ABSTRACT

The Transkei, located between the Kei and Umzimkulu Rivers in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa, is cartographically confused. Indeed, even today (2008) the government of the Republic of South Africa is still commissioning surveys to locate positions and draw boundaries in the area once known as the Transkeian Territories and later the so-called “Republic of Transkei.” It is an area whose cartographic history is poorly known, and it has not received the same consideration that historians and surveyors have devoted to the mapping of South African territories to the north of the Drakensberg range. Transkeian cartography’s very imperfection however gives us a window into the functioning of the colonial geographical archive.

This paper looks at the early mapping initiatives and collection of geographical information in the Western Transkei, to show its dual nature: at once highly irregular and partial, yet centralized in the Office of the Surveyor General and put forth in all its incomplete (and occasionally incompetent) glory. Through the early cartography of the Transkei, we will see how the manufactured image of complete knowledge was far more important than gaining the actual knowledge itself—so important, in fact, that the continuing lacuna of the Transkei’s cartography remained hidden from surveyors and historians alike.

The Transkei is cartographically confused. Indeed, even at the end of 2007 the government of the Republic of South Africa was still commissioning surveys to locate positions and draw boundaries in the area between the Kei and Mzimkulu rivers once known as “Kaffraria Proper” and later as the Transkeian Territories.1 It is an area whose cartographic history is poorly known, and it has not received the consideration that historians and surveyors have devoted to the mapping of territories to the north of the Drakensberg range. The western part of the territories, between the Kei and Mbashe Rivers (see Figure 1), were of particular interest to the imperial and colonial governments, and so was mapped to varying degrees and under varying circumstances between 1858 and 1900. By viewing the cartography of this area, we can see the centralization of colonial geographical knowledge at work.

The early mapping initiatives and collection of geographical information on the Western Transkei before 1900 show “frontier” mapping’s dual nature: it was at once highly irregular, incomplete, and contingent, but it accumulated in the Office of the Surveyor General, Cape Town, through which all cartographic knowledge about the Transkei passed from 1858 onward. Through the early cartography of the Transkei, we can see how the manufactured image of complete knowledge was far more
important than gaining the actual knowledge itself—so important, in fact, that the lacunae of the Transkei’s cartography and the nature of its early development have remained hidden.

Though maps of other parts of the Cape Colony could be compiled from property diagrams with the occasional trigonometrical point to aid correction, the Transkei as an area outside the pale of colonial land alienation (and indeed colonial power) had none of those resources. The results can be seen on early maps that purport to show the area; the detail they show varies dramatically and tends to follow lines of travel, or visibility from the sea or areas under colonial control. The great manuscript map drawn by L. Hebert and used for reference in the British Colonial Office after 1830 in fact collapses the Mbashe and Kei rivers completely into one river. In the case of one manuscript map produced by the Royal Engineers in 1854, the topography stops suddenly and almost completely at the Kei River (see Figure 2). The most prolific cartographer of South Africa at that time, the RE Draughtsman Henry Hall, drew his own information on the Transkei from those topographical sketches as well as travelogues available from military officers and missionaries; proper survey material was however much more sparse and so the geography was Hall’s subjective approximation at best.

In the wake of the disastrous prophetic cattle-killing movement of 1856-1857, Governor and High Commissioner Sir George Grey pursued a punitive war in early 1858 against the Xhosa paramount Sarhili (also known as Kreli) for purportedly being behind it, probably as cover for the destruction of Xhosa authority and seizure of land. Sarhili’s section of the amaXhosa, unable to oppose well-fed colonial troops and their African auxiliaries, retreated with what few cattle they could across the Mbashe river into Bomvana territory. That evacuation, combined with many deaths from starvation and the departure of other people in search of food, left the land between the Kei and Mbashe rivers virtually uninhabited all the way north to the Drakensberg Mountains save the colonial military force under Major J. C. Gawler. The colonial government knew very little about the geography of this area, quickly dubbed “the Transkeian Territory,” and so sought information on the physical character of the land, crops found growing there, and the potential of various sections for European colonization. The officers of the expedition against Sarhili readily complied.

