

Report on Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment on Portions 7, 8, 23,  
24, 46 and 69 of the farm Maggiesdal 456 JT, Nelspruit,  
Mpumalanga Province.

Compiled by



For  
Eco8 Environmental Planners CC  
Surveyor: Mr JP Celliers  
8 November, 2012

## Contents

Executive Summary	p. 3.
1. Introduction	p. 5.
2. Description of surveyed area	p. 7.
3. Methodology	p. 7.
4. History and Archaeology	p. 12.
4.1. Historic Period	p. 12.
4.1.1. Early History	p. 12.
4.1.2. The Voortrekkers	p. 15.
4.2. Archaeology	p. 18.
4.2.1. Stone Age	p. 18.
4.2.1.1. Early Stone Age	p. 18.
4.2.2. Middle Stone Age	p. 19.
4.2.3. Late Stone Age	p. 20.
4.2.4. Early Iron Age	p. 21.
4.2.5. Late Iron Age	p. 24.
5. Located sites, their description and suggested mitigation	p. 26.
6. Findings and recommendations	p. 40.
7. Bibliography	p. 42.
8. Appendix A – Terminology	p. 44.
9. Appendix B – List of located sites	p. 50.
10. Appendix C – Maps	p. 51.
1:50 000 location map	
Aerial photo location	
11. Appendix D – Photos of located sites	p. 56.

## **Executive summary**

**Site name and location:** Portions 7, 8, 23, 24, 46 and 69 of the farm Maggiesdal 456 JT.

**Purpose of the study:** An Archaeological Impact Assessment was conducted in order to locate remains of heritage significance in respect of a proposed township development.

**1:50 000 Topographical Map:** 2530 DB

**EIA Consultant:** Eco8 Environmental Planners, Mr Riaan Visagie.  
Tel: +2782 520 0461. E-mail: eco8@vodamail.co.za

**Client:** Braam van Staden Landmeters. Tel: +2713 753 2895

**Heritage Consultant:** Kudzala Antiquity CC.  
Contact person: Jean-Pierre (JP) Celliers Tel: +27 82 779 3748  
E-mail: [kudzala@lantic.net](mailto:kudzala@lantic.net)

**Report date:** 8 November 2012

### **Description and findings:**

An Archaeological Impact Assessment was conducted by Kudzala Antiquity CC for Eco8 Environmental Planners on Portions 7, 8, 23, 24, 46 and 69 of the farm Maggiesdal 456 JT, Nelspruit, Mpumalanga Province. This forms part of legislative requirements as appears in section 38 of the National Heritage Resources act (25 of 1999).

The survey was conducted on foot and with the aid of a motor vehicle in an effort to locate archaeological remains and historic features. The area is situated east of the R40 road between Nelspruit and Barberton.

Seventeen sites were documented. The sites comprise two graveyards with unmarked graves (Sites MAN 1 and MAN 4) considered to be of high significance; historic ruins of farm workers dwellings (Sites MAN 2, 3, 6-9; 16) which are considered to be sites of low to medium significance. One historic house (Site MAN 5) considered as low significance. A picnic area (MAN 17) of low significance. There are also LIA (Late Iron Age) sites considered to be of medium to high significance (Sites MAN 10-15). Significance allocations and mitigation measures are detailed in Section 5 of this report. Graves and

graveyards containing graves older than 60 years are protected by Section 36 of the NHRA (National Heritage Resources Act, 25 of 1999) and should there be any impact on these, a permit is required from the relevant heritage authority (SAHRA). Archaeological sites and features are protected by Section 35 of the NHRA and also require permitting before any impact is planned or executed.

**Disclaimer:** *Although all possible care is taken to identify all sites of cultural importance during the investigation of study areas, it is always possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the study. Kudzala Antiquity CC will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.*

**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 Kudzala Antiquity CC. 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 Kudzala Antiquity CC. The Client, on acceptance of any submission by Kudzala Antiquity CC and on condition that the Client pays to Kudzala Antiquity CC the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:

- The results of the project;
- The technology described in any report
- Recommendations delivered to the Client.

## 1. Introduction

Kudzala Antiquity CC was commissioned to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) on Portions 7, 8, 23, 24, 46 and 69 of the farm Maggiesdal 456 JT, Nespruit, Mpumalanga Province. The affected area, approximately 90 hectares in extent, is located within the boundaries of the Mbombela Local Municipal area.

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25, 1999, section 38) and the NEMA (National Environmental Management Act No. 107 of 1998) requires of individuals (engineers, farmers, mines and industry) or institutions to have specialist heritage impact assessment studies undertaken whenever any development activities are planned. This is to ensure that heritage features or sites that qualify as part of the national estate are properly managed and not damaged or destroyed.

Heritage resources considered to be part of the national estate include those that are of Cultural, historical significance or have other special value to the present community or future generations.

The national estate may include:

- places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance;
- places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
- historical settlements and townscapes;
- landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- archaeological and palaeontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds including:
  - (i) ancestral graves;
  - (ii) royal graves and graves of traditional leaders;
  - (iii) graves of victims of conflict;
  - (iv) graves of individuals designated by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette*;
  - (v) historical graves and cemeteries; and

other human remains which are not covered in terms of the Human Tissue Act, 1983 (Act No. 65 of 1983);

- sites of significance relating to slavery in South Africa;
- movable objects including:
  - (i) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
  - (ii) objects to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
  - (iii) ethnographic art and objects;
  - (iv) military objects
  - (v) objects of decorative or fine art;
  - (vi) objects of scientific or technological interest; and

books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic, film or video material or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1 of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996).

Cultural resources are unique and non-renewable physical phenomena (of natural occurrence or made by humans) that can be associated with human (cultural) activities (Van Vollenhoven, 1995:3).

These would be any man-made structure, tool, object of art or waste that was left behind on or beneath the soil surface by historic or pre-historic communities. These remains, when studied in their original context by archaeologists, are interpreted in an attempt to understand, identify and reconstruct the activities and lifestyles of past communities. When these items are disturbed from their original context, any meaningful information they possess is lost, therefore it is important to locate and identify such remains before construction or development activities commence.

An AIA consists of three phases, this document deals with the first phase. This (phase 1) investigation is aimed at getting an overview of cultural resources in a given area, thereby assessing the possible impact a proposed development may have on these resources.

When the archaeologist encounters a situation where the planned project will lead to the destruction or alteration of an archaeological site, a second phase in the survey is

normally recommended. During a phase two investigation, the impact assessment of development activities on identified cultural resources is intensified and detailed investigation into the nature and origin of the cultural material is undertaken. Often at this stage, archaeological excavation is carried out in order to document and preserve the cultural heritage.

Phase three consists of the compiling of a management plan for the safeguarding, conservation, interpretation and utilization of cultural resources (Van Vollenhoven, 2002).

Continuous communication between the developer and surveyor may result in the modification of a planned route or development to incorporate or protect existing archaeological sites.

## **2. Description of surveyed area**

The study area falls within the Mbombela Local Municipality, Mpumalanga Province. The survey was carried out on Portions of the farm Maggiesdal 456 JT. The area is situated east of the R40 road between Nelspruit and Barberton.

**Veld type:** Legogote Sour Bushveld. Located in gently to moderately sloping upper pediment slopes and dense woodland, including large and medium shrubs. Short thicket occur on rocky sites and granite outcrops are common (Mucina and Rutherford, 2009).

**Geology:** Mostly gneiss and migmatite of the Nelspruit Suite (Mucina and Rutherford, 2009).

The survey was conducted on foot and with the use of a motor vehicle in an effort to locate cultural remains.

