



FINAL EXHUMATION REPORT:

South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) Permit ID: 1887/Case ID: 6108

**EXHUMATION AND RE-INTERMENT OF EXPOSED HUMAN SKELETAL REMAINS ON
FARM UITVLUGHT 88KS, NEAR DEHOOP DAM, WITHIN TUBATSE LOCAL
MUNICIPALITY OF THE SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT,
LIMPOPO PROVINCE**

Compiled by:

VHUFASHU HERITAGE CONSULTANTS

45 Voortrekker St

Polokwane, 0700

P.O.Box 456

Ladanna, 0704

Tel: 015 291 3699

Fax: 015 291 3699

E-mail: info@vhhc.co.za

November 2014

Disclaimer: Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural importance during the phase two investigation, it is always possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the assessment programme. Vhufasha Heritage Consultants and its personnel will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.

Contents

<u>TABLE OF FIGURES</u>	3
<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	4
SUMMARY OF FINDS:	5
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:</u>	6
<u>PROFESSIONAL DECLARATIONS</u>	7
<u>1.INTRODUCTION</u>	23
<u>2. REGIONAL SETTING: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND</u>	24
<u>3. LOCATION</u>	27
<u>4.1. THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCE ACT (25 OF 1999)</u>	30
<u>4.2. THE HUMAN TISSUE ACT (65 OF 1983)</u>	33
<u>5.TERMS OF REFERENCE</u>	33
<u>6.TERMINOLOGY</u>	34
<u>7.COMMUNITY CONSULTATION</u>	36
<u>8.THE EXHUMATION SITE</u>	36
<u>9.THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROCEDURE</u>	37
10.2. EXHUMATION OF SKELETAL REMAINS.	38
<u>11. SPECIALIST ANALYSIS OF THE SALVAGED HUMAN REMAINS</u>	39
•SKELETON 1	39
<u>12.DISCUSSION</u>	40
<u>13.REBURIAL</u>	41
<u>14.CONCLUSION</u>	44
<u>15. REFERENCES</u>	45

Table of figures

Figure 1: Topographical map of the study area, where human remains were uncovered during construction of relocation houses on farm Uitvlucht 88KS..... 28

Figure 2: Google map of the study area (Courtesy Google Earth). 29

Figure 3: View of the affected site, with newly constructed houses at the background. 30

Figure 4: View of the affected site under construction..... 37

Figure 12: a small representative sample of collected ceramic shards. 41

Figure 13: Reburial process with the remains inside the wooden coffins 42

Figure 14: View of the community members who attended the reburial process..... 43

Figure 15: View of the Grave dressings..... 43

Annexure 1: Excavation Permit from the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Copyright: *Copyright in all documents, drawings and records whether manually or electronically produced, which form part of the submission and any subsequent report or project document shall vest in Vhufashu Heritage Consultants. None of the documents, drawings or records may be used or applied in any manner, nor may they be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever for or to any other person, without the prior written consent of Vhufashu Heritage Consultants*

Note: This report follows minimum standard guidelines and standard archaeological practices required by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA and SAHRIS) for compiling exhumation and analysis investigation Report.

Site name and location: The proposed site is situated on farm Uitvlught 887KS the area is situated at the following global positioning system co-ordinates South 24°59' .25.1" and East 29 ° .53.56.01, near De Hoop Dam. The area is located approximately 45kilometers west of Steelpoort CBD further north of the main tarred road (R555) from Burgersfort to Rossenekal, within Greater Tubatse Local Municipality of the Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province.

The work was commissioned by the Department of Water Affairs under the auspice of Rendeal four (4). The exhumation process was undertaken in accordance with rules outlined by section 36 (3) of the National heritage resources Act (Act No, 25 of 1999). All Legal documents that govern exhumation were obtained from South African Heritage Resource Agency (Burial Ground Unit Pretoria). The exhumation process was conducted on the 01 October 2014. The affected area was excavated within the international best practice framework. Human skeletal remains were uncovered in association with several late Iron Age diagnostic and undiagnostic potsherds. This report form part of the process written to communicate on the nature of the excavation and basic findings. Graves are more than any other aspects of Cultural Resources Management, human remains are prone to be the focus of emotional, ethical and cultural controversy, where exhumation approach seldom compromise emotional, ethical, and cultural consideration, and they are regarded as sensitive .The sentimental value attached to the graves and its contents, by the

relatives of the individuals is very high, therefore dealing with human remains demand the highest ethical standards, respect for the remains often involves a token gesture, real and heartfelt.

The work was commissioned by the Department of Water Affairs and conducted in line with the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999). The act protects heritage resources through formal and general protections. The South African Heritage Resources Agency developed minimum standards and, in addition to these local standards, the International Council of Monuments and sites (ICOMOS and the Burra Charter) has developed recording guidelines required for assessing heritage sites.

