especially as herds of game were hunted out and natural plant resources destroyed by farming. For those with domestic stock, it was necessary to have access to both the sourveld and the sweetveld as they rotated their herds between the two. The ‘hard’ frontier established by the colonists prevented this transference (Giliomee 1989). Indigenes also had a spiritual connection to the landscape. Certain features of the territory, especially certain rock shelters, where paintings may also have been found and created, were visited to perform rituals. These shelters were used by generations of ritual specialists and by visiting the same sites, current specialists forged a connection with those of the past (Blundell 2004: 172), and the images clearly show religious practice in the many forms of the trance dance as well as religious experiences such as out of body travel (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1998, 2019) This connection would have been affected by colonial expansion. In Chapter Two the effects of land expropriation on rock art, as well as the ‘reconstitution’ of the Bushmen themselves, are discussed as trade routes and social fabric were disrupted (cf. Harinck 1969).

Both pastoralists and African farmers were constantly in danger of colonists stealing their livestock. Settlers had few qualms about raiding the stock of indigenous kraals in order to supplement their own herds (Penn 1999: 112-113). For example, the 1739 ‘Bushman’ War, mentioned in Chapter Two, was allegedly instigated by a group of Europeans who stole
cattle from pastoralists across the northern border of the colony. This sort of theft would have been particularly devastating for Africans who had not just an economic connection to livestock, but also a spiritual reliance on their animals. This spiritual reliance is discussed in Chapter Six in relation to the Xhosa and their understanding of how their cattle connected them to their ancestors.

Chapter Three recounts that, as indigenes lost their lands and herds, many were forced to work in the colony in order to survive. Two of these occupations, namely farm workers and military staff, are described. It is noted that in both of these roles Khoe-San were treated horrifically. They were punished severely for any misdemeanour and in some cases were actually killed by their employers. Adding to this, families were often ripped apart as workers were denied visits home.

The impact of slavery: runaway slaves in bandit groups

Not all Khoe-San went to work on settlers’ farms of their own volition. Many were forced into work as slaves, as covered in greatest depth in Chapter Four. This practice is one which has received little treatment from scholars of colonial borderlands (but see Penn 1999). If we know that there were runaway slaves among these groups, to what extent can these rock art sites be treated as slave sites? Indeed, at a recent conference (Society of American Archaeologists, Albuquerque 2018; Sinclair-Thomson & Challis forthcoming), it was asked whether we necessarily have to find chains in order to prove the presence of slaves at a site.

The historical record describes runaway slaves among these groups of bandits (e.g. Pringle 1835: 233) although the slaves’ origins are not always stated. Certainly, some of them may have been ‘exotic’, that is to say, imported from elsewhere in Africa or the East Indies, such as some of those who joined with Khoe-San in the Cape (e.g. Ross 1983: 41; Penn 1999: 4). Others may have been born in the Colony. For example, the historical record includes names of individuals like Hester of the Cape (Theal 1903: 380) which clearly indicate their birthplace. Others, however, were Khoe-San who had been captured by commandos and sold into an illegal southern African slave market. This was often the case in the borderlands where it was easier, and cheaper, to capture a kraal of indigenes than to travel to, and pay for slaves in, Cape Town (Philip 1828:267).
Looking at these sites as the hiding places for slaves seeking refuge and, later, revenge, forces us to confront the horrors experienced by the painters. This is something highlighted by Adhikhari (2010), who writes that historians are too quick to gloss over the experience of Khoi-San during the colonial period, thereby minimising the effects of colonial expansion, when we should be focussing on the genocide that this expansion actively wrought. The art is then best viewed as the product of desperation – taking spiritual measures to prevent oneself or others from being killed or captured, while raiding or escaping, and forced into a life of slavery.

**Mixed group rock art sites: an archive of un-cohesive, yet mutually coherent images.**

In Chapters Two and Three we saw that the paintings of the Tarka, Mancazana and Baviaans Rivers have no clear conventions, even among imagery in the same shelter, which appear in the same colours and were likely created at the same time as they appear to be part of a singular panel. For example, horses painted at the same site are depicted in different ways and there is no singular convention for painting manes or legs. It is suggested in Chapters Two and Three that this is due to the coming together of individuals from different backgrounds into a band. Painting may well have been an activity that was undertaken by several members of the group. This was noted to be the case among a bandit group led by Soai in Lesotho in the nineteenth century where a woman named Elisabetha ‘Malékêtanyané Môhanoè noted that when she visited this group three men were painting (Mitchell 2010: 156). If painting was a group activity for the bandit groups of the Great Fish River region, then they seem not to have a single clear tradition. This contrasts with the art of the AmaTola, as mentioned in Chapters Two and Three, which is far more uniform and likely more suggestive of the cohesiveness and creolised nature of this group.