## **3. Methodology**

The methodological approach for this study meets the requirements of relevant heritage legislation. A desktop archival study followed by a physical survey of the impacted areas was conducted. This was done to assess whether graves or features of historical or archaeological value exist on the property.

SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency) and the relevant legislation (Act 25

of 1999, National Heritage Resources Act) require that the following components be included in an Archaeological impact assessment:

- Archaeology
- Shipwrecks
- Battlefields
- Graves
- Structures older than 60 years
- Living heritage
- Historical settlements
- Landscapes
- Geological sites
- Palaeontological sites and objects

All the above-mentioned heritage components are addressed in this report, except shipwrecks, geological sites and palaeontological sites and objects as these are not within the expertise of the surveyor.

The purpose of the archaeological study is to establish the whereabouts and nature of cultural heritage sites should they occur on the surveyed area. This includes settlements, structures and artefacts which have value for an individual or group of people in terms of historical, archaeological, architectural - built environment) and human (cultural) development.

It is the aim of this study to locate and identify such objects or places in order to assess whether they are of significance and warrant further investigation or protection. This is done by means of foot surveys, a desktop archival study as well as a study of the results of previous archaeological work in the area.

### **3.1. Desktop study**

The purpose of the desktop study is to compile as much information as possible on the heritage resources of the area. This helps to provide an historical context for located sites.



**Social Consultation:** During this survey, residents on the property were consulted to establish whether any graves and historical or archaeological features are located in the area. The Informants consulted in this regard was manager of the farms Mr Johan van Wyk and previous owner Mr David Roets.

Sources used for this study included published and unpublished documents, archival material and maps. Material obtained from the following institutions or individuals were consulted:

- Lydenburg Museum, Lydenburg
- Published and unpublished archaeological reports and articles
- Published and unpublished historical reports and articles

### **3.1.1. Previous Archaeological studies in the area**

The SAHRA database was used to gather information on previous Archaeological Impact Assessments conducted in the area. A study by Celliers (2005) done on a nearby farm Beryl 313 JT, revealed no significant cultural remains. Another study by Celliers (2008) on Portion 25 of Maggiesdal 456 JT, revealed a single grave (significant) and some houses of low significance.

### **3.2. Significance of sites**

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) formulated guidelines for the conservation of all cultural resources and therefore also divided such sites into three main categories. These categories might be seen as guidelines that suggest the extent of protection a given site might receive. They include sites or features of local (Grade 3) provincial (Grade 2) and national (Grade 1) significance.

For practical purposes the surveyor uses his own classification for sites or features and divides them into three groups, those of low or no significance, those of medium significance, those of high significance.

Regarding the establishment of the significance of a site or feature certain classifications of significance is allocated to a site or feature (Also see section 5. Located sites and their description).

These include:

- **Types of significance**

The site's scientific, aesthetic and historic significance or a combination of these is established.

- **Degrees of significance**

The archaeological or historic site's rarity and representative value is considered. The condition of the site is also an important consideration.

- **Spheres of significance**

Sites are categorized as being significant in the international, national, provincial, regional or local context. Significance of a site for a specific community is also taken into consideration.

To arrive at a specific allocation of significance of a site or feature, the archaeologist considers the following:

- Historic context
- Archaeological context or scientific value
- Social value
- Aesthetic value

More specific criteria used by the specialist in order to allocate value or significance to a site include:

- The unique nature of a site
- The integrity of the archaeological deposit
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site
- The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features
- The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined or is known)
- The preservation condition of the site
- Quality of the archaeological or historic material of the site
- Quantity of sites and site features

In short, archaeological and historic sites containing data which may significantly enhance knowledge that archaeologists currently have about our cultural heritage

should be considered highly valuable. In all instances these sites should be preserved and not damaged during construction activities. When development activities do however jeopardize the future of such a site, a second and third phase in the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) process is normally advised which entails the excavation or rescue excavation of cultural material along with a management plan to be drafted for the preservation of the site or sites.

Graves are considered very sensitive sites and should never under any circumstances be jeopardized by development activities. Graves are incorporated in the National Heritage Resources Act under section 36 and in all instances where graves are found by the surveyor, the recommendation would be to steer clear of these areas. If this is not possible or if construction activities have for some reason damaged graves, specialized consultants are normally contacted to aid in the process of exhumation and reinterment of the human remains.

## **4. History and Archaeology**

### **4.1. Historic period**

#### **4.1.1. Early History**

The first inhabitants of the eastern Lowveld were probably the San or Bushmen. They were a nomadic people who lived together in small family groups and relied on hunting and gathering of food for survival. Evidence of their existence is to be found in numerous rock shelters throughout the Lowveld where some of their rock paintings are still visible. A number of these shelters have been documented in the Nelspruit area (Bornman, 1995; Schoonraad in Barnard, 1975). It has been argued that the red ochre source for these paintings is to be found at Dumaneni, near Malelane (Bornman, 1995).

Two Late-Holocene (Later Stone Age) sites near Hazyview in the Kruger National Park date to the last 2500 years and are associated with pottery and microlith stone tools (Bergh, 1998: 95). This is contemporary to typical hunter-gatherer lifestyle and may also have been sites frequented by San.

It was only later that Bantu-speaking tribes moved into this area from the northern parts of Southern Africa and settled here. This period is referred to as the Early Iron Age (AD 200-1500 approx.). These were presumably Sotho-Tswana herder groups.

Various historians and ethnographers describe that the Lowveld was frequented by Swazi and Sotho-Tswana groups during historic times i.e. Late Iron Age times during the period AD 1500-1800. (Barnard, 1975; Bergh, 1998; Bornman, 2002; Herbst, 1985; Myburgh, 1949).

Old trade routes were well established before the period of Colonial expansion and these routes mainly existed as a direct consequence of metallurgy and mining for iron, tin, copper and some gold to make weapons, agricultural equipment and ornaments (Bergh, 1998:103). The earliest signs of iron mining and working in the old Transvaal dates to approximately 300 AD and copper mining and working in Southern Africa may have been practiced as early as 620 AD (Bergh, 1998:103).

These people were responsible for the establishment of large centres like Monomotapa the Zimbabwe Complex and also the famed Mapungubwe in the Limpopo valley. At around 900 AD Arab merchants established a trade post at Sofala (Beira). Since the start of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, these Arabs had trade relations with the people of Zimbabwe. Textiles, porcelain and glass beads were traded for gold, ivory and other minerals.

An ancient trade route passed close-by the current Nelspruit and started from Delagoabay in a westward direction through the Lowveld towards the gold fields of Lydenburg, by passing through Malalapoort, the Nkhomati and Crocodile Rivers to Skipberg in the current Kruger National Park close-by the place where Pretoriuskop Rest Camp is located. From here onwards there were two possible routes up the mountains to reach the goldfields. The first one passed by Spitskop (Sabie) and from there on to Lydenburg. The second passed south of the “Devils Knuckles” to Lydenburg. The Voortrekkers used this route in 1845 when making the wagon route between Ohrigstad and Delagoabay (Berg, 1998: 104). There were also several linking routes to existing main routes, one of which started from Sabie or Lydenburg to the route which linked Delagoabay to the Soutpansberg via Pilgrim’s Rest. It is also believed that a footpath existed at the foothills of the (Transvaal) Drakensberg which led around the mountain to link again with a major route alongside the Olifants River (Bergh, 1998:104).

