

**MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE
GRAVEYARD ON LILYVALE 2313
SUBDIVISION 7**

**BY ZOË HENDERSON
NATIONAL MUSEUM
BLOEMFONTEIN
OCTOBER 2005**

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Description of the site	3
Future position of the site and objectives	4
Stakeholders and responsible parties	5
Preservation of the site: requirements	6
Monitoring of the site	8
References	8
 APPENDIX 1: Extracts from Mangaung Local Municipality, by-laws relating to Municipal cemeteries	 9
APPENDIX 2: Extracts relevant to this report from the National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, (Sections 5, 36 and 47) and the Exhumations Ordinance, no. 12 of 1980.	 10
APPENDIX 3: Letter from Roodt partnership re. preservation of the Graveyard	 16
APPENDIX 4: Permit requirements from SAHRA	17
APPENDIX 5: Extract from Henderson 2004 report with description of the graveyard	18
Figure 1. Location of subdivision 3	
Figure 2. Location of graveyard on property	
Figure 3. Layout of the graveyard	

INTRODUCTION

A graveyard consisting of about 190 graves is located on the subdivision of the Lilyvale property, near to the Bloemendal Road (see Figs. 1 & 2). This graveyard, although marked on the 1951 1:50 000 map of Bloemfontein (2926AA), is not recorded in the municipal records (see Mangaung Local Municipality, By-laws relating to Municipal cemeteries, Appendix 1). The earliest, dated grave is from 1937, nearly 70 years ago. However, from its location within the graveyard, it is unlikely that it is the oldest grave. It would appear that there are a number of graves pre-dating this grave, making a substantial part of the graveyard older than 60 years. These graves would fall under regulations such as subsection 1 of Section 36 (see particularly 36 (3) (a) (b)) of the National Heritage Resources Act (see Appendix 2), and the Human Tissues Act. Exhumation of graves less than 60 years old would fall under the Exhumations Ordinance, Ordinance No.12 of 1980.

A Phase 1 archaeological impact assessment was carried out between December 2003 and January 2004 and a report submitted to SAHRA (Henderson 2004). The development on the property will not disturb the graveyard (see Appendix 3), but in terms of SAHRA requirements (Appendix 4), a management plan has to be submitted for the graveyard.

A management plan (in this case a conservation management plan) is designed to preserve, present and maintain a place and its values, and must provide objectives, clear operational requirements and future development guidance. It must also identify responsible parties, and include a monitoring process.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

A detailed description of the graveyard is given in Henderson (2004), and that section of the report is attached as Appendix 5. A brief summary only is given here.

The graveyard is a loose arrangement of about 190 graves (there may be more), arranged more-or-less in rows in a roughly north-south direction (Fig. 3). Only 11 of the graves have headstones on which details of the person buried in the grave are

given, and are still legible. On the basis of these 11 graves, it is clear that the graveyard was in use during a period of at least 30 years, up until 1965.

Records that could be traced relating to individuals buried in the graveyard indicate that the graves appear to be those of local farm workers in the Rayton area. The graves are mostly constructed in the manner traditional for farm workers' graves – dolerite head and footstones, with the grave covered by a heap of rocks and pebbles. Only one grave has a commercial marble headstone, and only 3 are demarcated by a brick rectangular outline. Of interest are 27 graves which have iron crosses. For the most part these crosses were handmade, and are reminiscent of British military grave markers.

The layout of the graveyard suggests that the most southerly 8 – 10 graves (grave nos 1, 3-7, 67-70 in Fig. 3) were laid out in a formal fashion, and that later the graveyard was subjected to more ad-hoc growth. Although there is as yet no concrete evidence for this, it is possible that the original set of graves were related to a settlement in the area during the Anglo-Boer War (possibly a black labour camp) and that as the settlement continued after the war, the graveyard continued to be used (Henderson 2004). This would also explain the presence of the “military”-style iron crosses on some of the graves (Benneyworth 2004).

Most of the graves have items placed on the graves, such as bottles, ceramics, and metal objects. There are also various other handmade grave markers.

FUTURE POSITION OF THE SITE AND OBJECTIVES

The graveyard will be incorporated into the development as a separate erf that will be zoned as an open space (Appendix 3). The graves will not be relocated, but will remain intact.