The paintings found in the Stormberg and southern Drakensberg (Dordrecht) region of the study area, which are considered in Chapter Seven, also demonstrate a greater uniformity than those further south-west in the Tarka area. This may also be suggestive of a greater uniformity among Stormberg groups than those of the Tarka. This is not to say that they were all from a singular ethnicity. Rather, this may be a tangible proxy, as discussed in Chapter Two, for a greater cultural coherence than that of the Tarka bandits. Indeed, we might be seeing how the art changes from the hybrid to the progressively creolised. The study of the increased use of conventions in colonial-era art, both temporally and geographically, demands further enquiry.
Interrogating bandits

Banditry was certainly not unknown prior to colonisation, as both theft and institutionalised raiding (King 2017) had long been entrenched in southern Africa. These phenomena were not, however, the same as bandity in the sense described by Eric Hobsbawm, in Bandits (1969) and Primitive Rebels (1959), where bandit groups are small scale, mixed or multi-ethnic entities inhabiting the outskirts of societies and steal from a larger dominant force in retaliation for a perceived injustice. I argue (e.g. Chapter Three) that Hobsbawmian banditry is a useful lens for understanding these groups and the art that they made. Importantly, we have historical accounts that these bandit groups were mixed. I am not the first to use the work of Hobsbawm and apply it to southern African groups who made rock art, indeed this has been done by Challis and Ouzman. However, in the case of Ouzman he tries to write the Korana as social bandits which, if we take Hobsbawm’s somewhat narrow and heavily critiqued view, they were not, owing to their excessive violence, including that perpetrated against those who were less well-off. For example, that the Korana took part in the internal slave trade is mentioned in Chapter Four as they captured Khoe-San from kraals and sold them to colonists. In the case of the AmaTola, it is also difficult to see them as Hobsbawmian bandits as they were described as a nation, and were therefore, arguably, too large-scale in formation.

Not that Hobsbawm’s concept of banditry is necessarily a perfect fit for any group. In Chapter Three I showed that Hobsbawm’s approach cannot be used uncritically. Certainly, he has repeatedly been critiqued (e.g. Blok 1972) for his concept of the ‘social bandit’, the Robin Hood archetype who steals from the rich with minimal loss of life. Indeed, the bandits of the borderlands were not without their brutality. In one instance, the Mancazana bandits killed the Khoe-San keeper of a herd they stole, and displayed the unfortunate woman’s intestines on a tree (Kay 1833: 479). Although this is a particularly brutal example, the fact remains that herd-keepers were often murdered during raids and their horses and firearms stolen as described in Chapter Three. The AmaTola also enhanced their notoriety in incidents such as when they ripped an unborn baby from its mother’s womb and shouted to their enemies that they would bewitch it (Vinnicombe 1976: 54; Challis 2008: 191-2). This notion of bewitching and magic is also important to the bandit in both the creation of terror and the need for protection (Hobsbawm 1969: 44). These practices are particularly well-understood in the southern African context from the ethnographic and written archival records where,
as explained throughout this thesis, multiple accounts testify to stock thieves making use of protective medicines and rituals.

What is particularly useful from Hobsbawm’s approach to banditry is his highlighting of the individuals who join bandit groups, the marginalised of society. Despite coming from different backgrounds, (e.g. ‘Bushman, Hottentots and Runaway slaves’), they unite out of a common cause, namely, to resist and take vengeance on those who oppress them. Importantly this is exactly what we see in the borderlands of the Cape Colony where those suffering from any, some, or all, of the injustices described above and in Chapter Three, join together as described by Pringle (1835) and Napier (1849) among others.

Rock art and the ethnographic record

The informed approach to studying southern African rock art pioneered by David Lewis-Williams and Patricia Vinnicombe relies heavily on the use of ethnographic accounts of the San. Although critiqued for supposed ahistoricity – applying nineteenth- and twentieth-century accounts to paintings that may be thousands of years old (see e.g. McCall 2007) – and for using the ethnography of groups who did not paint or are geographically removed, this approach is none the less extremely successful. Despite these criticisms, it has been shown that the ethnographic accounts describing the experience and role of ritual specialists within Khoe-San groups demonstrate multiple ‘fits’ with rock art images regardless of geographic or temporal differences owing to common rituals and beliefs (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1998).