In 1721 Dutch sailors reached Delagoa Bay and settled there for nine years, during this time they launched a number of expeditions inland. During August 1723 lieutenant Jan Steffler and 17 men launched the first of these expeditions but they were ambushed by natives shortly after crossing the Lebombo Mountains. Exactly where they crossed the mountains is uncertain but it is possible that they were actually in northern Swaziland when they were attacked. Steffler succumbed as a result of this ambush and his followers returned to Delagoa Bay (Bergh, 1998:116).

A second attempt to create an inland route took place two years later in June 1725 when Francois de Cuiper and 34 men departed from Delagoa Bay and travelled in a north-western direction. They reached Gomondwano in the current Kruger National Park where they were also attacked by a local tribe. This resulted in them also having to return to

Delagoa Bay. Although this attempt was also not successful, it is seen as the first European intrusion into this northern area (Bergh, 1998:116).

In the (Eastern Transvaal) Lowveld a sub-group of the Northern Sotho, known as the eastern Sotho, were present nearby the eastern escarpment. They are known as the Pulana, Pai (emaMbayi) and Kutswe, these people moved from northern Swaziland further northwards when Swazi expanded into this area during the *mfecane* (Bergh, 1998:107-108). One of the recorded events relates to the attack of the Ndwande under Zwide on the Pedi in 1825 (Bergh, 1998:114-115). This seems to have started from the Lowveld in the region of the Pretoriuskop area towards Steelpoort.

During the nineteenth century the Lowveld area of Mpumalanga was extensively settled by both Bantu and European groups that migrated into this area. Bantu migration was mainly as a result of political upheaval during the *mfecane* (“the crushing” in Nguni). This was a period of bloody tribal and faction struggles in present-day KwaZulu Natal and on the Highveld area, which occurred around the early 1820’s until the late 1830’s (Bergh, 1998). It came about in response to heightened competition for land and trade, and caused population groups like gun-carrying Griquas and Shaka’s Zulus to attack other tribes (Giliomee, 2003). During this period, a movement of Swazi people took place to the areas north and northwest of Swaziland. As a result reports indicate that the Swazi were living in the Lowveld area by the 1840’s (Bergh, 1998).

Before the *mfecane* period (1820’s) small farmer groups including the Pai and Pulana resided in the mountainous area surrounding Barberton and Nelspruit. The conflict during the *mfecane*, when the Swazi under Mswati II raided these smaller groups, resulted in scattered settlement of those who managed to escape the Swazi onslaught. Evidence of these scattered settlements are sometimes found in the form of small stone walled enclosures in and around Barberton, Nelspruit and onwards to the Schoemanskloof.

According to Bornman:

“Mswati continued his attacks on the emaMbayi (Sotho) tribes living south of the Ngwenya (Crocodile) and the Mlambongwane (Kaap) Rivers, who fled into the present

day Kruger National Park and into the mountainous area of Mphakeni (Crocodile Gorge) and the Three Sisters Mountains. But as soon as the Swazi army had retreated, the emaMbayi returned to their old haunts and reoccupied them.

Again the Swazi regiments drove the emaMbayi from this area. The battle, which took place near the creek, today known as Low's Creek, west of the Three Sisters Mountain, was so fierce that the creek ran red with the blood of the slain. After the battle the Swazi named the creek: the red (or blood) river (Mantibovu) and the Three Sisters they named Mbayiyane, meaning the 'mountain of the emaMbayi'.

Mswati proceeded systematically to settle this area with members of his own family and trusted commoners after they killed Tsibeni and evicted the remnants of his people who fled to an area near Legogote, where they are still living today" (Bornman, 1995).

Archaeological evidence recorded in *Prehistory of the Transvaal: a record of human activity* does however refer to the presence of terraced settlement and a set of "unusual group of walls" that most likely indicates the presence of a small Iron Age agricultural village in the vicinity of the area in which the farm is located in Mpumalanga (Mason, 1962). Information cited in the *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies* confirms the presence of Late Iron Age settlements in the area between ca 1000 and 1800 (Bergh, 1998).

#### **4.1.2. The Voortrekkers**

The Groot Trek of the Voortrekkers started with the Tregardt- van Rensburg trek in 1835. The two men met where Tregardt and his followers crossed the Orange River at Buffelsvlei (Aliwal North). Here van Rensburg joined the trek northwards. On August 23, 1837 the Tregardt trek left for Delagoabay from the Soutpansberg. They travelled eastwards alongside the Olifants River to the eastern foothills of the Drakensberg. From here they travelled through the Lowveld and the current Kruger National Park where they eventually crossed the Lebombo mountains in March 1838. They reached the Fortification at Lourenço Marques on 13 April 1838 (Bergh, 1998:124-125).

Permanent European (Voortrekker) settlement of the eastern areas of Mpumalanga can first be traced back to a commission under the leadership of A.H. (Hendrik) Potgieter who negotiated with the Portuguese Governor at Delagoabaai in 1844 for land. It was agreed that these settlers could settle in an area that was four days journey from the east coast of Africa between the 10° and 26° south latitudes. Voortrekkers started migrating into the area in 1845. Andries-Ohrigstad was the first town established in this area in July 1845 after the Voortrekkers successfully negotiated for land with the Pedi Chief Sekwati. Farms were given out as far west as the Olifants River. The western boundary was not officially defined but at a Volksraad meeting in 1849 it was decided that the Elands River would be the boundary between the districts of Potchefstroom and Lydenburg as this eastern portion of the Transvaal was then known (Bergh, 1998).

Due to internal strife and differences between the various Voortrekker groups that settled in the broader Transvaal region, the settlers in the Ohrigstad area now governed from the town of Lydenburg decided to secede from the Transvaal Republic in 1856. The Republic of Lydenburg laid claim to a large area that included not only the land originally obtained from the Pedi Chief Sekwati in 1849 but also other areas of land negotiated for from the Swazis. The Republic of Lydenburg was a vast area and stretched from the northern Strydpoort mountains to Wakkerstroom in the south and Bronkhortsspruit in the west to the Swazi border and the Lebombo mountains east.

As can be expected, the migration of Europeans into the north would have a significant impact on the indigenous people who populated the land. This was also the case in Mpumalanga. In 1839 Mswati succeeded Sobhuza (also known as Somhlomo) as king of the Swazi. Threatened by the ambitions of his half brothers, including Malambule, who had support from the Zulu king Mpande, he turned to the Ohrigstad Boers for protection. He claimed that the land that the Boers had settled on was Swazi property. The Commandant General of the Ohrigstad settlement, Andries Hendrik Potgieter, responded that the land was ceded to him by the Pedi leader Sekwati, in return for protection of the Pedi from Swazi attacks (Giliomee, 2003).



However, in reaction to the increasingly authoritarian way in which Potgieter conducted affairs at Ohrigstad, the Volksraad of Ohrigstad saw Mswati's offer as a means to obtain more respectable title deeds for the property (Bonner, 1978). According to a sales contract set up between the Afrikaners and the Swazi people on 25 July 1846, the former were the rightful owners of the land that had its southern border at the Crocodile River, which stretched out in a westerly direction up to Elandspruit; of which the eastern border was where the Crocodile and Komati rivers joined and then extended up to Delagoa bay in the north (Van Rooyen, 1951). The Europeans bought the land for a 100 heads of cattle (Huyser).

## **4.2. Archaeology**

### **4.2.1. Stone Age**

In Mpumalanga Province the Drakensberg separates the interior plateau also known as the higveld from the low-lying subtropical Lowveld which stretches to the Indian Ocean. A number of rivers amalgamate into two main river systems, the Olifants River and the Komati River. This fertile landscape has provided resources for humans and their predecessors for more than 1,7million years (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

The initial attraction of abundant foods in the form of animals and plants eventually also led to the discovery of and utilisation of various minerals including ochre, iron and copper. People also obtained foreign resources by means of trade from the coast. From 900AD this included objects which were brought across the ocean from foreign shores.