Summary of finds:

Human skeletal remains were uncovered from the central part prepared for house foundation. Both long bones cranial bone was badly disturbed, broken into small pieces by the TLB used in the excavation of the area. The proximal and distal sections of all the long bones have disintegrated. The only cultural grave goods associated with the area were few broken pieces of recent past period represented by diagnostic and undiagnostic potsherds. The site does not show grave pit possibly due to the nature of site disturbances. Preliminary conclusion was that the skeleton belongs to a female individual of African origin. Preliminary assessment of the remains reflected that the remains are of an adult individual characterized by well developed sutures, strong long bones as well as worn out tooth enamel. Possibilities are that the cranium or skull was damaged by earth moving machinery during foundations activities of the house foundation preparation

Acknowledgements:

Vhufashu Heritage Consultants wishes to express its sincere gratitude's to all who contributed to the exhumation process more especially the Department of Water Affair by commissioning this study. We also wish to acknowledge the role played by different stakeholders such as the South African Heritage Resource Agency Burial Grounds Unit for issuing the exhumation Permit. De hoop community for their generosity and allowing us to conduct the investigations. And last but not least this acknowledgement would not be complete if we do not mention the social facilitation and excavation team members.

HERITAGE CONSULTANT: Vhufashu Heritage Consultants

Mr. Mathoho N. Eric (BA, BA Hons Archaeology, University of Venda. MPhil in Archaeology, University of Cape Town, PhD Candidate University of Pretoria.

Heritage specialist/ ASAPA Accredited Archaeologist

Membership number # 312

Cell: 0718706947

Email: Info @ vhhc.co.za

PROFESSIONAL DECLARATIONS

I the undersigned, Mr. Mathoho Ndivhuho Eric hereby declare that I am a Professional Archaeologists accredited with the Association for South African Professional Archaeologist (ASAPA) Membership No # 312 and that Vhufahashu Heritage Consultants is an independent consultants with no association or with no any other interest what so ever with any institution, organization, or whatever and that the remuneration earned from consulting work constitute the basis of Company livelihood and income.



.....
Mr. Mathoho Ndivhuho Eric

Archaeologists and Heritage Consultants for Vhufahashu Heritage Consultants
ASAPA Membership # 312

1. INTRODUCTION

On 31 of July 2014 Rendeal 4 construction crew members' uncovered human remains on unmarked burial ground during vegetation clearing in preparation of access roads and residential units' foundation on farm Uitvlught 88KS. The remains were noted approximately 600meters north east of newly constructed three residential units. These remains were uncovered at the depth of 15cm from the surface. The exposed remains were characterised by broken cranium, mandible with molars, clavicle, femur and tibia. Portion of Uitvlught 88KS farm has been recently purchased by Water Affair as relocation site, for community members (families) who were affected by the construction of De Hoop dam along the Steel poort River. The finds were reported to the construction supervisor who in turn reported the matter to all relevant authority and the local police (Rosenekal Cluster). In consultation with the community at large, the remains were viewed as unknown. As a result, the Department of Water Affair requested that the remains be exhumed and be properly buried in a safe cemetery. Vhufashu Heritage Consultants, an independent heritage consulting specialists was requested to facilitate the exhumation and interment of this grave site.

Information at our disposal shows that the area has been operational for more than twenty (30) years as a cattle ranch farm. However based on the above statement it is quite obvious that the area began to function before the establishment of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) NEMA, as well as the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999. However recent Impact Assessment conducted by Vhufashu Heritage Consultants dated 16 July 2013 (AIA) did not identify any marked burial grounds on the property however the study did mentioned of the presence of an archaeological site represented by vitrified dung deposit in association with several undiagnostic potsherds. Nonetheless, as a result of service delivery framework (SDF) programme, the Department of Water Affair has been for the past years initiated an alleviation of water shortages within the Limpopo and the Mpumalanga Provinces by identifying and constructing dams at several areas suitable for dam constructions on several perennial streams. This initiative was adopted to curb water shortages, and to provide running and clean water to nearby communities as well as mining industries as well as other related infrastructures. The area was visited by an archaeologist from Vhufashu Heritage Consultants to confirm if the remains were that of human. The assessment was carried out in the presence of the South African Police Services (Rosenekal Cluster). After the initial inspection of the remains by an archaeologist, South African Heritage Resource Agency

Office (Burial Ground Unit in Pretoria) was informed immediately about the finds, but could not manage to arrange a site visit. SAHRA therefore relied on the recommendations of the principal investigator (Mr. Mathoho N.E) that the affected areas must be demarcated and cordoned off any activities (Construction) and that an archaeologist must be appointed to conduct a rescue operation. The Department of Water Affairs procured funding for site the exhumation and reburial process. A permit to exhume human skeletal remains was issued dated 1 September 2014.

The primary aim of the exhumation process was to respectfully salvage, exhume and re-bury the exposed human skeletal remains in a dignified manner at a safe local cemetery.