In Chapter Three I described how the borderlands of the Eastern Cape included hunter-gatherer, pastoralist and African farming communities. I have, therefore, like Challis (2014, 2018), drawn on ethnographic accounts of these different groups and seen where the similarities occur that might have been highlighted by members from different backgrounds in a group seeking to find commonalities. This made it necessary to explore what beliefs these individuals likely highlighted, especially those related to banditry, as well as to apply these beliefs to interpreting motifs.
Further evidence for the painters drawing on a perceived Khoe-San connection comes with the appearance of certain motifs which are also found in the earlier ‘traditional corpus’. However, as shown in Chapters Two, Three and Five, these were likely understood according to the changing socio-political landscape that came about owing to European colonisation. What is noted by the appearance of rain-animals, baboons and ostriches in art which can be reliably dated to the colonial era (based on the appearance of European-introduced items and animals) is that all three of these creatures can be linked specifically to beliefs about protection in a raiding context.

In Chapter Five I describe how ostrich potency is used in the Kalahari today (as it was used by earlier Khoe-San groups in nineteenth-century South Africa) as a means for combating fatigue. The ostrich’s powerful legs are particularly highlighted as giving this animal the attribute of a ‘master escape artist’. That we see rock art images of this bird painted among what appear to be raiding scenes speaks to the use of its potency by raiders in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who sought to make a safe escape following a raid. Chapter Five (Sinclair-Thomson forthcoming c) is dedicated to the appearance of ostriches in rock art concerned with raiding, this bird having not been studied in this way previously. By including this, I have aimed to show how these images make sense within an indigenous epistemology and to reinforce the necessary caution that such ‘scenes’ are not the mere depictions of actual historical events.

Chapter Five also covers the role of Khoe-San, both in the colonial military and as farm-workers. In doing so, I reiterate the injustices suffered by indigenous southern Africans (discussed in Chapter Three) at the hands of European settlers. These very injustices inspired many Khoe-San to turn to banditry. For those who had absconded from their work-places, the ostrich became a powerful animal to invoke in order to avoid recapture and certain harsh punishment.

Another ‘naturalistic’ animal that occurs throughout rock art concerned with raids is the baboon. Challis (e.g. 2012, 2014, 2016) has written extensively on the deployment of this animal’s potency by the AmaTola. The baboon is still revered as a spirit-guide or isilo for sangomas or amagqirha (Hammond-Tooke 1975: 26-7; Hirst 2005: 5; cf. Challis 2014: 260) and notorious among African farmers for stealing juvenile livestock and for being an animal associated with witchcraft (Soga 1930: 196; Berglund 1976: 284; cf. Challis 2014: 259).
Challis had previously suggested that the AmaTola may have had their early genesis in the Mancazana region, and following our fieldwork there in March 2019, and the discovery of paintings of raids which include baboons, this seems to have been the case. Although these sites do not include images of people dancing and turning into baboons, the appearance of these animals among scenes of riders and cattle is none the less suggestive of a very similar conception concerning baboons to that of the AmaTola.

As mentioned in Chapters Two and Six the baboon was believed by the southern San to keep a stick of a plant medicine known as so|-oa in its cheek which would alert it to danger. This medicine could also be used to confound ones enemies and applied to weapons and the assailants hands to ensure accuracy with projectile weapons or fist-fighting. In the Xhosa idiom, so|-oa, here known as umabophe, was used to disguise raiders in a mist and temporarily blind or paralyse ones enemies. These medicines are the focus of Chapter Six in which it is shown how Xhosa millenarian prophets administered them to their warriors prior to attacking colonial forces.

**Bullets to water**

Hobsbawm (1969) notes that groups of bandits often rely on magic and the supernatural to assist them with their clandestine activities. ‘Charms’ and tools may, for example, be used to ensure protection by nullifying and subduing the intended victim. Following this approach, I felt it necessary to examine what spiritual beliefs concerning protection were prevalent among the different groups whose members came together as bandits, and to see if there was any crossover that may have been highlighted. In doing so, I drew on the work of Challis, with whom I co-wrote the paper that is Chapter Six in this thesis (see Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017).