### **4.2.2. The Early Stone Age (ESA)**

In South Africa the ESA dates from about 2 million to 250 000 thousand years ago in other words from the early to middle Pleistocene. The archaeological record shows that as the early ancestors progressed physically, mentally and socially, bone and stone tools were developed. One of the most influential advances was their control of fire and diversifying their diet by exploitation of the natural environment (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

The earliest tools date to around 2, 5 million years ago from the site of Gona in Ethiopia. Stone tools from this site shows that early hominids had to cognitive ability to select raw material and shape it for a specific application. Many bones found in association with stone tools like these have cut marks which lead scientists to believe that early hominids purposefully chipped cobblestones to produce flakes with a sharp edge capable of cutting and butchering animals carcasses. This supplementary diet of higher protein quantities ensured that brain development of hominids took place more rapidly.

Mary Leaky discovered tools like these in the Olduvai Gorge in Tanzania during the 1960s. The tools are named after this gorge and is known as the Oldowan industry. These tools, only found in Africa, are mainly simple flakes which were struck from cobbles.

This method of manufacture remained for about 1,5 million years. Although there is continuing debate about who made these tools, two hominids may have been responsible. The first of these was an early form of *Homo* and the second was *Parathropus robustus*, which became extinct about 1 million years ago (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

Some time later, around 1,7 million years ago more specialised tools known as Acheulean tools, appeared. These are named after tools from a site in France by the name of Saint Acheul, where they were first discovered in the 1800s. It is argued that these tools had their origin in Africa and then spread towards Europe and Asia with the movement of hominids out of Africa. These tools had longer and sharper edges and shapes which suggests that they could be used for a larger range of activities which included the butchering of animals, chopping of wood, digging roots and cracking bone. *Homo ergaster* was probably responsible for the manufacture of Acheulean tools in South Africa. This physical type was arguably physically similar to modern humans, a larger brain and modern face, body height and proportion are all characteristics which are very similar to us. *Homo ergaster* was able to flourish in a variety of habitats in part because they were dependent on tools. They adapted to drier, more open grassland settings. Because these early people were often associated with water sources such as rivers and lakes, sites where they left evidence of their occupation are very rare. Most tools of these people have been washed into caves, eroded out of riverbanks and washed downriver. An example in Mpumalanga is Maleoskop on the farm Rietkloof where ESA tools have been found. This is one of only a handful of such sites in Mpumalanga.

#### **4.2.3. Middle Stone Age (MSA)**

A greater variety of tools with diverse sizes and shapes appeared by 250 000 BP. These replaced the large hand axes and cleavers of the ESA. This technological advancement introduces the Middle Stone Age (MSA). This period is characterised by tools which are smaller in size but different in manufacturing technique (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

In contrast to the ESA technology of removing flakes from a core, MSA tools were flakes to start with. They were of a predetermined size and shape and were made by preparing a

core of suitable material and striking off the flake so that it was flaked according to a shape which the toolmaker desired. Elongated, parallel-sided blades, as well as triangular flakes are common finds in these assemblages. Mounting of stone tools onto wood or bone to produce spears, knives and axes became popular during the MSA. These early humans not only settled close to water sources but also occupied caves and shelters. The MSA represents the transition of more archaic physical type (*Homo*) to anatomically modern humans, *Homo sapiens*.

The MSA has not been extensively studied in Mpumalanga but evidence of this period has been excavated at Bushman Rock Shelter, a well-known site on the farm Klipfonteinhoek in the Ohrigstad district. This cave was excavated twice in the 1960s by Louw and later by Eloff. The MSA layers show that the cave was repeatedly visited over a long period. Lower layers have been dated to over 40 000 BP while the top layers date to approximately 27 000 BP (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

#### **4.2.4. Later Stone Age (LSA)**

Early hunter gatherer societies were responsible for a number of technological innovations and social transformations during this period starting at around 20 000 years BP. Hunting of animals proved more successful with the innovation of the bow and link-shaft arrow. These arrows were made up of a bone tip which was poisoned and loosely linked to the main shaft of the arrow. Upon impact, the tip and shaft separated leaving the poisoned arrow-tip imbedded in the prey animal. Additional innovations include bored stones used as digging stick weights to uproot tubers and roots; small stone tools, mostly less than 25mm long, used for cutting of meat and scraping of hides; polished bone tools such as needles; twine made from plant fibres and leather; tortoiseshell bowls; ostrich eggshell beads; as well as other ornaments and artwork (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007).

At Bushman Rock Shelter the MSA is also represented and starts at around 12 000 BP but only lasted for some 3 000 years. The LSA is of importance in geological terms as it marks the transition from the Pleistocene to the Holocene which was accompanied by a gradual shift from cooler to warmer temperatures. This change had its greatest influence

on the higher lying areas of South Africa. Both Bushman Rock Shelter and a nearby site, Heuningneskrans, have revealed a greater use in plant foods and fruit during this period (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

Faunal evidence suggests that LSA hunter-gatherers trapped and hunted zebra, warthog and bovids of various sizes. They also diversified their protein diet by gathering tortoises and land snails (*Achatina*) in large quantities.

Ostrich eggshell beads were found in most of the levels at these two sites. It appears that there is a gap of approximately 4 000 years in the Mpumalanga LSA record between 9 000 BP and 5 000 BP. This may be a result of generally little Stone Age research being conducted in the province. It is, however, also a period known for rapid warming and major climate fluctuation which may have led people to seek out protected environments in this area. The Mpumalanga Stone Age sequence is visible again during the mid-Holocene at the farm Honingklip near Badplaas in the Carolina district (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

At this location, two LSA sites were located on opposite sides of the Nhlazatshe River, about one kilometre west of its confluence with the Teespruit. These two sites are located on the foothills of the Drakensberg where the climate is warmer than the Highveld but also cooler than the lowveld (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

Nearby the sites, dated to between 4 870 BP and 200 BP are four panels which contain rock art. Colouring material is present in all the excavated layers of the site which makes it difficult to determine whether the rock art was painted during the mid- or later Holocene. Stone walls at both sites date from the last 250 years of hunter gatherer occupation and they may have served as protection from predators and intruders (Esterhuizen & Smith in Delius, 2007; Bergh, 1998).

#### **4.2.5. Early Iron Age**

The period referred to as the Early Iron Age (AD 200-1500 approx.) started when presumably Karanga (north-east African) herder groups moved into the north eastern

parts of South Africa. It is believed that these people may have been responsible for making of the famous Lydenburg Heads, ceramic masks dating to approximately 600AD.

Ludwig von Bezing was a boy of more or less 10 years of age when he first saw pieces of the now famous Lydenburg heads in 1957 while playing in the veld on his father's farm near Lydenburg. Five years later von Bezing developed an interest in archaeology and went back to where he first saw the shards. Between 1962 and 1966 he frequently visited the Sterkspruit valley to collect pieces of the seven clay heads. Von Bezing joined the archaeological club of the University of Cape Town when he studied medicine at this institution. He took his finds to the university at the insistence of the club. He had not only found the heads, but potsherds, iron beads, copper beads, ostrich eggshell beads, pieces of bones and millstones. Archaeologists of the University of Cape Town and WITS Prof. Ray Innskeep and Dr Mike Evers excavated the site where von Bezing found the remains. This site and in particular its unique finds (heads, clay masks) instantly became internationally famous and was henceforth known as the Lydenburg Heads site.