STAKEHOLDERS AND RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

Stakeholders:

The question needs to be addressed as to whether there are stakeholders from the community, and if so, whether, and how should they be involved in the process. There is no clarity on whether the graveyard is still visited by family members, or whether there is any local memory of the place. This would have to be determined, if thought necessary, by a separate process. However, no indications of visitation by relatives (eg flowers, offerings or tending of the graves) have been noticed by the Heritage Assessment team during sporadic visits to the graveyard over a period of nearly two years.

Responsible parties:

The owners of the property are responsible for the preservation of the graveyard. This will necessitate a medium-term and a long-term management plan for the graveyard. The medium-term plan will encompass the treatment of the graveyard during the development phase of the property. This is to ensure that there is no accidental damage to the graveyard during construction work, and also to ensure that there is no pillaging of the graves during that time.

The long-term plan will need to be set in place to ensure that the graveyard is maintained, that it does not become an area that is subject to vandalism or neglect within the development, and that it remains preserved.

The developers will have to bear responsibility for the implementation of the medium-term plan, and this will need to be monitored by SAHRA. The long-term plan will be the responsibility of the owners of the property, and this will need to be established, and agreements entered into before development takes place. Again, SAHRA will need to monitor the situation, unless there is an agreement reached with the Mangaung Municipality to take over the maintenance of the graveyard.

Decisions that will have to be made will include who controls access to the site by visitors, who will keep the site clean (ie of litter etc), and who will be responsible for general maintenance of the fencing, and also of the graveyard area itself. These decisions will have to be made by the relevant stakeholders, and responsibilities determined.

PRESERVATION OF THE SITE: REQUIREMENTS

The graveyard should not be developed further in any way, unless there is consensus about this between the various stakeholders, including SAHRA.

Medium-term plan:

The medium-term plan is to ensure that the graveyard is not damaged or vandalised during the construction phase of the project. Preservation of the site will require the determination of the extent of the area to be demarcated as the graveyard area. The graveyard will have to be fenced off for the duration of the construction phase of the project. The fence will have to be a sturdy construction, which will ensure that access to the graveyard is impossible, and with a lockable gate (if there is to be a gate).

Certain sensitive items from the graves can be kept at the National Museum for safekeeping during the development, and returned to the relevant graves once the development has been completed.

Long-term plan:

A decision will need to be made as to whether the graveyard should be permanently fenced. In terms of the continuous management of the graveyard, this is the recommended option, as it defines the area, and also makes monitoring of the state of the graveyard easier. It will also ensure that the graveyard is not used as a recreational area (eg. children playing on the graves) and that the area is treated with respect. The type of fence constructed to surround the area will need to meet both security and aesthetic requirements, and should be determined in consultation with SAHRA.

The following issues will also have to be addressed in the long-term plan:

1. Maintenance of the graveyard.

The graveyard is an informal one, and was located in the open veld. Some of this character should be maintained if possible. In other words, the graveyard should not be cleaned of all the vegetation growing between and on the graves, and should not be transformed with gravel or paving between the graves. The graves themselves should not be “neatened up” (this would be contrary to regulations), and neither should they be tampered with in any way.

However, a certain level of maintenance would have to be conducted. This would entail the cleaning of the site of alien vegetation (ie weeds which would be introduced from gardening activities etc after the development has been completed) and introduced grass. Litter will need to be removed, and it will be necessary to ensure that the fence is maintained, so that the site is not used for inappropriate or illegal activities.

A maintenance programme will have to be drawn up and the relevant parties responsible identified, as part of the agreements relating to the greater development of the Lilyvale subdivision, and the status of the property on which the graveyard is located.

2. Responsible parties.

These identified people will be responsible for the maintenance of the graveyard, the surrounding fence, and for monitoring the site for vandalism or other activities. In this situation the parties responsible need to be identified at an early stage of the development, and any legal documentation or agreements relating to the position of the development and its future relationship with any legal bodies, needs to take this aspect into account.