Chapters Six and Seven consider how introduced material culture was reconceptualised by indigenous southern Africans to fit in with a pre-existing epistemology. The cases of the 1819 attack on Grahamstown by Xhosa warriors and the War of Mlanjeni are noted for their similarities concerning the millenarian ideals of their leaders (Sinclair-Thomson & Challis 2017) and for the use of protective medicines. Chapter Six in particular highlights where the beliefs that were applied to firearms in the colonial period originated. In doing so, this paper examines the use of umabophe by Xhosa warriors, and its equivalent so|-oa by the San.
It is noted that the beliefs which came to be applied to firearms, in the bullets-to-water phenomenon, were not created *ex nihilo*, but were rather adapted from pre-existing beliefs pertaining to projectile weapons, namely spears and arrows. The article also includes statements from individuals in the Matatiele region of the Eastern Cape today who claim that these traditional medicines, or *muthi*, are still in use. They appear in stick-fighting among male youths and are also believed to be employed by livestock thieves, a use to which they were certainly put in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Chapter Six highlights the fact that there seems to have been a pan-southern African belief in the use of ritual substances and practices to influence the path or efficacy of projectile weapons. It is noted that this widespread belief is likely related to the longstanding interactions between hunter-gatherers, pastoralists and African farming communities (discussed in Chapter Two) prior to the arrival of European colonists on the sub-continent.

*Rain, rain-animals and raiding*

Chapter Six examines the relationship between firearms and water, something which is important when we consider that many of the paintings considered in this thesis, also include depictions of the *khwa-xa-xoro*, the rain animal. In this paper special mention is made of the Xhosa prophets Nxele and Mlanjeni, both of whom claimed that their medicinal substance, *umabophe*, would turn settler’s bullets into water. These prophets were also rainmakers, a role typically held by the war-doctor in Xhosa society, and seemingly mirrored among hunter-gatherers, as further explained in Chapter Seven and below.

In highlighting the work of Mlanjeni and Nxele, this paper, ‘*Bullets to water*’, also shows how the war-doctors among Xhosa society drew on rain-making beliefs to assist their armies. Mist could be called upon to disguise an approaching group of warriors and rain was controlled to cover up the tracks of stolen animals following a raid. These beliefs appear to have also been present among the AmaTola, as noted in this chapter.
The influence of rain also seems to have been important to the bandits of the eastern borderlands. We find depictions of rain animals in the art ranging from the Stormberg mountains in the north to the Baviaans River in the south. It is suggested in Chapters Two and Three that this animal, which is lead from a water-hole and cut/killed by a ritual specialist to create rain, in Khoe-San belief, was also called upon by ritual specialists to assist with raids by covering tracks or creating a mist (Vinnicombe 1976: 43), just as the Xhosa war-doctors did for their armies. This animal also likely influenced beliefs in controlling the projectiles of firearms, not just in the sense of nullifying them (mist to dampen gunpowder), but ensuring their accuracy (as ‘rain’s bolts’ or ‘black lightning’) explained in Chapter Seven and below).

![Figure 1. Depictions of rain animals at a colonial-era site in the Stormberg. Photos by author.](image)

**Indigenising the gun**

The theme of rain, and associated weather, and its relation to firearms within an indigenous framework, is continued in Chapter Seven. This chapter was published in the journal *Time and Mind* (Sinclair-Thomson 2019). It expands on the beliefs held by indigenes that were applied to the control of projectile weapons and relates these beliefs to rock art depictions of firearms.

‘Indigenising the gun’ has a greater focus on the offensive use of traditional medicines when applied to firearms, rather than the defensive uses described in ‘Bullets-to-water’. This paper also has a greater emphasis on the Khoe-San beliefs, whereas the previous paper, ‘Bullets-to-water’, focuses largely on African farmer beliefs. The reason for this split is that throughout this thesis I have drawn on the work of Sam Challis, indeed three of the papers in this thesis are co-written with him. The art of the AmaTola studied by Challis, which stands as something of a case study, is noted for having an African farmer influence, as described previously.
Further to the south-west, this influence is not as clear in the art. This is not to say that there was no involvement of African farmers among these bandit groups, historical sources certainly make note that there was, but rather that their influence may have not been as strong. This is something which will be covered in a forthcoming paper that examines to which Khoe-San groups, forced further east, experienced something of an Nguni farmer ‘injection’ into their communities, leading to the creolisation seen in groups like the AmaTola.