Two of the clay masks are large enough to probably fit over the head of a child, the other five is approximately half that size. The masks have both human and animal features, a characteristic that may explain that they had symbolic use during initiation- and other religious ceremonies. Carbon dating proved that the heads date to approximately 600 AD and was made by Early Iron Age people. These people were Bantu herders and agriculturists and probably populated Southern Africa from areas north-east of the Limpopo river. Similar ceramics were later found in the Gustav Klingbiel Nature Reserve and researchers believe that they are related to the ceramic wares (pottery) of the Lydenburg Heads site in form, function and decorative motive. This sequence of pottery is formally known as the Klingbiel type pottery. No clay masks were found in similar context to this pottery sequence.

Two larger heads and five smaller ones make up the Lydenburg find. The heads are made of the same clay used in making household pottery. It is also made with the same technique used in the manufacture of household pottery. The smaller heads display the modeling of a curved forehead and the back neck as it curves into the skull. Around the neck of each of the heads, two or three rings are engraved horizontally and are filled in

with hatching marks to form a pattern. A ridge of clay over the forehead and above the ears indicates the hairline. On the two larger heads a few rows of small clay balls indicate hair decorations. The mouth consists of lips – the smaller heads also have teeth. The seventh head has the snout of an animal and is the only head that represents an animal.

Some archaeological research was done during the 1970's at sites belonging to the EIA (Early Iron Age), location Plaston, a settlement close to White River (Evers, 1977). This site is located on a spur between the White River and a small tributary. It is situated on holding 119 at Plaston.

The site was discovered during house building operations when a collection of pottery shards was excavated. The finds consisted of pottery shards both on the surface and excavated.

Some of the pottery vessels were decorated with a red ochre wash. Two major decoration motifs occurred on the pots:

- Punctuation, using a single stylus and
- Broadline incision, the more common motif

A number of Early Iron Age pottery collections from Mpumalanga and Limpopo may be compared to the Plaston sample. They include Silver Leaves, Eiland, Matola, Klingbiel and the Lydenburg Heads site. The Plaston sample is distinguished from samples of these sites in terms of rim morphology, the majority of rims from Plaston are rounded and very few beveled. Rims from the other sites show more beveled rims (Evers, 1977:176).

Early Iron Age pottery was also excavated by archaeologist, Prof. Tom Huffman during 1997 on location where the Riverside Government complex is currently situated (Huffman, 1998). This site known as the Riverside site is situated a few kilometers north of Nelspruit next to the confluence of the Nelspruit and Crocodile River. It was discovered during the course of an environmental impact assessment for the new Mpumalanga Government complex/ offices. A bulldozer cutting exposed storage pits, cattle byres, a burial and midden on the crest of a gentle slope. Salvage excavations

conducted during December 1997 and March 1998 recovered the burial and contents of several pits.

One of the pits contained among other items, pottery dating to the eleventh century (AD 1070 ± 40 BP) this relates the pottery to the Mzonjani and Broederstroom phases. The early assemblage belongs to the Kwale branch of the Urewe tradition.

During the early 1970's Dr Mike Evers of the University of the Witwatersrand conducted fieldwork and excavations in the Eastern Transvaal. Two areas were studied, the Letaba area south of the Groot Letaba River, west of the Lebombo Mountains, east of the great escarpment and north of the Olifants River. The second area was the Eastern Transvaal escarpment area between Lydenburg and Machadodorp.

These two areas are referred to as the Lowveld and escarpment respectively. The earliest work on Iron Age archaeology was conducted by Trevor and Hall in 1912. This revealed prehistoric copper-, gold- and iron mines. Schwelinus (1937) reported smelting furnaces, a salt factory and terraces near Phalaborwa. In the same year D.S. van der Merwe located ruins, graves, furnaces, terraces and soapstone objects in the Letaba area.

Mason (1964, 1965, 1967, 1968) started the first scientific excavation in the Lowveld which was followed by N.J. van der Merwe and Scully. M. Klapwijk (1973, 1974) also excavated an Early Iron Age (EIA) site at Silverleaves and Evers and van den Berg (1974) excavated at Harmony and Eiland, both EIA sites.

Recent research by the National Cultural History Museum resulted in the excavation of an Early Iron Age site in Sekhukuneland, known as Mototolong (Van Schalkwyk, 2007). The site is characterized by four large cattle kraals containing ceramics which may be attributed to the Mzonjani and Doornkop occupational phases.

#### **4.2.6. Late Iron Age**

The later phases of the Iron Age (AD 1600-1800's) is represented by various tribes including Ndebele, Swazi, BaKoni and Pedi which is characterized by extensive stonewalled settlements found throughout the escarpment and particularly around Lydenburg, Badfontein, Sekhukuneland, Roosenekal and Steelpoort. Smaller tribes such



as the Pai (Mbayi) and Pulana residing in the Lowveld, were attacked by and made to flee from the aggressive Swazi, especially during the *mfecane* (difaqane). They (Swazi) were particularly active in the Lowveld during the difaqane period (1820's) and it is well-known that they frequently attacked and ousted smaller herder groups like the Pai and Pulana, especially in the area today known as Low's Creek. They were however prevented from settling in the low-lying areas due to the presence of the tsetse fly and malaria. Consequently there is little evidence of large scale settlement in the Crocodile River valley until the time of colonial settlement (1890's) and later. Small, isolated dry-packed stone-walled enclosures found near Nelspruit and surrounding areas may be attributed to these smaller groups who hid away from the Swazi onslaught. The sites were probably not used for extended periods as they were frequently on the move as a result of the onslaught and therefore small, indistinct and with little associated cultural material. As mentioned previously, it is known that the Mbayi (Pai) resides near Legogote in modern times (Bornman, 1995).

## 5. Located sites, description and suggested mitigation

Seventeen (17) site locations were documented which consist of grave sites, LIA stone-walled enclosures, ruins of historic dwellings and an historic house.

**Table 5.1.** Summary of located sites and their significance

<b>Type of site</b>	<b>Identified sites</b>	<b>Significance</b>
Graves and graveyards	MAN 1, MAN 4	High; <b>LS 3A</b>
Late Iron Age	MAN10-15	High; <b>LS 3B</b>
Early Iron Age	None	N/A
Historical buildings	MAN 5	Low; <b>GPC</b>
Historical structures (ruins)	MAN 2, 3, 6-9; 16, 17	Medium-Low; <b>GPB &amp; GPC</b>
Stone Age sites	None	N/A

**Table 5.2.** Significance rating guidelines for sites

<b>Field Rating</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation</b>
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1		Conservation, nomination as national site
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2		Conservation; Provincial site nomination
Local significance (LS. A)	Grade 3A	High Significance	Conservation, No mitigation advised
Local Significance (LS. B)	Grade 3B	High Significance	Mitigation but at least part of site should be retained
Generally Protected A (GPA)		High/ Medium Significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GPB)		Medium Significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GPC)		Low Significance	Destruction

## **5.2. Description of located sites**

### **5.2.1. Site MAN 1.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Graveyard with 12 unmarked graves. Local significance (LS); high significance. Grade 3A (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

It is recommended that the site not be disturbed by any future development activities. It is recommended that the grave site be fenced off and relatives be allowed access to the graves. If this is not possible, a process of social consultation should be followed with the families or relatives of the deceased to discuss further options. This is in accordance with section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998). It is also recommended that a management plan then be compiled for this feature.