2. REGIONAL SETTING: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The history Ba- Pedi before the 20th century has been well described and documented in several literatures. The exact origin of Ba-Pedi is shrouded by mystery; they are undoubtedly, of Sotho origin. The Sotho division is so classified principally on the linguistic grounds of similar characteristic of Sotho people (Mönnig, 1967). The Tswana Chiefdom form part of the larger group of Sotho people, while Sotho group itself is one of the three great sub-divisions of the bantu-speaking peoples situated north of the Nguni communities. In addition to Batswana or Western Sotho, the Sotho group includes the Basotho of Lesotho and the Orange Free State, to whom the term Sotho has come to be more specifically the almost exclusively applied. This group some time also referred to as the southern Sotho. The third group comprises the Bapedi who have been generally referred to as the northern Sotho, with the exception of some Tswana; this group is the one that dominated in the study area. To wrap up the above all these tribes call themselves Sotho (Mönnig, 1967).

Legassick (1969) summary of the vast and complicated literature on the Sotho- Tswana oral tradition provide a frame work for the understanding of the relevant archaeological records. It is possible to establish a meaningful relationship between archaeological and historical groups and to use this relationship to clarify the early history of the Sotho-Tswana-Ba-Pedi. The Transvaal Sotho has been subdivided into a number of groups. These are the eastern Sotho, particularly the Kutswe, Pai and Pulana; the north eastern Sotho, particularly the Phalaborwa, Mmamabolo and Lobedu the northern Sotho, particularly the Kgaga, Birwa, Tlokwa and some

Koni and Tau. Historical documents and Sotho oral tradition suggest that they originated from the Great Lakes in central Africa. Their migration occurred in succession of waves over many years under the leadership of king Kgalakgadi who settled in Botswana in the early 13th centuries. The next group to have arrived in the early period seems to have been the Digoya who were the first group to cross the Vaal River, little is known of their history and they were finally absorbed by the Ba-Taung tribe. The majority of the proper Sotho followed two three migration of the Ba-Rolong, Ba- Fokeng and Ba- Hurutshe.

Documents suggest that Marota (commonly called Ba-Pedi) originated from Ba- Kgatla from central Highveld near present day Rustenburg and Pretoria, an important offshoot, the Ba- Pedi is thought to have moved northeast in the mid 17th century. Another member of the cluster may be the Ba- Tlokwa. Maggs (1976) connect Ba- Tlokwa with the Pembe ruins which are situated some few kilometers south of Ntsuanatsatsi hill, he further alluded that Ba- Tlokwa once built a capital called Itholanoga in the Pilansberg near the present day Sun City; it was at a later stage that the Ba-Kgatla took over this area. The site is characterized by well constructed stone walled complex located on top of hill; the architectural style of the stone wall has been dominated by Molokwane patterns. According to Maggs (1976) the Ba-Kgatla tribes were responsible with the construction of the stone walling while Ba-Tlokwa was responsible with the earliest occupation. According to Boeyens (2005) Tlokwa are known to have lived in the late 18th century at Marathodi site.

Oral traditions suggest that migration and settlement in the sub- continent are of course conjectural with trace of genealogies of the Ba-Rolong tribe back to 1270 and the Ba- Fokeng even to 980 AD, the Ba-Rolong began their migration at the beginning of the 15th century and towards the 16 century they were followed by two last group, the last of which was the Ba- Hurutshe who transverse the land and settle in what is now the western Transvaal. History suggest that when Mmathobele was expecting her first child the other wives of Diale (The ruler), were jealousy and they said that they could hear the child crying in her womb. Naturally this unusual event was attributed to witchcraft, and the Kgatla wanted to kill the mother and child, Diale interceded for her and the child was born normally, the child was nick-named Lellelateng (it cries inside), as the child grow older, his father, seeing that the tribe would never accept his son to attained the kingship, he instructed him to leave with his mother and followers towards the east, the group under the leadership of Thobele founded their own tribe, the Pedi. Lellelateng is generally taken as founder of the Pedi, although tradition makes no

further mention of his sons or successors, where as Thobele is accepted as the man who led the Pedi to their new home (Mönnig 1967).

According to the 19th century settlement of this region, the Sotho speaking Ba-Pedi arrived relatively late, they did however build powerful kingdom in time of Thulare 1790-1820. One of the reasons was availability of excellent pasture and good landscape. Historians suggest that Ba- Kgatla clan consolidated other smaller clan forming the Ba-Pedi stronghold state. The Pedi oral traditions suggest that Ba- Pedi chief Thulare maneuvered to the top of the ladder through his superb military tactics and became undisputed paramount chief of the region. By 1828 the new Pedi chief Sekwati had returned to the area, and over the next ten years rebuilt the Pedi stronghold. When the Voortrekker arrived in the Marota (Ba-Pedi) Empire King Sekwati (King Sekhukhune's father) resisted, and a famous battle was fought at Phiring in 1838, Sekwati defeated the Boer. The Ndzundza Ndebele, who also appear to have a long history in the area appear to have been subordinate to the Pedi up until the death of Sekwati in 1861 at this point the Ndzundza declared their independence (Esterhysen & Smith, 2007).

After the death of king Sekwati an illegitimate ruler who came to power using military force, emerged (king Sekhukhune), he maintained stronghold with neighbouring tribes through intermarriages, it was at this time that his brother Mampuru (legitimate ruler) was forced to flee from the kingdom. During the reign of Sekhukhune he sent young men under the auspices of his headmen's to work in white farms and at the diamond mines, money earned from these employment were taxed and the taxes was used to buy guns form the Portuguese in Delagoa bay where he usually sent his subordinates for trade purposes, some of the money was used for purchasing cattle in an attempt to increases Marota's wealth.