MONITORING OF THE SITE

It is essential that the site be monitored on a regular basis. This will be the function of the responsible parties identified above, but SAHRA should also monitor the site on an annual basis. The responsible parties for monitoring the site will include the owner of the site, the Municipality if they are to be involved in the maintenance of the site, and any other stakeholders identified. The owner will need to monitor the site on a continual basis, with a clearly identified procedure to be followed if maintenance (other than routine maintenance determined above) needs to proceed.

Monitoring and maintenance procedures need to be clearly defined within the agreements reached relating to the site.

REFERENCES

Benneyworth, G. 2004. Report on the burial site and associated terrain Lilyvale, Bloemfontein, Unpublished report.

Henderson, Z.L. 2004. Report on the archaeological survey of subdivision 7, remainder and portion of subdivision 25, of the farm Lilyvale 2313, Bloemfontein. Unpublished report

**APPENDIX 1: Extracts from Mangaung Local Municipality, by-laws relating to
Municipal cemeteries**

**MANGAUNG LOCAL MUNICIPALITY
BY-LAWS RELATING TO MUNICIPAL CEMETERIES
As promulgated by Local Government Notice
No. 97 of 27 September 2002**

Chapter 2

Establishment of management of Cemeteries

2. Establishment of cemeteries

- (1) The Council may from time to time set aside and reserve suitable municipal land within the municipality for the establishment and management of a cemetery. The Council may consider and approve an application for the establishment and maintaining of a private cemetery or a private columbarium on private land on conditions that the Council may deem necessary.
- (2) The following cemeteries have been established by the Council, and are currently managed and controlled by the Council:
 - (a) Bainsvlei Cemetery
 - (b) Bloemspruit Cemetery
 - (c) Heather Heights Cemetery
 - (d) Memoriam Cemetery
 - (e) Phahameng Cemetery
 - (f) South Park Cemetery
 - (g) Storm Avenue Cemetery
 - (h) Traditional cemeteries (Bloemfontein)
 - (i) Botshabelo cemeteries (2)
 - (j) Thaba Nchu urban cemeteries (18)
 - (k) Thaba Nchu rural cemeteries (38)

APPENDIX 2: Extracts relevant to this report from the National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, (Sections 5, 36 and 47) and the Exhumations Ordinance, no. 12 of 1980.

1. Extracts relevant to this report from the *National Heritage Resources Act* no. 25 of 1999, (Sections 5, 36 and 47):

General principles for heritage resources management

5. (1) All authorities, bodies and persons performing functions and exercising powers in terms of this Act for the management of heritage resources must recognise the following principles:

- (a) Heritage resources have lasting value in their own right and provide evidence of the origins of South African society and as they are valuable, finite, non-renewable and irreplaceable they must be carefully managed to ensure their survival;
 - (b) every generation has a moral responsibility to act as trustee of the national heritage for succeeding generations and the State has an obligation to manage heritage resources in the interests of all South Africans;
 - (c) heritage resources have the capacity to promote reconciliation, understanding and respect, and contribute to the development of a unifying South African identity; and
 - (d) heritage resources management must guard against the use of heritage for sectarian purposes or political gain.
- (2) To ensure that heritage resources are effectively managed—
- (a) the skills and capacities of persons and communities involved in heritage resources management must be developed; and
 - (b) provision must be made for the ongoing education and training of existing and new heritage resources management workers.
- (3) Laws, procedures and administrative practices must—
- (a) be clear and generally available to those affected thereby;
 - (b) in addition to serving as regulatory measures, also provide guidance and information to those affected thereby; and
 - (c) give further content to the fundamental rights set out in the Constitution.
- (4) Heritage resources form an important part of the history and beliefs of communities and must be managed in a way that acknowledges the right of affected communities to be consulted and to participate in their management.

(5) Heritage resources contribute significantly to research, education and tourism and they must be developed and presented for these purposes in a way that ensures dignity and respect for cultural values.

(6) Policy, administrative practice and legislation must promote the integration of heritage resources conservation in urban and rural planning and social and economic development.

(7) The identification, assessment and management of the heritage resources of South Africa must—

(a) take account of all relevant cultural values and indigenous knowledge systems;

(b) take account of material or cultural heritage value and involve the least possible alteration or loss of it;

(c) promote the use and enjoyment of and access to heritage resources, in a way consistent with their cultural significance and conservation needs;

(d) contribute to social and economic development;

(e) safeguard the options of present and future generations; and

(f) be fully researched, documented and recorded.