### **5.2.2. Site MAN 2.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

The remains of four ruined stone-built rectangular structures. Probably farm worker's dwellings. Medium significance, GPB (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recording of features before destruction.

**5.2.3. Site MAN 3.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Concrete floor of ruined foundation. Low significance, GPC (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended, may be destroyed if necessary.

**5.2.4. Site MAN 4.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Some unmarked graves. Pointed out by informants Mrs David Roets and Johan van Wyk. Total number uncertain, at least two. Local significance (LS); high significance. Grade 3A (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:** It is recommended that the site not be disturbed by any future development activities. It is recommended that the grave site be fenced off and relatives be allowed access to the graves. If this is not possible, a process of social consultation should be

followed with the families or relatives of the deceased to discuss further options. This is in accordance with section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998). It is also recommended that a management plan then be compiled for this feature.

#### **5.2.5. Site MAN 5.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Old house. According to informant Mr David Roets, this is one of the oldest houses on the property but has been altered through the years. Low significance, GPC (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended, may be destroyed if necessary.

#### **5.2.6. Site MAN 6.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

The remains of a ruined stone-built rectangular structure. Probably farm worker's dwelling. Medium significance, GPB (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recording of features before destruction.

**5.2.7. Site MAN 7.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

The remains of a ruined stone-built rectangular structure. Probably farm worker's dwelling. Very little remains of this structure. Note that there may be graves located under floor which was therefore not located during the survey. Low significance, GPC (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended, may be destroyed if necessary.

**5.2.8. Site MAN 8.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

The remains of a ruined stone-built rectangular structure. Probably farm worker's dwelling. Very little remains of this structure. It is probably associated with site MAN 7 as it is located close-by. Note that there may be graves located under floor which was therefore not located during the survey. Low significance, GPC (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended, may be destroyed if necessary.

**5.2.9. Site MAN 9.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

The remains of a ruined stone-built rectangular structure. Probably farm worker's dwelling. Very little remains of this structure. It is probably associated with site MAN 7 and MAN 8 as it is located close-by. Note that there may be graves located under floor which was therefore not located during the survey. Low significance, GPC (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended, may be destroyed if necessary.

#### **5.2.10. Site MAN 10.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:** Semi-circular stone-built wall. Associated with LIA (Late Iron Age) occupation. Significance medium, generally protected B (GPB) see table 5.2.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recording of the site before destruction.

#### **5.2.11. Site MAN 11.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Small circular stone-walled enclosure, much weathered. A few metres to the west of site MAN 10. A few pottery sherds visible on the surface (fig. 15, App. D). Associated with LIA (Late Iron Age) occupation. Significance medium, generally protected B (GPB) see table 5.2.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recording of the site before destruction.



### **5.2.12. Site MAN 12.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Small circular stone-walled enclosure, much weathered. Measures approximately 4m across. Associated with LIA (Late Iron Age) occupation. Significance medium, generally protected B (GPB) see table 5.2.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recording of the site before destruction.

### **5.2.13. Site MAN 13.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Medium sized stone-walled enclosure, much weathered. Measures approximately 9m across. A number of pottery sherds collected on the surface (fig. 18, App. D). Associated with LIA (Late Iron Age) occupation. Significance medium, generally protected B (GPB) see table 5.2.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recording of the site before destruction.

#### **5.2.14. Site MAN 14.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:**

Medium sized stone-walled enclosure, much weathered. Measures approximately 12m across. Associated with sites, MAN 10-13. A large number of pottery sherds scattered on the surface (fig. 20, App. D). None of the pottery has any decoration. One piece with rim. Associated with LIA (Late Iron Age) occupation. Significance medium, generally protected A (GPA) see table 5.2.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recommended. Mitigation (excavation and recording) before destruction.

#### **5.2.15. Site MAN 15.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:** Small stone-walled enclosure. Measures approximately 5m across. Associated with sites, MAN 10-14. A number of pottery sherds scattered on the surface (fig. 20, App. D) but less than previous site. None of the pottery has any decoration. Associated with LIA (Late Iron Age) occupation. Significance medium, generally protected B (GPB) see table 5.2.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

Recording before destruction.

#### **5.2.16. Site MAN 16.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:** Stone walling on top of mountain. Small enclosure inside with rectangular wall outer (fig. 22). Significance medium, generally protected B (GPB) see table 5.2.

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably not be impacted upon by development activity as it is located out of the proposed development area.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended.

#### **5.2.17. Site MAN 17.**

**Location:** See Appendix B and D.

**Description:** A picnic/ recreational area. Recently built. Low significance, GPC (table 5.2).

**Impact of the proposed development/ activity:**

The site will probably be impacted upon by development activity.

**Mitigation:**

None recommended, may be destroyed if necessary.

**TABLE 5.1. General Significance of located sites.**

Site No.	Description	Type of significance	Degree of significance	Sphere of significance
MAN 1	Graves	Local, High, grade 3A	Archaeological: None Historic: High, Grade 3A	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 2	Ruins	Historic and Social. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Not known Historic: Medium, GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 3	Ruins	Historic and Social	Archaeological: None Historic: Low, GPC	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 4	Graves	Local, High, grade 3A	Archaeological: None Historic: High, Grade 3A	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 5	Old house	Historic and Social	Archaeological: None Historic: Low, GPC	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 6	Ruins	Historic and Social. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Not known Historic: Medium, GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 7	Ruins	Historic and Social. Low, GPC	Archaeological: Not known Historic: Low, GPC	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 8	Ruins	Historic and Social. Low, GPC	Archaeological: Not known Historic: Low, GPC	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 9	Ruins	Historic and Social. Low, GPC	Archaeological: Not known Historic: Low, GPC	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 10	LIA structure	Archaeological. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Medium GPB Historic: Medium GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 11	LIA structure	Archaeological. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Medium GPB Historic: Medium GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT

MAN 12	LIA structure	Archaeological. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Medium GPB Historic: Medium GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 13	LIA structure	Archaeological. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Medium GPB Historic: Medium GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 14	LIA structure	Archaeological. Medium GPA	Archaeological: Medium GPA Historic: Medium GPA	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 15	LIA structure	Archaeological. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Medium GPB Historic: Medium GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MN 16	LIA structure	Archaeological. Medium GPB	Archaeological: Medium GPB Historic: Medium GPB	Maggiesdal 456 JT
MAN 17	Rec. Areas	Historic and Social. Low, GPC	Archaeological: Not known Historic: Low, GPC	Maggiesdal 456 JT

**TABLE 5.2. Significance allocation of located sites**

Site no.	Unique nature	Integrity of archaeological deposit	Wider context	Relative location	Depth of deposit	Quality of archaeological/historic material	Quantity of site features	Preservation condition of site
MAN1	Graves	Not known	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Not known	Archaeologically: Not known  Historically: Not known	12	Good
MAN2	None, ruins	Poor	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	None	Archaeologically: Low  Historically: Fair	4	Fair-Poor
MAN3	None, ruins	Poor	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	None	Archaeologically: Low  Historically: Poor	1	Fair-Poor
MAN4	Graves	Not known	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Not known	Archaeologically: Not known  Historically: Not known	2 (visible)	Poor
MAN5	None, old house	N/A	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	N/A	Archaeologically: None  Historically: Low	1	Fair
MAN6	None, ruins	Poor	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	None	Archaeologically: Low  Historically: Fair	1	Fair-Poor
MAN7	None, ruins	Poor	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	None	Archaeologically: Low  Historically: Poor	1	Poor
MAN8	None, ruins	Poor	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	None	Archaeologically: Low  Historically: Poor	1	Poor
MAN9	None, ruins	Poor	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	None	Archaeologically: Low  Historically: Poor	1	Poor
MAN10	Some, LIA structure	Fair	19 <sup>th</sup> Cent Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Shallow	Archaeologically: Fair  Historically: Fair	1	Fair
MAN11	Some, LIA structure	Poor	19 <sup>th</sup> Cent Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Shallow	Archaeologically: Poor  Historically: Fair	1	Poor