By the 19th century the Marota Empire had grown to unite all disparate people in the area (Sekhukhune land). It was the same guns that were used in the war of resistance against the Boers and British. During the wars of resistance Sekhukhune was of the attitude that the land between the Vaal and Limpopo Rivers belongs to him and his area fall outside Pretoria's jurisdictions. Communities around the region were living harmoniously, trading and farming it was up to the year 1826 when Mzilikazi Khumalo fled from King Shaka's rule and reaches the region devastating the tribes that were within the region including Ba-Pedi communities, fortunately the Ba- Pedi recovered the devastation. A notable event was the decimation of the Pedi at some point between 1823 and 1825, there were some dispute over who was responsible

and Mzilikazi Khumalo (Ndebele) moved up into the region to revenge the Pedi and their land, Ndwandwe under Zwibe were responsible. The Pedi survivor took refuge in the Waterberg area (Esterhysen & Smith 2007).

Many wars of resistance were fought and later Sekhukhune was forced to hide himself in the cave. And the European troops cut supply of food and water and Sekhukhune was forced to come out of the cave to surrender, and was captured and locked in prison. It was after his release in 1882 that his brother Mampuru murdered him. During those years Mampuru and Nyabela fled and hid from Commandant General Piet Joubert. (Mapoch was the chief of the Ndzundza-Ndebele tribe) The cave where Nyabela and Mampuru were hiding was besieged by Joubert in 1882 and Nyabela was arrested and lost his chieftaincy and the land under his jurisdiction was divided amongst the white (Burgers) who participated in the siege.

3. LOCATION

The proposed site is situated on farm Uitvlucht 887KS the area is situated at the following global positioning system co-ordinates GPS South 24°59' .25.1" and East 29 ° .53.56.01, near De Hoop Dam. The area is located approximately 45 kilometers west of Steelpoort CBD further north of the main tarred road (R555) from Burgersfort to Rossenekal, within Greater Tubatse Local Municipality of the Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province.

Topography of the study area is much varied influenced by the presence of mountain ranges such as the Sekhukhune Mountains and Steelpoort perennial stream. Historical documents suggest that these areas were the most preferred settlement places by Iron Age communities in the past. The proposed area is characterized by flat section of land which forms a lower lying area south of the Sekhukhune Mountains. The geology and soils is set on Gneiss formation, which varies in colour between light and dark brown, the rocks are generally relatively exposed with rocky outcrops limited to bottom and top slope of the Sekhukhune Mountains. Several sections are covered by hematite layer of rocks represented by maroon pebbles. The soils include sand, eutrophic plinthic catenas these are freely drained soils. The vegetation of the study area comprises of sparse numerous endemic plant species, heterogeneous rocky habitat, with numerous floristic links and grass cover, important plant taxa include: *Grewia Flava*,

Boscia Albitrunca, *Acacia Karoo*, *Rhus Lancea*, *Commifora sp*, *Acacia Negrences* *Acacia Eurobenses*, *Acacia Karoo*, *Acacia tortilis*, *Dichrostachys cineria*, *schlerocarya birrea combretum apiculatum*, *A melifera* *Boschia albitrunca*, *Euphorbia tirucalli* and *engens* and grass etc (Acocks 1975; Mucina and Rutherford 2006).




Figure 1: Topographical map of the study area, where human remains were uncovered during construction of relocation houses on farm Uitvlucht 88KS




Figure 2: Google map of the study area (Courtesy Google Earth).



Figure 3: View of the affected site, with newly constructed houses at the background.

4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Two sets of legislation are relevant for the study with regards to the protection of heritage resources and graves.

4.1. The National Heritage Resource Act (25 of 1999)

This Act established the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA) as the prime custodians of the heritage resources and makes provision for the undertaking of heritage resources impact assessment for various categories of development as determined by section 38. It also provides for the grading of heritage resources (section 7) and the implementation of a three-tier level of responsibility and functions from heritage resources to be undertaken by the State, Provincial and Local authorities, depending on the grade of heritage resources (section 8)

In terms of the National Heritage Resource Act 25, (1999) the following is of relevance:

Historical remains

Section 34 (1) No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure, which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant Provincial Heritage Resources Authority.

Archaeological remains

Section 35(3) Any person who discover archaeological or Paleontological object or material or a meteorite in the course of development or agricultural activity must immediately report the find to the responsible heritage resource authority or the nearest local authority or museum, which must immediately notify such heritage resources authority.

Section 35(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

- destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;
- destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or paleontological material or object or any meteorite;
- trade in ,sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from republic any category of archaeological or paleontological material or object or any meteorite; or
- bring onto or use at an archaeological or paleontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist with the detection or recovery of metal or archaeological material or object or such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.