Figure 1 The Transkeian Territories (Western Transkei). Modifications by the author.
These officers included Captain George Pomeroy Colley, who already had specific orders to “make a rough survey of the country, and report on its capabilities for agriculture, sheep farming, &c., the direction in which roads should be made, and whether any of the mouths of the rivers could be made into harbours.” As a military surveyor, Colley was unusual for not being a Royal Engineer, but he had attended the Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst and thus possessed the skill set of a 19th-century military officer, including an education in military sketching and traverse survey. Colley had already produced a number of local topographical sketches that accompanied despatches to the Chief Commissioner of British Kaffraria, John Maclean, who theoretically also had authority over the Transkei. The flight of Sarhili provided an open field for survey operations on the eastern bank of the Kei for the first time, so Colley took the primary responsibility for a wide-ranging military survey of the region.

A few private maps had already passed through the office of the Deputy Surveyor General, British Kaffraria, and some were copied by the clerks and likely made their way to Colley and his

Figure 2  Cole/Tylden Royal Engineers manuscript map, 1854. Note the abrupt cessation of topographic detail at the Kei. Source: MR 1/1277, BNA.
compatriots. One notable example of these maps was a secondhand copy of a schematic of the entire Transkei, from Kei to Mzimkulu Rivers, dated 1852 but clearly amended later (see Figure 3). Maclean brought that plan, attributed to Reverend Thomas of the Clarkebury mission, directly to the Deputy Surveyor General of British Kaffraria at some point between 1856 and 1860. Its presence testifies both to the importance placed on even the most inaccurate plans drawn by amateur cartographers as well as the paucity of data available to the DSG.12 There were few points of longitude known in the area, and so virtually all renderings of territory became exercises in judging the relative value of any data provided.

**Map 3** Copy of the map by Rev. Thomas, missionary at Clarkbury, showing its dependence on route-based observation. Source: DSGBK 56, KAB.

The flaws of Thomas’s map are legion, as was true of all maps of the Transkei produced at the time. Its details are extremely sparse, with limited topography, impossibly straight rivers, and vague textual notes about the character of the country, various chiefs’ lands, large forests, and occasionally mission stations, forts, and capitals. In short, it contains only the sort of information that could be gleaned in passing, without a dedicated, equipment-laden operation that might raise the well-founded suspicion of the inhabitants. Thomas’s map showed no boundaries other than a rough red line around the territory of the Mpondo chief Faku, fixed on natural features by treaty in 1844 and probably added to the copy later. A number of such materials, including Thomas’s map, found their way into the compilation sketches and maps produced during the 1850s by Henry Hall of the Royal Engineers detachment at Cape Town; Hall deposited copies of his sketches with the RE depot in Grahamstown for military and administrative use in the region well before any publication.13 The compilation of such uneven source material was however no substitute for new and more thorough surveys. One important feature did appear in most early maps that obtained in virtually all later maps of the Transkei: the rotation of the region about forty degrees clockwise, to bring the Indian Ocean coast parallel to the southern limit of the map sheet and the Kei winding its way upwards. This approach
made sense because it fit the largest image onto the smallest possible sheet, but it also generated an image of the territory whereby a map reader could truly treat the Transkei as a narrative text, read from left to right as a progressing frontier.

Faced with asserting control over, and plotting the resettlement of, such a poorly-known territory, officials in British Kaffraria and at the Cape put a high value on collecting cartographic information on the territory, and Colley’s assignment to the task was but one manifestation. This emphasis was especially strong when it came to the Governor of the Cape, Sir George Grey, whose own career had begun with surveying in Australia and who was therefore keenly aware of the value of survey and mapping for his type of detail-oriented colonial administration. Grey asked in April 1860 for the draughtsmen at the Surveyor General’s Office in Cape Town to reproduce three maps for him, including one map of British Kaffraria and a sketch of the Transkeian Territory. The identity and eventual fate of these maps is uncertain but they or their source maps are probably among the many un-annotated sketches in the DSGBK or BK repositories.