Burial grounds and graves

36. (1) Where it is not the responsibility of any other authority, SAHRA must conserve and generally care for burial grounds and graves protected in terms of this section, and it may make such arrangements for their conservation as it sees fit.

(2) SAHRA must identify and record the graves of victims of conflict and any other graves which it deems to be of cultural significance and may erect memorials associated with the grave referred to in subsection (1), and must maintain such memorials.

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

(a) destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;

(b) 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

(c) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

(4) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for the destruction or damage of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection (3)(a) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such graves, at the cost of the applicant and in accordance with any regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority.

(5) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for any activity under subsection (3)(b) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has, in accordance with regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority—
(a) made a concerted effort to contact and consult communities and individuals who by tradition have an interest in such grave or burial ground; and
(b) reached agreements with such communities and individuals regarding the future of such grave or burial ground.

(6) Subject to the provision of any other law, any person who in the course of development or any other activity discovers 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 resources authority which must, in co-operation with the South African Police Service and in accordance with regulations of the responsible heritage resources authority—

(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 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 arrangements as it deems fit.

(7) (a) SAHRA must, over a period of five years from the commencement of this Act, submit to the Minister for his or her approval lists of graves and burial grounds of persons connected with the liberation struggle and who died in exile or as a result of the action of State security forces or *agents provocateur* and which, after a process of

public consultation, it believes should be included among those protected under this section.

(b) The Minister must publish such lists as he or she approves in the *Gazette*.

(8) Subject to section 56(2), SAHRA has the power, with respect to the graves of victims of conflict outside the Republic, to perform any function of a provincial heritage resources authority in terms of this section.

(9) SAHRA must assist other State Departments in identifying graves in a foreign country of victims of conflict connected with the liberation struggle and, following negotiations with the next of kin, or relevant authorities, it may re-inter the remains of that person in a prominent place in the capital of the Republic.

General policy

47. (1) SAHRA and a provincial heritage resources authority—

(a) must, within three years after the commencement of this Act, adopt statements of general policy for the management of all heritage resources owned or controlled by it or vested in it; and

(b) may from time to time amend such statements so that they are adapted to changing circumstances or in accordance with increased knowledge; and

(c) must review any such statement within 10 years after its adoption.

(2) Each heritage resources authority must adopt for any place which is protected in terms of this Act and is owned or controlled by it or vested in it, a plan for the management of such place in accordance with the best environmental, heritage conservation, scientific and educational principles that can reasonably be applied taking into account the location, size and nature of the place and the resources of the authority concerned, and may from time to time review any such plan.

(3) A conservation management plan may at the discretion of the heritage resources authority concerned and for a period not exceeding 10 years, be operated either solely by the heritage resources authority or in conjunction with an environmental or tourism authority or under contractual arrangements, on such terms and conditions as the heritage resources authority may determine.

(4) Regulations by the heritage resources authority concerned must provide for a process whereby, prior to the adoption or amendment of any statement of general policy or any conservation management plan, the public and interested organisations

are notified of the availability of a draft statement or plan for inspection, and comment is invited and considered by the heritage resources authority concerned.

(5) A heritage resources authority may not act in any manner inconsistent with any statement of general policy or conservation management plan.

(6) All current statements of general policy and conservation management plans adopted by a heritage resources authority must be available for public inspection on request.

2. Extracts from *The Exhumations Ordinance, Ordinance no. 12 of 1980*

“To prohibit the desecration, destruction and damaging of graves in cemeteries and receptacles containing bodies; to regulate the exhumation, disturbance, removal and re-interment of bodies, and to provide for matters incidental thereto”.

A “cemetery” is defined as any land, whether public or private, containing one or more graves.

A “grave” includes:-

- (1) any place, whether wholly or partly above or below the level of ground and whether public or private, in which a body is permanently interred or intended to be permanently interred, whether in a coffin or other receptacle or not; and
- (2) any monument, tombstone, cross, inscription, rail, fence, chain, erection or other structure of whatsoever nature forming part of or appurtenant to a grave.