Section 35(5) When the responsible heritage resource authority has reasonable cause to believe that any activity or development which will destroy, damage or alter any archaeological or paleontological site is underway, and where no application for a permit has been submitted and no heritage resource management procedures in terms of section 38 has been followed, it may

- serve on the owner or occupier of the site or on the person undertaking such development an order for the development to cease immediately for such period as is specified in the order
- carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not an archaeological or paleontological site exists and whether mitigation is necessary;

- if mitigation is deemed by the heritage resources authority to be necessary, assist the person on whom the order has been served under paragraph (a) to apply for a permit as required in subsection (4); and
- recover the cost of such investigation from the owner or occupier of the land on which it is believed an archaeological or paleontological site is located or from the person proposing to undertake the development if no application for a permit is received within two week of the order being served.

Subsection 35 (6) the responsible heritage resource authority may, after consultation with the owner of the land on which an archaeological or paleontological site or meteorite is situated; serve a notice on the owner or any other controlling authority, to prevent activities within a specified distance from such site or meteorite.

Burial grounds and graves

Section 36 (3) No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority:

- (i) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
- (ii) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in detection or recovery of metals.

Subsection 36 (6) Subject to the provision of any person who in the course of development or any other activity discover the location of a grave, the existence of which was previously unknown, must immediately cease such activity and report the discovery to the responsible heritage resource authority which must, in co-operation with the South African Police service and in accordance with regulation of the responsible heritage resource authority-

- (I) carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not such grave is protected in terms of this act or is of significance to any community; and if such grave is protected or is of significance, assist any person who or community which is a direct descendant to make arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such grave or, in the absence of such person or community, make any such arrangement as it deems fit.

Cultural Resource Management

Section **38(1)** Subject to the provisions of subsection (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development*...

- must at the very earliest stages of initiating such development notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.

development means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of the heritage authority in any way result in a change to the nature, appearance or physical nature of a place, or influence its stability and future well-being, including:

- (i) Construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change of use of a place or a structure at a place;
- (ii) Any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land, and
- (iii) Any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil;

place means a site, area or region, a building or other structure

structure means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to the ground.

4.2. The Human Tissue Act (65 of 1983)

This act protects graves younger than 60 years, these falls under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Department. Approval for the exhumation and reburial must be obtained from the relevant provincial MEC as well as relevant Local Authorities.

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE

- (a) carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not such grave is protected in terms of this Act or is of significance to any community; and
- (b) if such grave is protected or is of significance, assist the Department of Roads and Transport and any person who or community which is a direct descendant to make arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the content of such grave or,

in the absence of such person or community, make any such arrangement as it deems fit and submit a specialist report to the South African Heritage Resource Agency and the Department of Roads and Transport, which addresses the following:

- Executive summary
- Scope of work undertaken
- Methodology used to obtain supporting information
- Overview of relevant legislation
- Results of all investigations
- Interpretation of information
- Assessment of impact
- Recommendation on effective management measures
- References

6. TERMINOLOGY

The Heritage impact Assessment (HIA) referred to in the title of this report includes a survey of heritage resources as outlined in the National Heritage resources Act,1999(Act No25 of 1999) Heritage resources, (Cultural resources) include all human-made phenomena and intangible products that are result of the human mind. Natural, technological or industrial features may also be part of heritage resources, as places that have made an outstanding contribution to the cultures, traditions and lifestyle of the people or groups of people of South Africa.

The term ‘pre –historical’ refers to the time before any historical documents were written or any written language developed in a particular area or region of the world. The historical period and historical remains refer, for the project area, to the first appearance or use of ‘modern’ Western writing brought South Africa by the first colonist who settled in the Cape in the early 1652 and brought to the other different part of South Africa in the early 1800.

The term ‘relatively recent past’ refers to the 20th century. Remains from this period are not necessarily older than sixty years and therefore may not qualify as archaeological or historical remains. Some of these remains, however, may be close to sixty years of age and may in the near future, qualify as heritage resources.

It is not always possible, based on the observation alone, to distinguish clearly between archaeological remains and historical remains or between historical remains and remains from the relatively recent past. Although certain criteria may help to make this distinction possible, these criteria are not always present, or when they are present, they are not always clear enough to interpret with great accuracy. Criteria such as square floors plans (a historical feature) may serve as a guideline. However circular and square floors may occur together on the same site.

The 'term sensitive remains' is sometimes used to distinguish graves and cemeteries as well as ideologically significant features such as holy mountains, initiation sites or other sacred places. Graves in particular are not necessarily heritage resources if they date from the recent past and do not have head stones that are older than sixty years. The distinction between 'formal' and 'informal' graves in most instances also refers to graveyards that were used by colonists and by indigenous people. This distinction may be important as different cultural groups may uphold different traditions and values with regard to their ancestors. These values have to be recognized and honoured whenever graveyards are exhumed and relocated.

The term 'Stone Age' refers to the prehistoric past, although Late Stone Age people lived in South Africa well into the historical period. The Stone Age is divided into an Early Stone Age (3Million years to 150 000 thousand years ago) the Middle Stone Age (150 000 years ago to 40 years ago) and the Late Stone Age (40 000 years to 200 years ago).

The term 'Early Iron Age' and Late Iron Age respectively refers to the periods between the first and second millenniums AD.