MAN12	Some, LIA structure	Fair	19 <sup>th</sup> Cent Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Shallow	Archaeologically: Fair Historically: Fair	1	Fair
MAN13	Some, LIA structure	Fair	19 <sup>th</sup> Cent Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Shallow	Archaeologically: Fair Historically: Fair	1	Fair
MAN14	Some, LIA structure	Good-fair	19 <sup>th</sup> Cent Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Shallow	Archaeologically: Fair Historically: Fair	1	Fair
MAN15	Some, LIA structure	Fair	19 <sup>th</sup> Cent Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Shallow	Archaeologically: Fair Historically: Fair	1	Fair
MAN16	Some, LIA structure	Fair	19 <sup>th</sup> Cent Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	Shallow	Archaeologically: Fair Historically: Fair	1	Fair
MAN17	None, Rec. area	N/A	Local Community	Maggiesdal 456 JT	N/A	Archaeologically: None Historically: Low	1	Fair

## **6. Findings and recommendations**

Mitigation measures were allocated to each site as discussed in section 5: **Located sites and their description.**

Sites MAN 5 and MAN 17 are not regarded as being of archaeological, cultural or historical significance. Sites MAN 1 and 4 is the location of graveyards which is considered to be of high significance. Alteration or demolition of the graveyards is not recommended and if it any alteration or reinterment of the graves is planned, it will have to be accompanied by a valid permit obtainable from SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency) in terms of section 36 of the NHRA, 25 of 1999. Prior to the issue of such a permit extensive social consultation will have to be conducted as part of a number of requirements for permit application.

Sites MAN 2, 3; MAN 6-9 are considered to be of medium to low significance but some mitigation recommended as indicated above. Note that all mitigation measures associated with these sites must be permitted first (section 35 of NHRA) by either the MHRA (Mpumalanga Heritage Resources Agency) or SAHRA.

Sites MAN 10-16 are all associated with LIA (Late Iron Age occupation) possibly by Mbayi (Pai) during the *difaqane* period (1820's) and are all significant. Site MAN 14 contains large quantities of pottery sherds and the stone walling is also in good condition compared to the other LIA sites. Therefore mitigation (recording and excavation) is recommended before destruction. This is in accordance to section 35 of the NHRA (25 of 1999). Note that all mitigation measures associated with sites MAN 10-16 must be permitted first (section 35 of NHRA) by either the MHRA (Mpumalanga Heritage Resources Agency) or SAHRA.

### **For the remainder of the area note that:**

The bulk of archaeological remains are normally located beneath the soil surface. It is therefore possible that some significant cultural material or remains were not located



during this survey and will only be revealed when the soil is disturbed. Should excavation or large scale earth moving activities reveal any broken pieces of ceramic pottery, large quantities of sub-surface charcoal, ash or any material that can be associated with previous occupation, a qualified archaeologist should be notified immediately. If any human skeletal remains are revealed in the construction process all activity will be immediately halted and application made for an emergency rescue permit in terms of section 36 of the NHRA (25 of 1999) in order to exhume the remains.

This will also temporarily halt such activities until an archaeologist have assessed the situation. It should be noted that if such a situation occurs it may have further financial implications.

## 7. Bibliography

1. Amery, L.S. (ed), *The times history of the war in South Africa 1899-1902*, Vol VI. London, 1909
2. Barnard, C. 1975. *Die Transvaalse Laeveld. Komee van 'n Kontrei*.
3. Bergh, J.S. (ed.) 1998. *Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies*. (J.L. van Schaik, Pretoria).
4. Bonner, P. 1978. *Factions and Fissions: Transvaal/ Swazi politics in the mid-nineteenth century*. Journal of African History 19 (2), p. 226.
5. Bonner, P. 1983. *Kings, Commoners and Concessionaires: The evolution and dissolution of the nineteenth-century Swazi state*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
6. Bornman, H. (red.) 1979. *Nelspruit: 75 in '80*. Stadsraad van Nelspruit.
7. Bornman, H. 1995. *Pioneers of the Lowveld*.
8. Breutz, P.L. 1985. *Pre-Colonial Africa: The South-Eastern Bantu Cultural Province*.
9. Celliers, JP. 2005. *Report on Archaeological Survey on Portion 1 of Portion 3 of the Farm Beryl 313 JT, Nelspruit*. An unpublished report by Kudzala Antiquity on file at SAHRA as: 2005-SAHRA-0120.
10. Celliers, JP. 2008. *Report of Archaeological Survey on Portion 25 of the farm Maggiesdal 456 JT, Nelspruit*. An unpublished report by Kudzala Antiquity.
11. Delius, P. 2007. *Mpumalanga History and Heritage*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
12. Delius, P. (ed.) 2009. *Mpumalanga: an illustrated history*. Highveld.

13. Evers, T.M. 1975. *Recent Iron Age Research in the eastern Transvaal, South Africa*. South African Archaeological Bulletin. 30: 71-83.
14. Evers, T.M. 1977. *Plaston Early Iron Age Site, White River District, Eastern Transvaal, South Africa*. South African Archaeological Bulletin. 32: 170-178.
15. Evers, T.M. in Voight, E.A. 1981. *Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern and Eastern Transvaal*. Transvaal Museum, Pretoria.
16. Huffman, T.N. 1998. *Presidential Address. The Antiquity of Lobola*. South African Archaeological Bulletin 53: 57-62.
17. Mason, R. 1962. *Prehistory of the Transvaal: a record of human activity*. Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg.
18. Massie, R.H. 1905. *The Native tribes of Transvaal. Prepared for the general staff war office*. Harrison and Sons, London.
19. Myburgh, A.C. 1949. *The Tribes of Barberton District*. Department of Native Affairs. Ethnological Publications No. 25.
20. Ross, R. 2002. *A Concise History of South Africa*. Cambridge.
21. Van Rooyen, T. S. 1951. *Die verhouding tussen die Boere, Engelse, en naturelle in die Geskiedenis van die Oos-Transvaal tot 1882* in Archives Yearbook for South African History, 14(1).
22. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 2002. *Die Metodiek van Kultuurhulpbronbestuur (KHB)*. S.A. Tydskrif vir Kultuurgeskiedenis 16(2).
23. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 1995. *Die bydrae van Argeologie tot Kultuurhulpbronbestuur*. Referaat gelewer voor die Suid-Afrikaanse Vereniging vir Kultuurgeskiedenis, Transvaal Streektak, Sunnyside.

## Appendix A

## **Terminology**

“**Alter**” means any action affecting the structure, appearance or physical properties of a place or object, whether by way of structural or other works, by painting, plastering or other decoration or any other means.