No person shall desecrate, destroy or damage any grave in a cemetery, or any coffin or urn without written approval of the Administrator.

No person shall exhume, disturb, remove or re-inter any body in a cemetery, or any coffin or urn without written approval of the Administrator.

Application must be made for such approval in writing, together with:

- (a) a statement of where the body is to be re-interred; and
- (b) why it is to be exhumed.
- (c) The methods proposed for exhumation.

Written permission from local authorities, nearest available relatives and their religious body owning or managing the cemetery; and where all such permission cannot be obtained, the application must give reasons why not.

The Administrator has the power to vary any conditions and to impose additional conditions.

5. Anyone found guilty and convicted is liable for a maximum fine of R200 and a maximum prison sentence of six months.

APPENDIX 3: Letter from Roodt partnership re. preservation of the graveyard

APPENDIX 4: Permit requirements from SAHRA

APPENDIX 5: extract from report by Henderson (2004)

NOTE: Fig. references refer to figures in the original report, which are not reproduced here.

1. Graveyard (Fig. 3).

190 graves were recorded. The plan of the graveyard is, however, irregular, and the number may be either less or more (Fig. 3). Six of the graves recorded are questionable (nos. 8, 17, 71, 80, 86 and 87), but there are also gaps in the layout of the graveyard where a grave could be expected. Therefore, the number is probably higher than 190. Grave numbers referred to in this report are numbers designated during the survey, and refer to the plan of the graveyard (Fig. 3), but do not appear in official records. Only a general description of the graves and graveyards are given here.

Form of the graves

The graves are mostly packed with dolerite cobbles, ranging in size from large to small (Fig. 4). A few have bricks packed over the graves (Fig. 5), and three are demarcated by a brick wall around the grave (Fig. 6). 60% of the graves have defined head and foot markers (Fig. 7a & b), 19% have just head markers, and 7% consist of only a head and foot marker, with no other covering of the grave. Table 1 presents a descriptive breakdown of the graves.

Table 1. Summary of grave descriptions

Description	Category	Frequency	Percentage of total no. of graves (190)
Shape	Oval	98	52
	Rectangular	58	30
	Round	8	4
	thin	3	1.5
	other & questionable	10	5
Covering	dolerite cobbles	154	81
	bricks	3	1.5
	dolerite & bricks	8	4
	brick wall around grave	3	1.5

	densely covered	78	41
	centre raised	82	43
Markers	Head & foot markers	114	60
	Head markers only	36	19
	Foot markers only	6	3
	Only head & foot markers (no other covering over grave)	13	7
	Additional head markers (e.g. crosses)	56	29
	Information still visible on head marker	11	6

The head and foot markers usually consist of a dolerite stone which was placed upright at the end of the grave, sometimes slightly off-set. The stone can be a natural rock, either a slab or square or rectangular shaped in cross-section. In 29% of the graves another marker was placed at the head of the grave. This was often in association with the dolerite headmarker (particularly in the case of the iron crosses, Fig. 8a, b & c). A summary of the head markers is presented in Table 2 (see also Fig. 9).

Table 2: Summary description of head markers on the graves

Marker type	Frequency	Percentage (of 56)	No. with visible inscription
Metal cross	27	48	0
Cement cross	9	16	3
Cement headstone	8	14	6
Shale headstone	1	2	not enough preserved to determine what was inscribed
Dolerite headstone	9	16	0
Marble headstone	1	2	1
Metal plate	1	2	1
TOTAL	56	100	11

The gravestones:

Most of the grave markers were hand-made. The marble headstone (and possibly the shale headstone as well) was commercially made (Fig. 10a & b). The cement crosses and headstones where the writing is still visible are covered in plaster, and the words have been scratched into the plaster (Fig. 11). On two of the cement crosses the writing was painted on, but is now no longer legible (Fig. 12). Two of the dolerite headstones (nos. 51 and 52) had crosses scratched onto the western side (i.e. side

away from the grave) of the headstones (Fig. 13). The metal crosses were made from various pieces of scrap metal, and also from the lids or top sections of drums (Fig. 14a, b, c, & d). The metal sheet (no. 167) had an inscription painted onto it, but most of it was illegible. The names on the 11 legible gravestones, together with any visible dates, are presented in Table 3.