The 'Late Iron Age' refers to the period between the 17th and the 19th centuries and therefore includes the historical period.

Mining heritage sites refers to old, abandoned mining activities, underground or on the surface, which may date from the pre historical, historical or relatively recent past.

The term 'study area' or 'project area' refers to the area where the developers wants to focus its development activities (refer to plan)

Phase I studies refers to survey using various sources of data in order to establish the presence of all possible types of heritage resources in a given area.

Phase II studies includes in-depth cultural heritage studies such as archaeological excavating and sometimes laboratory work. Phase II work may include documenting of rock art, engravings or historical sites and dwellings; the sampling of archaeological sites or shipwrecks; extended excavation of archaeological sites; the exhumation of bodies and the relocation of grave yards, etc. Phase II work may require the input of specialist and require the co-operation and the approval of SAHRA.

7. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

During the initial site inspection the archaeologists had identified the remains as belonging to the pre-colonial Iron Age period based on the content of some of the ceramics that were found nearby, in accordance with legislative requirements, a community consultative process was undertaken in an attempt to test local indigenous knowledge about the remains. Ms Hlabangwane Sibongile a representative of Hluli Environmental Consultants undertook the community consultation process. Interviews were held with local residents with the aid of project liaison officer, a public meeting was held in an attempt to identifying the site. The Department of Water Affairs and Rendeal 4 facilitation team were extremely helpful and positively participated directly in the process. The community consultation produced no direct descendants or any person who claimed the grave. Satisfactory arrangements were made with the project team to facilitate the salvaging, exhumation and reburial of the remains. The Department of Water Affairs identified site, as the reburial place, a site in close proximity to De hoop dam wall where previously exhumed individuals were buried. A date for the re-burial was finalised to be the 14 November 2014.

8. THE EXHUMATION SITE

The farm Uitvlucht 88KS is situated approximately 3 kilometres west of the De hoop dam. The affected site is situated north east of recently constructed houses. The farm was purchase by the Department of Water Affairs to be used as relocation area for several families who were affected by the construction of De hoop dam. The area did not have grave dressings or any associated permanent marker such as a tree or a rock.

The site is situated at the following global positioning system co-ordinates South 24° .59' .25.1" and East 29 ° .53.56.01



Figure 4: View of the affected site under construction

9. THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROCEDURE

Excavation has been defined by Shrare and Ashmore (1979) as the principal means by which data is gathered about the past the method is used to gather and retrieved data from beneath the ground. This data is seldom in primary context. The archaeological excavations included both formally laid out excavation trenches and/or squares in predetermined areas; in this regard it was decided to concentrate on disturbed areas, where human skeletal remains were noted.

The procedures to deal with the site were in Threefold:

- The visible skeletal materials were exhumed.
- A control test trench was excavated within the road and it's reserved. This was done in an attempt to investigate the presence of any archaeological material in context and to enable determination of stratigraphy and cultural sequence associated with the remains.

- Laboratory work for conducting specialist analysis to determine the number of individual's recovered and basic pathological data such as age and gender of the individuals.

10.2. EXHUMATION OF SKELETAL REMAINS.

The disturbed site was excavated according to archaeological techniques used to investigate historical and archaeological graves as described by Nieneber (1997) Nieneber & Steyn (1999) for the recovery and analysis of human skeletal remains. The procedures employed minimise damages to the bones and helps in determining and confirming the burial position of the deceased as well as determining the identity in terms of race, sex and age. Standard anthropological procedures were employed to analyse the remains in situ after the remains were exposed by means of archaeological methods.

Disturbed site: the area had scattered human remains, out of context. After carefully excavating on the area presumed to be the grave pit, at the depth of 5cm, a clavicle was noted possibly still in situ: the area had dark brown soil discolouration soil. The burial position of the the remains could not be decirn because, the cranial part of the skeleton was badly disturbed by TLB activities, of importance is the presence of broken pieces of diagnostic and undiagnostic potsherd. Both proximal and distal long bones have disintegrated. Traditionally within the African context potsherds are made, and mostly used by Women. Based on certain conclusion derived from some of skeletal feature, the remains belong to a female individual of African origin. Preliminary assessment of the remains reflected that the remains are of an adult individual characterized by well developed sutures, strong long bones as well as worn out tooth enamel. No other associated grave goods were encountered during the exhumation process.

11. SPECIALIST ANALYSIS OF THE SALVAGED HUMAN REMAINS

A **single skeleton** was salvaged during the exhumation process.

- **Skeleton**

Skeleton: 25, 4% complete.

Dentition: 3% loose molars and incisor present.

Age: 30-55.

Gender: female, according to the shape of the rami in the mandible and section of the retrieved pelvic girdle. This was the only feature that could be used for gender determination. Ossification of acetabulum complete: Ossification starts at the age of 12 years and the process complete at the age of 16 years. Permanent dentition fully erupted: complete by 21 years. At 15 years only 3rd molar needs to be erupted. 2nd and 3rd mandibular molars are erupted, thus approximately 11 years. Mandibular 3rd molar, the last tooth to erupt, at approximately 15-21 years.