The early Transkei map copied for Grey however probably shares its origins with several small schematic maps used by the authorities in British Kaffraria and at the Cape to plot the expansion of the former territory, to which the Transkei was briefly (and contentiously) annexed between 1862 and 1865, but also to plot usage in a prescriptive manner. One color tracing map in particular, probably drawn during 1858, divided the territory by “suitability” for Europeans and “Natives” as well as particular areas thought “good for sheep” and showing areas already inhabited (see Figure 4).

Figure 4  Schematic map for settlement schemes in the Transkei, 1858. Source: DSGBK 56, KAB.

- at that time, occupying the post of Transkeian Magistrate - raised significant objections to the characterization of certain lands as “Adapted for Europeans” on the basis that large arable farms...
could not be assembled there and, in the eyes of the colonizer, only “the native” might be satisfied with farming irregular lots on rocky ground.\textsuperscript{18}

Colley’s survey work in the Transkei slowed considerably in late 1858, when he was created Special Magistrate of “the country lately forfeited by the Chief Kreli and of the settlements formed therein” upon Gawler’s departure for service against the rebellion in India.\textsuperscript{19} Almost immediately, concerns from the newly-ensconced Mfengu military settlement on the Mbashe river in Idutywa over boundaries came to Colley’s attention, which must have underscored the importance of continuing the survey of the territory.\textsuperscript{20} Further, Colley had to contend with Sarhili’s people beginning to set up new kraals and grazing cattle on the attractively fallow western bank of the Mbashe. The resources available for grazing where Sarhili and many of his people had fled were under severe pressure, and he surely harbored hope of recovering authority over some or all of his territory. The importance of visibly occupying the territory was exceptionally clear to Colley and his superiors in British Kaffraria and at the Cape.\textsuperscript{21}

In early 1861, Colley was able to petition for a return to the field in the still-empty lands in the Transkei with the express purpose of “completing the military sketch of the Transkeian District.”\textsuperscript{22} Colley, who was working virtually alone, requested a second officer in July to aid him. Such help was necessary, Colley stated, because the sketch map of the Transkei “will be of the greater service in the settlement of that country & the questions raised concerning it” and an additional survey officer would not only speed the work but continue it in case of Colley’s recall to England.\textsuperscript{23} The fact that the Cape government and the Colonial Office in London were actively discussing the settlement of the entire territory with “Europeans and friendly Natives” (that is, the Mfengu, who provided the bulk of African levies for the Colony) aided his case.\textsuperscript{24}

The growing volume of African claims and overt encroachments upon the fertile, though rocky, land on the eastern banks of the Kei rendered Maclean and Grey amenable to proposals which would speed the survey of the territory and consequently its settlement with Europeans and pliant Africans. In an effort to make his case for incorporation and European settlement of the Transkei as well as the highlands beyond it, Grey forwarded his feelings in the matter to London along with a more extensive “suitability” map - on the model of the 1858 sketch - drawn by the newly-hired Chief Compiler at the Surveyor General’s Office in Cape Town, Charles Neumann Thomas. This map was not only sent to the Duke of Newcastle at the Colonial Office, but was also published in a Blue Book with Grey’s report and Newcastle’s reply in late 1861 by the Cape government.\textsuperscript{25}

In such an environment, Colley’s request for help with the sketch survey was propitious. Colley requested he be assigned Lieutenant James Murray Grant, a Royal Army officer who had served closely with the settlement of German veterans of the Crimean War in the area and had experience with engineering and topographical sketching. Grant had been liaison between the War Office in London and the Germans ever since he arrived in the region in September 1856, but as the Legion’s numbers dwindled in the late 1850s, Grant left the imperial service and joined the Frontier Armed & Mounted Police (F.A.M.P.) as did a number of the Germans.\textsuperscript{26} At the time Colley requested Grant’s assignment, the latter had planned to accompany a survey of the sparsely-occupied country near the Quaithlamba mountains from the Cape to Natal led by Royal Engineer Captain James Grantham, but the sketching of the eastern banks of the Kei took priority.\textsuperscript{27}