It is noted in Chapter Three that there were Khoe chieftaincies in the area of the Tarka, Mancazana and Baviaans Rivers. Their presence made it necessary to examine Khoe beliefs relating to weapons in this paper (Sinclair-Thomson 2019). Unfortunately, these are not as well historically detailed as those of the |Xam San collected in the Bleek-Lloyd archive. That said, they are not entirely historically absent. Many of these beliefs come from the Korana, the Khoe-speaking multi-ethnic raiders who are detailed throughout this thesis. As mentioned in Chapter Seven, this also makes sense as it was Khoe-speakers who had the longest period of interaction with European colonists, acquiring introduced material culture, owing to their geographic location in the Cape.

We find, among Khoe-speakers, that ammunition was kept with muthi, in order to make bullets fly straight. Once again the use of so|oa is noted, although here I focus not so much on its connection with baboons, but rather how it was used by the |Xam and the Korana to make their arrows fly straight. This was done by rubbing ash from the burnt root into incisions on their wrists. Used in this way, it was also believed to ensure success in fist-fighting bouts. Although the historical sources do not say what the name was of the muthi that was kept with the ammunition by Khoe-speakers, the likelihood is that it was so|oa as this medicine was already used in conflict to ensure a straight and true trajectory, as discussed in Chapter Six.

The appearance of the Khwa-xa-xoro (rain animal) at sites including scenes concerned with raiding is notable because it can be linked to beliefs in making firearms accurate. When present in its aggressive male form, this mythical beast is linked with lightning and thunderstorms. Evidence from Khoe-San ethnography suggests that these weather phenomena were also linked with firearms within their epistemology. The loud report of guns echoed the sound of thunder, and the flash in the pan and sparks produced during the firing of a musket recalled lightning.
These characteristics likely reinforced the belief that projectiles could be influenced through ritual performance and medicines. Importantly, it was believed that ritual specialists could influence the path of lightning and wield it as a weapon. This belief is still found today among African farming communities as mentioned in Chapter Six. The relation between rock art and control is described in Chapter Seven and I suggest here that firearms were included in the art not out of some need to depict a witnessed narrative, but because it was believed that they could be controlled just as other projectile weapons and weather phenomena could.

Why so few paintings?

It must be noted that the areas surveyed for this thesis, including the southern Drakensberg, Stormberg, Suurberg, Bamboesberg and the Winterberg, did not contain an enormous number of paintings that could be certainly dated to the colonial era (owing to subject matter from this time period). While this was initially frustrating, the further I read of settlers’ and early travellers’ writings the more it made sense. It seems that many of these groups of bandits were not active for very long. Indeed, in some cases they may have only conducted a singular raid before being attacked by a punitive commando and all but destroyed. In Chapter Three, I reference Thomas Pringle who writes that the last raid in his region of the Baviaans, Mancazana and Tarka Rivers, took place in 1826. Bandits were either killed by colonists or had to leave the area in order to survive. Some, notably Lynx of the Bamboesberg, were pardoned, later finding work on settlers’ farms. For those who opted to flee, their options were to either join with African farmer communities, like the Xhosa to the east, or alternatively to head north and into the Drakensberg mountains. The latter likely explains the genesis of the AmaTola, some of whose original members may have galvanised in the Mancazana region, who continued to draw on the power of the baboon to assist them in raids in the mid-nineteenth century (e.g. Challis 2012: 273-4).

Limitations

This project was impacted by the vast size of the region under study. I had hoped to cover as much of the region that made up the borderlands of the Cape Colony as possible. This meant having to take a broad approach, where we focussed on specific sites previously known, either to local farmers, or to the academy. In covering such a large area, time was
This meant that I did not conduct any systematic survey (though localised searches were made proximate to known sites) because it would be too time consuming. The project examined the greater borderlands rather than just a specific mountain range or locality. It is likely, therefore, that there are more sites in the study area than those accounted for in this thesis. I none the less believe that there are not a great number of colonial-era sites present in the region. I base this on the limited time-scale for banditry along the borderlands as well as the fact that these are the only sites that were known to the farmers with whom I spoke. It is, of course, entirely possible that there are further sites of which the farmers themselves are not aware. Future systematic survey in these areas will doubtless reveal more.

Further research

Although only fourteen colonial-era painting sites were found in the Stormberg, Suurberg, southern Drakensberg and Winterberg regions, I do not believe this to be a disadvantage to this thesis. Certainly, further surveys may reveal additional paintings. Many farmers were consulted in these regions as to whether there were paintings on their land. Where there were, these were visited, although the vast majority of these were of the earlier ‘traditional’ corpus. These almost certainly date from a time period where hunter-gatherers were not forced to flee across the landscape by incoming groups.