Pathology: no sign of post burial trauma, bone depression or pathology could be read from the broken pieces of the remains.

The remains were poorly preserved, broken into small pieces that make it difficult to analyze. None of the long bones were complete, the proximal and distal ends have disintegrated (all their ends were eroded away) all the four limb could be observed out of context, very little could be seen on the ribs and vertebrae. A complete set of permanent teeth with advanced wear was evident. Analysis of a piece of pelvic girdle shows some age changes; these characteristic probably indicate an individual older than 40years. The pelvis was very fragmentary and was completely exposed but the ends of the girdle have disintegrated, and could thus not use in sex determination. However, the skull was quite robust with large mastoids, prominent brow ridge and rounded orbital margins, broad nasal aperture, thus indicate an individual of African descent; it was not possible to take cranial measurement that could be used for further analysis. Assessment for the presence of trauma and pathology was hampered by poor preservation and incomplete cranium.

12. DISCUSSION

The affected site was identified as a Late Iron Age Icon facies of the Moloko Branch, the first Sotho-Tswana speakers that entered the area during the 13th century. This was achieved through a comparative study with the pottery remains found in the deposit. Most of the ceramics were highly fragmented making it difficult to reconstruct the shape profiles. When cleaned, it became clear that some of the pottery fragments were decorated with designs formed by red ochre and graphite burnishing, cross hatched, fine lines incisions, herringbone and punctate. Considering the multiplicity of shapes, size, paste design organizations, these designs are typical Moloko wares, and have been dated elsewhere to the Late Iron Age (Huffman 2007).

About 1800 years ago the first farming communities entered South Africa and started to replace the Stone Age hunter-gatherers. For the first time, people lived in settled communities, cultivating such crops as sorghum, millets, ground beans and cowpeas, and they herded cattle as well as sheep and goats. Because these early farming peoples also made their own iron tools, many archaeologists call this block of time the **Iron Age**. For convenience and to mark widespread events, it is divided into three periods: the Early Iron Age (AD 200-900), the Middle Iron Age (AD 900-1300) and the Late Iron Age (AD 1300-1820- see page 33 for details).

Archaeologically, the Sotho-Tswana language is associated with the ceramic cluster known as Moloko. The earliest recorded facies of Moloko is *Icon*. *Icon* pottery first appears in the Phalaborwa area in the 12th to 13th centuries and then slightly later in the rest of the Limpopo Province. *Icon*, in both areas forms major disjunctions with the local sequences: it cannot be derived from *K2* and *Mapungubwe* in the Limpopo Province or from *Kgolpolwe* to the southeast. Furthermore, *Icon* cannot be derived from the *Happy Rest – Eiland* sequence elsewhere in Limpopo. Because of the constraints within an historical tradition, *Icon* cannot be derived from other **KALUNDU** facies in Botswana, Zimbabwe or Zambia. By a process of elimination, Sotho-Tswana then most likely had Early Iron Age **UREWE** sources somewhere in East Africa. Sites with this pottery are limited to the Limpopo Province, Mpumalanga and

perhaps Botswana, dating to between about AD 1300 and 1500. According to the ceramic evidence, in some places *Icon* incorporated earlier *Eiland* elements (Huffman 1980, in Press). This phase predates the oral record. Because *Eiland* cultural remains were also found, this site may add to the evidence of the merging of *Eiland* and *Icon* in about the 13th – 14th centuries.



Figure 5: a small representative sample of collected ceramic shards.

13. REBURIAL

After the completion of the excavation process, including preliminary basic analysis of the skeletal remains, the remains were handed over to the community via project social liaison officer and the Department of water affairs representatives. All the remains were place inside wooden coffins for the reburial process. A large number of community members congregated for the reburial process. Important to note is that project leadership, ward councillors, Department of Water Affairs representatives attended the re-burial ceremony.

The remains were reburied at the De hoop dam cemetery; the cemetery is located just several meters below Dehoop dam wall, the site is situated further south of the Steelpoort River. The

area has been demarcated and was previously used for reburial of all individual's graves exhumed within the Dehoop dam basin, these individual's original burial grounds were affected by the dam development process. The cemetery site is at global positioning system co-ordinates, South 24°.57' .05.04" and East 29 ° .58.03.08. This concluded the process and the local community member expressed their satisfaction with the proceedings.



Figure 6: Reburial process with the remains inside the wooden coffins



Figure 7: View of the community members who attended the reburial process



Figure 8: View of the Grave dressings

14. CONCLUSION

The objective of this project was concluded by re-interment of the exposed human skeletal remains at De Hoop dam cemetery. Although certain evidence leads us to conclude that these remains were not related to the present community residing at Uitvlucht 88KS, however it surface that the farm was occupied by Mamabolo family. In case this became valid claim, they are in titled to have access to the grave. Since the burial site pre-date oral history the Department of Water Affairs, community closely monitored and participated fully on the entire process. The salvaging of remains was successfully concluded.