The recruitment of Grant turned out to be timely. Colley wished to return to England to attend the Staff College at Camberley as a first step towards higher military office, and tendered his request to that end at the beginning of December, 1861. By that time, Colley reckoned that he had, during about 12 months’ work, surveyed about 2,500 square miles of this district, embracing the whole of the
native locations and all the central and most important part of the country - and by the end of this month hope to have about 3,000 miles done. There will then remain unsurveyed about 1,000 square miles, viz: about 600, mostly barren mountain, near the heads of the “Tsomo,” “Indwe,” & “Umgwali” rivers, and 400 along the coast - neither of which tracts are likely to be of much value, and the survey of which might be completed at leisure by Lieut. Grant. 28

So long as the survey was suitably detailed across the land deemed viable for European settlement, there was no great hurry to survey the remainder.

To maintain such a pace, the nature of the survey was understandably limited; the techniques used and detail attained were little different from those of prior military surveys on the Eastern Cape. As in those cases, the surveyor himself was the critical instrument. No numerical data of any kind was given; they only recorded the basic indications of ridges, landforms, watercourses, and the like. Visually unobtrusive features like wells and temporary ones like seasonal watercourses, often vital to prospects for static settlement, went undetected by Colley and Grant. Their survey was however intended neither to be the final metrification of the territory nor to obviate eventual cadastral survey. The mapping operation, which Grant maintained was “carried on too rapidly”, was intended not to “fix stations” but rather

... to delineate the general character of the country, and the features which would guide an officer in directing the march of his patrol, a land board in laying out farms, or an engineer in selecting a line of road – in short to answer all the purposes of a military sketch - ... 29

These purposes presumably also included serving as a basis for later surveys and providing the bare necessities for conducting both military operations and native administration (which were not mutually exclusive categories) in the territory so covered.

Just before his departure for England, Colley drew a large outline map of the Transkeian Territory based upon his rough sketches and notes, and deposited a copy with Bryant (see Figure 5). Colley also prepared smaller charts showing the lands claimed by the two mission stations—St. Mark’s and Butterworth—within the territory. 30 These plans were intended to represent raw material from which future maps could be compiled, including the improved maps of the Transkei that would in principle result from Grant’s extension of the survey. In May 1870 the Chief Compiler at the Surveyor General’s Office, Charles Neumann Thomas, copied Colley’s outline map, and in 1871 transferred it to a lithographic stone with a few alterations for administrative use—most notably the rough boundaries of the “native” territories (see Figure 6). 31 Grant himself continued fieldwork in the areas deemed marginal near the mountains, at a lower rate of pay than Colley’s (and with periodic threats of resignation and interruptions in response to Maclean’s refusal to increase it), until he finally declined to resume the survey in November 1862 and handed his sketches over to the Deputy Surveyor General on the first of December that year along with notes “to facilitate the resumption of the work” if desired. 32

The recall of Grey in August 1861 and his replacement by Sir Philip Wodehouse as Governor and High Commissioner meant that the issue of the Transkei’s occupation became more negotiable. Despite a number of proposals to sell lands and settle enough Europeans to make the area both secure and financially supportable for British Kaffraria, high quitrents and occupation requirements combined with the demand that land claimants pay for an expensive survey meant that few Europeans applied for grants after the terms became public in June 1864 even though some six hundred had expressed interest before. 33 The cost of occupying the Transkei directly was clearly too high, and a withdrawal to the west was necessary for reasons of both security and economy. 34
Wodehouse eventually made an agreement with Sarhili that allowed him to return to the southern third of their former lands in the Transkei, an area that Grant had not sketched, except for three major forests at the Kei, Qora, and Mbashe river mouths to be designated “government reserves.”35 Those lands remained completely unsurveyed until 1879. In the northeastern Transkei, Wodehouse acceded to Thembu demands on the land, and allowed them occupy the territory that separated the “Tambookie Location” (Glen Grey) from the Thembu lands well outside the Colony on the Indian Ocean in hopes of clearing the Location.36 Any plans of settling even a few Europeans were quashed in 1865, in favor of a plan to move Africans within the colony across the Kei, thus freeing their lands for white settlement and, presumably, ensuring a greater increase to the Colonial treasury than would have come European settlers in the Transkei.