The text on the gravestones is in English, apart from nos. 47, 117 and 167. No. 47 only has the name and date, so is impossible to determine, but nos. 117 and 167 have inscriptions in Sotho (Fig. 15). An attempt was made to trace any information on the people named, but there was only success in five of the cases. Only the most important details are discussed below.

Table 3: Names and other information recorded on 11 legible gravestones

Grave no. & description	Name	Date	Other information
26 - cement headstone	Sarel Nkoe	10 February 1937	100 years
47 - cement headstone	Andris Nkoe	1938	
117 - cement cross	Paolosi Thopa	3 November 1948	80 years, Roman Catholic Church
119 - cement cross	Augustina Molise	10 May 1948	
121 - cement headstone	Elias Nkoe	1950	
131 - cement headstone	Nicodimo Nkwe	16 January	
143 - cement headstone	Betty Nkoe	13 December 1958	
152 - cement cross	Jonnas Watersouk	20 April	60 years
153 - marble headstone	Clara Meyers	11/7/1925 - 3/8/1951	Rest in peace
162 - cement headstone	Dorah Nkwe	30 December 1957	with the age of 37 years
167 - metal plate	Gladys Ntab...	?1965	

Sarel Nkoe, grave no. 26 (Fig. 16):

According to the cemetery register (SBS 2/1/3/23, entry no. 195) Sarel Nkoe died at the Raytons Dairy Farm on 8 February 1937, and was buried there. His death was reported by Henry Nkoe on 10 February (the date which appears on his gravestone). There is an elaborate iron construction (rather like a fence panel) which probably

stood upright on the grave. There were five containers and a porcelain statuette on the grave as well.

Betty Nkoe, grave no. 143 (Fig. 17):

Betty Nkoe left an estate of £1-16-3 in a Post Office savings book (SOB 1/1/1/35, estate no. 178/58). She was unmarried and had lived at Plot 8, Rayton. Her father was Sarel Nkoe, and her brothers were listed as Henry, Fish and Solomon Nkoe. Her brother Henry lived at plot 8, Rayton, and was declared heir of the estate. Graves 26 and 143 would therefore appear to be those of father and daughter.

Augustina Molise, grave no. 119 (Fig. 11a):

Augustina Molise was born Thoopla, and died aged 20 at Tempe (SBS 2/1/3/38, entry no. 615). Her intended place of burial was Tempe.

Jonnas Watersouk, grave no. 152 (Fig. 11b):

In the cemetery records (SBS 2/1/3/40, entry no. 565) his name is spelt Jonas Watersoek, and he is reported as dying on 19 April 1950 at Rayton. His intended place of burial was listed as Rayton. His death was reported by Isaac Watersoek on 20 April.

Clara Meyers, grave no. 153 (Fig. 10a):

Clara Meyers was born Waterboer (SBS 2/1/3/42, entry no. 1138). She died at Rayton, and was to be buried there.

One of the other graves with a legible inscription was that of Paolosi Thopa (Fig. 15). No information could be traced about this person, but it seems possible that there was some family connection between him and Augustina Molise, who was born Thoopla. It is also possible that Jonnas Watersouk and Clara Meyers were related in some way. Meyers' maiden name is listed as Waterboer, but it is possible that it was supposed to be written Watersoek. One of the deaths listed in the cemetery records is that of Katie Letube (SBS 2/1/3/24, entry no 39). Her maiden name was Watersoek. She was murdered (it appears to have been domestic violence) on 20 October 1937 and had lived at "Rayton Dairy, Tempe". Her grave was not found, but it appears that the Watersoek family was a local one, as were the Nkoe/Nkwe (Fig. 18a, b, c &d) and

Thopa/Thoopa families. A Thoopha infant, Paulus, aged 1 month and 7 days, is recorded as dying at Rayton on 11 August 1951, and being buried there (SBS 2/1/3/42, entry no. 1188).

Dating of the graveyard

The graveyard was in use for a period of at least 21 years, and possibly as much as 28 years, if the date of 1965 is correctly deciphered on grave no. 167. The dates of 1937 and 1965 appear on graves on the most westerly and easterly (respectively) rows on the graveyard, which could possibly bracket the age of the use of the burial ground effectively.

