

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE UPGRADING OF  
THE ROAD BETWEEN MOUNT FLETCHER AND  
KETEKETE**

**For Ninham Shand**

**By**

**Gavin Anderson**

**Institute for Cultural Resource Management, Natal Museum, Private Bag 9070,  
Pietermaritzburg, 3200**

**22 June, 2012**



## **Introduction**

The Institute for Cultural Resource Management was approached by Ninham Shand to undertake an archaeological survey of the road between Mt. Fletcher and Ketekete and the associated servitudes. These servitudes include the quarries and borrow pits. In addition to this, a survey was taken amongst the local community in order to recognise sites of cultural significance. The latter is covered by a separate report.

Little archaeological work has been undertaken previously in the study area. Surveys have been undertaken in the large river valleys, and these include Early and Late Iron Age sites. The area is also known to have rock art and other Stone Age related sites.

Three archaeological sites were recorded during the course of the survey. One of these sites may be directly affected by a quarry, while two may be indirectly affected by the same quarry. A permit for the damage to one site will be required prior to any development. This permit is available from the South African Heritage Resources Agency.

The terms of reference for this are:

1. Review previous archaeological work done in this area
2. Compile a report containing:
  - 2.1. An overview of the local and regional cultural/archaeological context of the study area
  - 2.2. A description of the cultural aspects along the route
  - 2.3. A description and assessment of the significance of potential impacts on the cultural/archaeological resources, associated with the proposed road resurfacing and associated activities
  - 2.4. Detailed guideline measures to manage and impacts, particularly during the construction phase, and an assessment of their likely success
  - 2.5. Indicate any cultural or historical sites/areas on the maps/orthophotos provided

## **Methodology**

The archaeological survey entails a foot survey of areas to be affected by the development. Each scatter of artefacts is usually regarded as a site. All sites have been grouped according to low, medium and high significance for the purpose of this report. Sites of low significance have no diagnostic artefacts, especially pottery. Sites of medium significance have diagnostic artefacts and these are sampled. Sampling includes the

collection of artefacts for future analysis. Sites of high significance are excavated or extensively sampled. The sites that are extensively sampled have high research potential, yet poor preservation of features.

Significance is generally determined by several factors. However, in this survey, a wider definition of significance is adopted since the aim of the survey is to gather as much information as possible from every site. This strategy allows for an analysis of every site in some detail, without resorting to excavation.

### **Defining significance**

Archaeological sites vary according to significance and several different criteria relate to each type of site. However, there are several criteria that allow for a general significance rating of archaeological sites.

These criteria are:

**1. State of preservation of:**

- 1.1. Organic remains:
  - 1.1.1. Faunal
  - 1.1.2. Botanical
- 1.2. Rock art
- 1.3. Walling
- 1.4. Presence of a cultural deposit
- 1.5. Features:
  - 1.5.1. Ash Features
  - 1.5.2. Graves
  - 1.5.3. Middens
  - 1.5.4. Cattle byres
  - 1.5.5. Bedding and ash complexes

**2. Spatial arrangements:**

- 2.1. Internal housing arrangements
- 2.2. Intra-site settlement patterns
- 2.3. Inter-site settlement patterns

**3. Features of the site:**

- 3.1. Are there any unusual, unique or rare artefacts or images at the site?
- 3.2. Is it a type site?

3.3. Does the site have a very good example of a specific time period, feature, or artefact?

**4. Research:**

4.1. Providing information on current research projects

4.2. Salvaging information for potential future research projects

**5. Inter- and intra-site variability**

5.1. Can this particular site yield information regarding intra-site variability, i.e. spatial relationships between various features and artefacts?

5.2. Can this particular site yield information about a community's social relationships within itself, or between other communities.

**6. Archaeological Experience:**

6.1. The personal experience and expertise of the CRM practitioner should not be ignored. Experience can indicate sites that have potentially significant aspects, but need to be tested prior to any conclusions.

**7. Educational:**

7.1. Does the site have the potential to be used as an educational instrument?

7.2. Does the site have the potential to become a tourist attraction?

7.3. The educational value of a site can only be fully determined after initial test-pit excavations and/or full excavations.

The more a site can fulfill the above criteria, the more significant it becomes. Test-pit excavations are used to test the full potential of an archaeological deposit. These test-pit excavations may require further excavations if the site is of significance. Sites may also be mapped and/or have artefacts sampled as a form of mitigation. Sampling normally occurs when the artefacts may be good examples of their type, but are not in a primary archaeological context. Mapping records the spatial relationship between features and artefacts.

### **Archaeological sites**

Three archaeological sites were recorded during the course of the survey. Two of these are of high significance, and one is of low significance.

### **MFR3**

This site is just over 10km from the Batloaka School on the right hand side of the road. The site is a scatter of Middle and Late Stone Age tools just below the sandstone outcrop. There is no visible cultural deposit and it appears that the site is an open scatter of tools.

The stone tools include:

- Cores
- Flakes
- unifacial point
- Naturally backed knife
- Thumbnail scraper
- Side scraper

Significance:

The site is of low archaeological significance

Mitigation:

No further mitigation is required for the site. However, a permit is needed for the destruction and/or damage to the site. The developer will need to apply for the permit.

### **MFR4**

This site is on the outskirts of MFR3, along the sandstone ridge just below the outcrop. The site consists two rock art images in a sandstone overhang. The overhang is approximately 3 m high, 7 m long and 2 m deep. There is a stonewalled feature in the front of the overhang and this is probably the remains of an enclosure for domestic animals. No cultural deposit was visible in the shelter. The images are well preserved.

The images are (from left to right):

1. Human in a running posture facing right.
2. Female Kudu facing left. The left forelegs are resting on a natural crack and are slightly higher than the hindlegs.