After the first group approached, the Ngqika under Sandile, refused to make the exchange, Wodehouse

---

Symposium on “Shifting Boundaries”: Cartography of the 19th and 20th Centuries. ICA Commission on the History of Cartography
settled in mid-1865 upon appealing to the Mfengu living in crowded locations in the districts of Peddie, King Williams Town, and Victoria East to serve as proxies for the colonial government in the central Transkei, a course that met with approval from London. There was clearly no other avenue on offer to the Mfengu to alleviate land shortage, and between late 1865 and the planting season in 1866, some 40,000 Mfengu crossed the Kei under the eyes of the F.A.M.P. The new land was not a chiefdom, but more of a sub-colony, because the Mfengu remained British subjects and so had only limited independence. Fingoland’s boundaries were specified in 1865—subtractively, as the Mfengu were the last group offered land—but those boundaries needed to be inserted into the cartographic record.

As the new Fingo Agent, Charles Cobbe immediately undertook a sketch map of the new territory, apparently without reference to any existing map. Cobbe sought to define the extent of the Tsomo and Gcuwa river valleys that comprised Fingoland, and appears to have assigned names to the smaller streams, though it is not known how he settled upon them. As the only map specifically showing

**Figure 6**  C. N. Thomas’s lithographed plan based on Colley’s map, with added detail for colonial administrative use. Source: SG 1/1/3/46, KAB.
Fingoland (until its borders’ own incorporation into Thomas’s copy of Colley’s map in 1871) or the Tsomo rivercourse, the clerks at the Deputy Surveyor General’s Office in King Williams Town duly copied Cobbe’s map and forwarded it to the Surveyor General in Cape Town.8 There, it entered the archive upon which the Cape’s map compilers drew.

Some boundaries, however, never entered that record. Sir Walter Currie, commander of the F.A.M.P., reportedly arrayed the Mfengu into 105 “locations” in 1865-1866, but these did not appear on Cobbe’s map or any later map (though the headmen’s names occasionally appeared). The later creation of four districts (1879) and subdivision of those districts into locations (1900-1906) do not refer to locations except as the “wards” of various headmen by name, and not as territorial extents, pointing to the primacy of kinship over geography.39 Beyond being imprecise and probably inaccurate, Cobbe’s map was also not widely redistributed; the commander of the F.A.M.P. himself was uncertain of the boundaries, and when he contacted the Governor’s office in 1871, they relied upon the Surveyor General to provide them with the textual and graphical description of Fingoland’s boundaries directly.40 That information probably came from Grant’s map.

During the period of dislocation and resettlement no additional general surveys were authorized or performed in the Kei valley. Map coverage in the valley remained roughly as it was between the halt of Grant’s survey in 1862 and the late 1870s. The cessation of work is in part understandable given that the areas not surveyed were heavily populated Ngqika, Gcaleka, and Thembu territories, where the appearance of British or Cape military personnel would naturally create suspicion and unrest. There was also little justification for the expense, given the concerns of the imperial, Cape, and Kaffrarian governments about expenditures, and the arrival at an equitable settlement scheme for the Transkei that did not involve European settlement and collected adequate taxes. The twelve land surveyors licensed to practice in British Kaffraria thus restricted their work to the southwestern side of the Kei except for a few mission stations and other small plots.41

The cartography of the Transkei and colonial understanding of its territory therefore remained primarily dependent upon the work of Colley and Grant. Grant settled permanently in British Kaffraria, which was itself annexed to the Cape Colony in 1866, and revisited the sketch of the Transkei on a number of occasions. Grant produced a sketch map of the entire area between the Kei and Natal seaward of the Qathlamba mountains to illustrate the report of the Transkeian Commission, charged in 1872 with settling disputes between the abaThembu and Sarhili (see Figure 7).42 The sketches of Colley and Grant were also compiled to produce a relief-shaded, lithographed military map of the southwestern Transkei produced by the Quartermaster General’s Department in Britain in 1875 (see Figure 8).43 Grant presumably cooperated with that effort or at least corresponded with Colley in its creation, though its drafters took liberty with the source material given that Grant drew a reference map in 1876 to indicate that large areas remained unsurveyed.44 Grant periodically asked for Cape government assistance in compiling a better map of the Transkei, though there is no indication that anything other than open access to data was ever provided. The 1872 map however provided the basis for a number of other compilations for various purposes, and it stands as the first map of the Transkei alone with an orientation to the north.