The role of women

Throughout this thesis I have focused on the activities performed by the men in these bandit groups. It has not been my intention to present these groups as consisting only of a single sex. Women were certainly also present, as attested by reports from commandos (see e.g. Theal 1905: 48–49). The paintings that seem to be concerned with raids rarely, however, feature images of human figures that can be recognised as being female. Indeed, only one painting, PRT001 in the south-western Drakensberg near Dordrecht, definitely includes women. In this panel there are two women dressed in hooped skirts (cf. Mallen 2008). However, as demonstrated in Chapter Seven, we cannot say that these are necessarily European women based on their clothing. Indigenes of both sexes were acquiring European material culture since the very first foreign settlers arrived on the landscape. Adding to this, These women are painted among
rain animals and one of them holds a knobkierrie. It seems unlikely that the painters would have included depictions of European women alongside otherworldly creatures from Khoe-San cosmology and holding African weapons, especially those weapons which oftentimes are used by female diviners (cf. Challis 2012b).

Figure 2. Depictions of women in hooped skirts at a site in the Stormberg. Photos by author.

We know that in at least one bandit group, that led by Nqabayo in the Drakensberg, the women assisted the men in raids by following the men on foot and gathering plant foods with which to feed them on their post-raid retreat (Stanford 1910). Challis (2016: 296-7; 2012b) notes the appearance of women in the rock art of the AmaTola. In these instances they are often shown depicted with spears, the markers of diviners. He argues that this was a role that women came to perform among the AmaTola as the men were focussed primarily on raiding livestock. A closer investigation, with a focus on the role of women in bandit groups, into historical and archival sources may reveal more of the importance of these marginalised actors.

Aardvarks in the rock art

In Chapter Five I explored the way in which ostrich potency was wielded to ensure successful escapes, either following a raid or while absconding from a place of work. Three of the paintings, one in the Windvogelberg near Cathcart, one in the Mancazana River valley, and one in the Suurberg, found during fieldwork for this thesis, included images of aardvarks. Aardvark burrows were also found near the paintings, attesting to their presence in these areas. It cannot be assumed that these animals were painted for no reason, beyond art-for-art’s-sake. What their role was among raiding groups is unknown and enquiry is beyond the scope of this thesis. Further study may reveal, however, that these animals too
played a crucial role in the cosmology of bandit groups and that like the ostrich this role was based on its characteristics and behaviour.

![Figure 3. Depiction of an aardvark at a colonial-era site in the Zuurberg. Photo by author.](image)

**Influencing domestic stock**

Throughout this thesis I have focused on how bandits likely influenced their raids through magical means. These include using medicines and ritual practices to either avert or ensure the accuracy of projectile weapons and the use of rain-control to either cover up the tracks of stolen animals or to call down mist to disguise thieves, as is practised in southern African warfare. I have not yet examined beliefs in the ability to influence animals. This is a phenomenon in hunting situations, in which hunters use medicine and ritual to make their prey behave in a way conducive for capture (McGranaghan and Challis 2016). The work of McGranaghan and Challis (2016) demonstrates that in many cases hunter-gatherers discuss their prey in terms of ‘wildness’ and ‘tameness’. Certain ritual specialists accordingly sought to make prey behave ‘nicely’ so that they would be easier to hunt. These practices may have been extended to domestic stock and the control of these animals through ritual means. This could have occurred during raids as bandits may have sought to influence the animals that they were stealing to behave in a certain way, such as encouraging them to cover large distances at speed. This may speak to the need to include images of livestock in rock art concerned with raiding. Further examination might demonstrate this relationship. The antiquity of the presence of domestic stock
in the subcontinent, as well as their close relationship with groups who had previously been considered pristine hunter-gatherers (McGranaghan 2015 cf. Chapter Two), makes it more than likely that there was a suite of beliefs pertaining to cattle and other livestock.

Conclusion

The paintings of the colonial period in the study region are few but depicted in many different manners and with different techniques. In taking a qualitative approach to these images, I believe that they stand as a tangible proxy for the socio-political forces present on the landscape at the time that these images were created. They are few because bandit groups were constantly being destroyed, forced to move or otherwise disband and in some cases re-band or ‘re-tribe’ (Challis 2016). The paintings lack uniform conventions as these bandits came from different backgrounds and joined together in common cause. The art includes some motifs associated with the traditional corpus and earlier rock art, as these bandit groups drew on their perceived connection to the Khoe-San. What these images are not is insignificant. The existence and struggles of the image-makers deserve as much recognition as that of larger groups who fought and struggled under colonialism and ultimately shaped southern African society.
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