“**Archaeological**” means –

- Material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and which are older than 100 years, including artifacts, human and hominid remains and artificial features or structures;
- Rock Art, being any form of painting, engraving or other graphic representation on a fixed rock surface or loose rock or stone, which was executed by human agency and which is older than 100 years, including any area within 10m of such representation;
- Wrecks, being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof, which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land, in the internal waters, the territorial waters or in the maritime culture zone of the Republic, as defined respectively in sections 3, 4 and 6 of the Maritime Zones Act, 1994 (Act No. 15 of 1994), and any cargo, debris or artifacts found or associated therewith, which is older than 60 years or which SAHRA considers to be worthy of conservation; and
- Features, structures and artefacts associated with military history which are older than 75 years and the sites on which they are found;

“**Conservation**”, in relation to heritage resources, includes protection, maintenance, preservation and sustainable use of places or objects so as to safeguard their cultural significance;

**“Cultural significance”** means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance;

**“Development”** means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of a 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 –

- construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change of use of a place or a structure at a place;
- carrying out any works on or over or under a place;
- subdivision or consolidation of land comprising, a place, including the structures or airspace of a place;
- constructing or putting up for display signs or hoardings;
- any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land; and
- any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil;

**“Expropriate”** means the process as determined by the terms of and according to procedures described in the Expropriation Act, 1975 (Act No. 63 of 1975);

**“Foreign cultural property”**, in relation to a reciprocating state, means any object that is specifically designated by that state as being of importance for archaeology, history, literature, art or science;

**“Grave”** means a place of interment and includes the contents, headstone or other marker of such a place, and any other structure on or associated with such place;

**“Heritage resource”** means any place or object of cultural significance;

**“Heritage register”** means a list of heritage resources in a province;

**“Heritage resources authority”** means the South African Heritage Resources Agency, established in terms of section 11, or, insofar as this Act (25 of 1999) is applicable in or in respect of a province, a provincial heritage resources authority (PHRA);

**“Heritage site”** means a place declared to be a national heritage site by SAHRA or a place declared to be a provincial heritage site by a provincial heritage resources authority;

**“Improvement”** in relation to heritage resources, includes the repair, restoration and rehabilitation of a place protected in terms of this Act (25 of 1999);

**“Land”** includes land covered by water and the air space above the land;

**“Living heritage”** means the intangible aspects of inherited culture, and may include –

- cultural tradition;
- oral history;
- performance;
- ritual;
- popular memory;
- skills and techniques;
- indigenous knowledge systems; and
- the holistic approach to nature, society and social relationships;

**“Management”** in relation to heritage resources, includes the conservation, presentation and improvement of a place protected in terms of the Act;

**“Object”** means any moveable property of cultural significance which may be protected in terms of any provisions of the Act, including –

- any archaeological artifact;
- palaeontological and rare geological specimens;
- meteorites;
- other objects referred to in section 3 of the Act;

**“Owner”** includes the owner’s authorized agent and any person with a real interest in the property and –

- in the case of a place owned by the State or State-aided institutions, the Minister or any other person or body of persons responsible for the care, management or control of that place;
- in the case of tribal trust land, the recognized traditional authority;

**“Place”** includes –

- a site, area or region;
- a building or other structure which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such building or other structure;
- a group of buildings or other structures which may include equipment, furniture, fittings and articles associated with or connected with such group of buildings or other structures;
- an open space, including a public square, street or park; and
- in relation to the management of a place, includes the immediate surroundings of a place;

**“Site”** means any area of land, including land covered by water, and including any structures or objects thereon;

**“Structure”** means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to land, and includes any fixtures, fittings and equipment associated therewith



## Appendix B


## 9. List of located sites


Sites located on the surveyed area were numbered MAN 1-17. The initials “MAN” represents the farm Maggiesdal and Nelspruit, followed by the number of the site. A spatial location with the aid of a GPS (Global Positioning System) was added to the site.


Table 9.1.


<b>Site name</b>	<b>Date of compilation</b>	<b>GPS Coördinates</b>	<b>Photo figure No.</b>
MAN 1	1/11/2012	S25°30'54.44" E030°57'27.10"	Fig. 1, 2.
MAN 2	1/11/2012	S25°30'59.03" E030°57'22.80"	Fig. 3, 4.
MAN 3	1/11/2012	S25°30'56.94" E030°57'24.81"	Fig. 5.
MAN 4	1/11/2012	S25°30'33.64" E030°57'22.54"	Fig. 6, 7.
MAN 5	1/11/2012	S25°30'33.60" E030°57'18.98"	Fig. 8.
MAN 6	1/11/2012	S25°30'58.10" E030°57'22.79"	Fig. 9.
MAN 7	1/11/2012	S25°30'57.41" E030°57'21.83"	Fig. 10.
MAN 8	1/11/2012	S25°30'57.16" E030°57'20.84"	Fig. 11.
MAN 9	1/11/2012	S25°30'56.97" E030°57'21.26"	Fig. 12.
MAN 10	1/11/2012	S25°31'00.47" E030°57'33.51"	Fig. 13.
MAN 11	1/11/2012	S25°31'00.48" E030°57'32.92"	Fig. 14, 15.
MAN 12	1/11/2012	S25°31'01.93" E030°57'32.45"	Fig. 16.
MAN 13	1/11/2012	S25°31'02.75" E030°57'29.97"	Fig. 17, 18.
MAN 14	1/11/2012	S25°31'00.85" E030°57'29.53"	Fig. 19, 20.
MAN 15	1/11/2012	S25°31'00.31" E030°57'28.83"	Fig. 21.
MAN 16	1/11/2012	S25°30'23.28" E030°57'48.95"	Fig. 22.
MAN 17	1/11/2012	S25°30'40.02" E030°57'46.03"	Fig. 23.

## **Appendix C – Maps**









## Appendix D





Fig. 1. Site MAN 1. Unmarked graves, photo taken in northern direction.



Fig. 2. Site MAN 1. One of the 12 graves, photo taken in eastern direction.



Fig. 3. Site MAN 2. One of four ruins (dwellings) located here. Photo taken north.



Fig. 4. Site MAN 2. Another of the ruins located here, photo taken in eastern direction.



Fig. 5. Site MAN 3. The ruined remains of a dwelling. Photo taken in south-western direction.



Fig. 6. Site MAN 4. Arrows indicate grave dressing (stones) at a site where a number of graves are located.



Fig. 7. Site MAN 4. General view of the gravesite. All the graves are located within thick vegetation and difficult of access which makes them difficult to count.



Fig. 8. Site MAN 5. One of the oldest houses on the property, not significant.



Fig. 9. Site MAN 6. Another ruined dwelling. Photo taken in eastern direction.




Fig. 10. Site MAN 7. The remains of a ruined dwelling. Photo taken in western direction.



Fig. 11. Site MAN 8. Another ruin located west of site MAN 7. Photo taken in southern direction.



Fig. 12. Site MAN 9. Ruins, arrows indicate where the foundations of the building were. North of site MAN 8.



Fig. 13. Site MAN 10. Arrows indicate the much weathered stone walling arranged in semi-circle.



Fig. 14. Site MAN 11. Arrows indicate the location of stonewalling. Photo taken in western direction.



Fig. 15. Site MAN 11. Small pieces of pottery found inside the stone-walled enclosure. Pen indicates north.



Fig. 16. Site MAN 12. Small stone-walled enclosure.





Fig. 17. Site MAN 13. Medium sized stone-walled enclosure.



Fig. 18. Site MAN 13. Some of the pottery found at the enclosure, were put on the stone wall to photograph. Pen indicates north.



Fig. 19. Site MAN 14. A larger stone-walled enclosure with a large surface scatter of pottery.



Fig. 20. Site MAN 14. Some of the numerous pottery sherds scattered around the enclosure. Put on the enclosure wall for photography. Pen indicates north.



Fig. 21. Site MAN 15. Linear stone walling located a few metres north of site MAN 14.



Fig. 22. Site MAN 16. Rectangular stone walling on top of the mountain.



Fig. 23. Site MAN 17. Recent recreational site.