15. REFERENCES

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999)

Finnegan, F. Hart. T. & Halkett, D. 2011. The informal burial grounds at Prestwich street Cape Town: Cultural and chronological indicators for the pre historic Cape underclass. *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*. Vol66, no 194

Huffman, T.N. 2007 *Handbook to the Iron Age: The archaeology of pre-colonial farming societies in southern Africa*. Scottville: University of KwaZulu Natal Press

Loubser, J.H.N. 1994. Ndebele Archaeology of the Pietersburg area: *Navorsinge van die Nasionale Museum Bloemfontein*. Vol 10, (2)63-147

Nienaber, W.C. Steyn, M. & Hutten L. 2008. The grave of King Mgolombane Sandile Ngqika: Revisiting the Legend. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 63 (187)46-50

Nienaber, W.C. 1997. The exhumation and reinterment of Burger CG Naude. *South African journal of cultural history* 11:123-133.

Nienaber, W.C & Steyn, M. 1999. The exhumation and analysis of the remains of a black native participant in the second Anglo- Boer War (1899-1902), Kwazulu-Natal. *South African Journal of cultural history* 13:94-110

Shrere, R.J. & Ashmore, W. 1979. *Fundamentals of Archaeology*. The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc.

Van Warmelo, N.J. 1930. Transvaal Ndebele Text. *South African Ethnology publication*, 1. Pretoria: Government Printers

Annexure 1: Excavation Permit from the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA)

RESCUE OF HUMAN REMAINS ON A FARM UITVLUGHT 887KS, LIMPOPO

Our Ref:

Enquiries: Itumeleng Masiteng
Tel: 012 320 8490
Email: imasiteng@sahra.org.za
CaseID: 6108

Date: Monday September 01, 2014
Page No: 1

PermitID: 1887



PERMIT: Remove from its original position

In terms of Section 36(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)

Permit Holder: Ndivhuwo Eric Mathoho
Vhufa Hashu Heritage Consultants

Site: UITVLUGHT 887 KS (UITVLUGHT 887 KS)

Conditions: Application for a rescue permit of human remains uncovered during the construction of housing project on farm Uitvlught 887KS near De hoop Dam and main tarred road (R555) from Burgersfort within the Greater Tubatse Local Municipality of the Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province.

1. If the permit holder is not to be present on the site at all times then the heritage authority must be provided with the names and qualifications of the authorised representatives.
2. Adequate recording methods as specified in the Regulations and Guidelines pertaining to the National Heritage Resources Act must be employed. Note that the position of all excavations and objects collected must be marked on a plan of site.
3. A standard site record form must be lodged on SAHRIS.
4. Human remains must at all times be handled with respect and graves should not be disturbed except where unavoidable. The consultation procedures as indicated in the Regulations and the National Heritage Resources Act must be observed as appropriate. The recommendations for removal of graves and exhumations and for re-burial stipulated in SAHRA's Policy 'What to do when graves are uncovered', section 3, must be observed as far as possible. A report on the specimens recovered and their origin must be submitted to the heritage authority annually on or before 15 September 2015 for the duration of the permit.
5. All remains recovered, including relics and artefacts, will be kept with the skeletal material and reburied at the local cemetery.
6. Reprints of all published papers or copies of theses and/or reports resulting from this work must be lodged with the relevant provincial heritage authority and SAHRA.
7. If a published report has not appeared within three years of the lapsing of this permit, the report required in terms of the permit will be made available to researchers on request.
8. It is the responsibility of the permit holder to obtain permission from the landowner for each visit, and conditions of access imposed by the landowner must be observed.
9. It is the responsibility of the permit holder to fill in excavations and protect sites during and after excavation to the satisfaction of the heritage authority and the landowner.
10. The heritage authority shall not be liable for any losses, damages or injuries to persons or properties as a result of any activities in connection with this permit.
11. The heritage authority reserves the right to cancel this permit by notice to the permit holder.



The South African Heritage Resources Agency

Street Address: 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town 8000 * Postal Address: PO Box 4637, Cape Town 8000
* Tel: +27 21 462 4502 * Fax: +27 21 462 4509 * Web: <http://www.sahra.org.za>

RESCUE OF HUMAN REMAINS ON A FARM UITVLUGHT 887KS, LIMPOPO

Our Ref:

Enquiries: Itumeleng Masiteng
Tel: 012 320 8490
Email: imasiteng@sahra.org.za
CaseID: 6108

Date: Monday September 01, 2014
Page No: 2

PermitID: 1887



an agency of the
Department of Arts and Culture

This permit is valid from 01/09/2014 to 01/09/2015.

Itumeleng Masiteng
Heritage Officer: BBG Permitting
South African Heritage Resources Agency

Mimi Seetelo
Manager: Burial Grounds & Graves Unit
South African Heritage Resources Agency

Additional Info:

Please note that this permit may be suspended should an appeal against the decisions be received by SAHRA within 14 days from the date of the permit. SAHRA may not be held responsible for any costs or losses incurred in the event of the suspension or retraction of this permit.



The South African Heritage Resources Agency

Street Address: 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town 8000 * Postal Address: PO Box 4637, Cape Town 8000
* Tel: +27 21 462 4502 * Fax: +27 21 462 4509 * Web: <http://www.sahra.org.za>