Significance:

The site is of high significance as the images are well preserved.

#### Mitigation:

No direct mitigation is required for the site. However, if the location of the sandstone quarry is chosen, then certain preclusions must be adhered to. These are discussed in the mitigation for MFR5.

#### **MFR5**

This site is approximately 50 m south of MFR4 in an overhang. The overhang is approximately 17 m long, 4 m deep and 0.5 m to 3 m high. The archaeological site consists of hunter-gatherer and a more recent farmer component. The site was divided into 1 m intervals for analyses.

The more recent farmer component consists of a small enclosure within the overhang. This enclosure is located at the 0 m to 1 m division. At the far back of the enclosure is a flat stone. This enclosure may be related to ritual activities often associated with southern African farmers. Amongst other things, these include rain making rituals.

The hunter-gatherer component consists of rock art images and a cultural deposit. These images begin from the 0 mark

1. Faded animal facing left in red. Indeterminate paint to the right
2. Very faded animal facing left, red smears of paint above.
3. Areas of red paint with white and black graffiti. One large animal torso (eland?)
4. Two red legs. One large human facing left bending forwards and one arm points backwards. The image has a white graffiti outline. Red smears to the right.
5. One human bending forward to the left. One arm extends backwards and the other touches the 'ground' – may be in a kneeling position.
6. No art
7. One red image (human?). Thin human to the right facing left.
8. One bichromatic female eland sitting down and facing left. The head, neck and legs are in white, while the rest are red. The front of the forelegs and back of the hind legs are outlined in red. Superimposed on the eland is an orange animal. Below is a group of seven humans facing right. The first three are superimposed by the elands legs. The fourth human has a bag with tassels. The fifth to seventh humans are very faded. To the right of the eland is a human male(?) facing right with a possible spear on the back and walking stick in other

hand. In front of this image is an inverted antelope in orange. Above this image is a very faded human facing left.

On the ridge to the right is a group of humans. The first four show signs of steatopygia and are sitting down with their arms in an upright position, suggesting a clapping posture. Above this is a faded red eland torso.

9. One very faded white antelope facing left with red paint above it. Two faded white antelope facing right. Above these is a bichromatic eland facing right. This eland appears to be superimposed on a red image (animal?) and a red male. To the right of this eland is one white antelope standing upright with its forelegs on the eland's head. To the right of this eland is one white antelope standing upright with its forelegs on the eland's head. To the right is a smaller white antelope. In this area are several red stripes/lines which could be reminiscent of human equipment. On far right are three humans. The first human faces left and has a faded infill face. The second faces left and has a white head, and carries a quiver with bows and arrows. The third human is below the previous two and faces right with a stick held in the hind hand. On the far right is a human that could be holding an arrow. Above this is a human figure facing left with one arm on the hip and the other arm faces forward. To the right of these are indeterminate images and three running human figures. On the next ledge is a group scene of at least 7 humans. The first human faces left, the second and third faces right and they hold long sticks in their hands. The fourth human is in a sitting posture. The last three humans are very faded. This panel appears to be a dancing scene. Above this scene is a shaded bichromatic eland female in brown and white facing left.

10. The lower ledges have faint paint smears. The upper ledge has three humans and one indeterminate red image. The first faces right with a long stick. The second and third humans are very faded.

11. Lower ledge has areas of red and white paint and one human in a possible running position. The upper ledge has an area of red paint and possible two humans. There are watermarks over the first human. Above this latter human is one human facing left.

12. White graffiti on top of a bichromatic (red and white) eland. Red paint to the right and of this eland. On the ledge above the eland are areas of red paint and indeterminate images. Above this are areas of very faded red paint and one animal with white ears, and two white stripes. To the right are two white animals superimposed on each other facing the opposite directions.

13. Areas of red paint, very faded humans and animals. On the roof is one running human facing right.

14. One indeterminate red image. One antelope with very fine legs. One animal with legs apart. Group of three humans near each other. The second human may have a quiver. Two humans to the right have quivers, and the second human is shooting an image with a bow and arrow. The latter image has been partially chipped. All of the above humans are facing right. Above these images is one human facing left with one arm on its hip and the other raised. The foreleg of this human has been chipped.

15. No art.

16. Group of three humans facing left. One animal torso below these humans.

### Significance

The site is of high archaeological significance. The shelter has a wide range of rock art and an archaeological deposit.

### Mitigation

It is unlikely that the site will be directly affected by the quarry. This is, however, true only if the sandstone quarry does not come close to the rock face where the art is located. Indirect damage may occur by structural weakening of the rock face and shelter as a result of the quarry. Detailed plans of the location of the quarry and its extent should be given to SAHRA to ensure that no indirect damage will occur. It may be preferable that this location is not used as a sandstone quarry. Another indirect impact will be the increase in dust of the area due to the quarry. Dust has the potential to damage rock art images, and mitigatory methods should be undertaken. Mitigation should be in the form of covering the art while the quarry is used.. This should be undertaken by a qualified person who has dealt with rock art.

### Conclusion

Three archaeological sites were recorded during the course of the archaeological survey between Ketekete and Mt Fletcher. Only one of these sites will be directly impacted by quarries, while two others may be indirectly affected. The latter two sites are of high archaeological significance and the contractors will need to liaise with SAHRA to ensure that the rock art sites are not damaged. The contractor will need to apply to SAHRA for a permit to damage the sites.



**Co-ordinates for the three archaeological sites**

MFR3:	S 30 46' 43"	E 28 32' 14"
MFR4	S 30 46' 47"	E 28 32' 21"
MFR5:	S 30 46' 46"	E 28 32' 21"