Almost half of the graves had containers on them, which were presumably used to hold flowers, or to decorate the grave, along with statuettes and other items (Table 4, Fig 19a, b & c).

Most of the containers were glass jars (Fig. 20a & b) and cups (Fig. 21). Many of the graves had a selection of containers. Some of these containers provide dates, such as the *Peck's* anchovette bottles (Fig. 22) which date to 1926, or the *Allenburys Feeder* (for babies) dating to between 1920 and 1930. An Art Deco scent bottle dates to the 1930s, and spongewear fragments indicate a first half of the 20th century date. These ceramics were made up until the 1940s (Trehaven 1989). The containers found on the graves support a timespan from about the 1920s until the 1960s.

A commemorative container of 1938, issued for the centenary of the Great Trek (Fig. 23) fits with the dates on the gravestones, as does a cup from grave 136 marked *made in occupied Japan*. This would appear to relate to post World War II.

Table 4: summary of containers found on the graves

Material	Container type	Frequency (no. of graves with that particular category)
Glass	Bottles or jars	46
	(Peck's anchovette)	8
	Tumblers or wine glasses	13

	Dishes	13
	Containers	3
	Unidentifiable fragments	5
	Small bowls	4
Ceramics	Cups	28
	Bowls	7
	Plates	6
	Statuettes	3
	Unidentifiable fragments	10
Glass or ceramic	Vases	10
Earthenware	Jars/containers	3
	Tea pots / coffee pot	8 / 1
Metal	Containers	2
	Tins	7
Enamel	Bowl	1
	Mug	3
Other decoration on graves	Clock	1
	Perlemoen shell	1
	Irises (which had been planted)	1

Interpretation of the graveyard

The graveyard would appear to be that of local black people. Several other factors support the designation of an informal graveyard. First of all the layout of the graveyard is irregular (Fig. 3), which suggests that it was not controlled by officials or regulations. Although the dates on the graves are fairly consistent with a growth of the graveyard from west to east, there are several graves which are “out of phase” (see for instance nos. 143 and 162). This could suggest that certain areas might have been reserved for family members. Support for this supposition comes from the locations of the Thopa (no. 117) and Molise (no. 119) graves which are only separated by a single (unidentified) grave, and the Watersouk (no. 152) and Meyers (no. 153) graves which are next to each other.

Another feature of the graveyard is the construction of the graves themselves. Most of the graves have simple markers at the head and foot of dolerite rocks placed upright. These rocks had obviously been collected from the area. The crosses and headstones are also largely home-made. The only gravestone which was definitely commercially

made was the marble headstone of Clara Meyers. Only graves 117, 119 and 120 were surrounded by formal brick outlines (two bricks high), whereas the rest of the graves were packed with dolerite cobbles and boulders (in 8 cases also combined with bricks, and in 3 cases of bricks alone) from the local area.

The packing of the graves with dolerite boulders is similar to older graves, and is a continuation of a particular style of grave making. It is possible that the graveyard was initially started during the Anglo-Boer War, and related to the 'native location' nearby (see below for discussion of this). This 'location' was still present in 1913, and it happened in several cases that initial black locations or concentration camps became places of settlement after the war, as the people did not move away (J. Wolfaardt, pers comm.). It could be that the settlement continued for some time after the war, possibly up until the time that people were required to live in certain areas, or when Hillsboro was developed. The tradition of burial near to where one came from could explain the late dates on some of the graves, and also the fact that some of the gravestones with late dates are seemingly 'out of phase' with the 'growth' of the graveyard. People might have been living elsewhere, but were still brought 'home' to be buried. The presence of a settlement (even a small one) which endured over a fairly long period would also help to explain the number of graves, which is quite large to be merely the result of farm labourers in the area.

No official (municipal) records of the graveyard have yet been traced. However, the graveyard is marked on a 1951 1:50 000 map of Bloemfontein (no. 2926AA, Fig. 24). It would have been in use at the time. The 1999 edition of the map (fourth edition) does not mark the graveyard (Fig. 1).