Grant did, however, provide assistance for the updating of C. N. Thomas’s 1870 copy of Colley’s map to serve as a “map of the seat of the war” during the Cape Colony’s one-sided war against the Ngqika and Gcaleka in 1877-78. That map included some data that had appeared first on Grant’s 1872 map, labels naming headmen in Fingoland, and new topography. The map itself went through at least two editions during October 1877 alone as improved military sketches of the areas Grant himself had not surveyed near the Indian Ocean became available, and the Surveyor General’s role was confirmed by the presence of an amended state of the map there.45 As the most recently updated
Figure 7 Lithographed map by J. M. Grant of the entire territory between the Kei and Mzimkulu rivers based on SGO and RE materials, 1872. Source: MPG 1/943/2, BNA.

and official map of the Transkei, the charts found a ready distributor in the Cape Argus, and so was likely the first map of the Transkei to achieve wide consumption.

Despite the importance of their surveys for printed maps of the Transkei, the most important cartographic descendant of the surveys of Colley and Grant was in fact not among the published maps. That distinction is reserved for the Transkei Noting Plan produced sometime in 1882 or 1883 by C. N. Thomas for the Surveyor General. This large (roughly 3.5m x 1.5m) roller map derived directly from Grant’s 1872 map, surveys made by land surveyors in a few northern and southern areas between 1878 and 1882, and the 1875 topographical map made in London. The new surveys included an abortive attempt to divide the southern part of the western Transkei into farms (visibly incomplete on the manuscript), and the survey of farms in parts of northern Tembuland and Griqualand East. The Noting Plan’s immediate purpose appears to have been as a draft for the much smaller but still influential “Map of Kaffraria Proper” that the Surveyor General first published in August 1884 (see Figure 9).
The Noting Plan’s immediate purpose appears to have been as a draft for the much smaller but still influential “Map of Kaffaria Proper” that the Surveyor General first published in August 1884 (see Figure 9).  

However, the manuscript map took on a life of its own at some point, when Thomas and others began making notes and amendment marks on it. The staff at the Surveyor General’s Office began using the

Figure 8  The Quartermaster-General’s topographical plan of the Transkeian Territories based on Grant and Colley, 1875.  Source: Maps 3/32, KAB.
plan to note new subdivisions and correspondence relative to old ones, to indicate new land grants, stores, and mission stations, and to correct erroneous geography, both terrestrial and human (see Figure 10). Within only a year or two, the manuscript map of Kaffraria Proper had become the Transkei Noting Plan, the central repository for the graphical depiction of colonial geographical knowledge for the critical quarter-century between 1883 and 1910. All other office plans of the region were indexed on that one; details about new plans, proclamations, and surveys were all duly added to its outwardly cacophonous and chaotically polychromatic litany of data. Because it was the ultimate index for geographical data on the Transkei, the Noting Plan informed policy, guided inquiry, and served as a uniquely alterable landscape that could be drawn and redrawn as colonial knowledge changed. Only with the compilation of the ten-sheet Map of the Transkeian Territories, published in 1912, was the Noting Plan superseded as the primary repository of cartographic data on the region.

Maps of the Transkei accumulated centrally starting at the end of the 1850s, and the ontology of information is clear for the maps produced because of the few surveys and other sources of cartographic information available between 1858 and 1898. Only during the South African War would a complete recompilation begin; in the decade after the war the survey of lands for individual title for Africans added dramatically to the storehouse of geographical knowledge. That information however still fed completely through the Office of the Surveyor General, with all the omissions and
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uncertainties that implied. The structure of colonial knowledge dictated the nature of the geographical archive, which in turn dictated the cartographic output on the colony’s liminal areas.
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