

BETHLEHEM FARM 153
DWARS RIVER VALLEY, DRAKENSTEIN
HISTORICAL SURVEY OF ITS OWNERS &
THE EARLY FRENCH CONGREGATION

JANUARY 2009

VIEW TOWARDS BETHLEHEM FARMYARD
(BOSCHENDAL CATALOGUE)

Prepared for
BOSCHENDAL ESTATE
Drakenstein

HENNIE VOS
Historical Archaeologist and Consultant
ARCape Consultancy PO Box 379 Stellenbosch
(082-217-0036 Fax 021-889-8956)

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. GOALS	2
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE FARM	4
4. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: DRAKENSTEIN >1680	
4.1 Dutch farmers 1680-1687	12
4.2 Dutch farmers >1687	16
4.3 French farmers >1687-1689	18
4.4 Condition of farmers 1680-1710	21
5. BUILDINGS OF THE PIONEER SETTLERS	
5.1 Cape Town	24
5.2 Stellenbosch	24
5.3 French Refugees: Berg river Pioneers 1687-1710	26
5.3.1 Early conditions	26
5.3.2 Labour force	26
5.3.3 Knechten	29
5.4 Structures: Pioneer Period	30
5.4.1 General: Cape & Simondium	30
5.4.2 Bergen Henegouwen (Donkerhoek)	31
5.4.3 Fredericksberg & La Motte	32
5.4.4 Conclusion	35
6. DRAKENSTEIN CONGREGATION	
6.1 Farmyard Period 1687-1694	37
6.1.1 Placement of religious worship: Farmyard church	37
6.1.2 Simond versus De Savoye feuds	42
6.1.3 Simond argues for a Church Council	44
6.1.4 Simond offended De Savoye at baptismal ceremony	45
6.1.5 Government positions of Church and State	46
6.1.6 Simond and De Savoye as businessmen	46
6.1.7 Paul Roux: Voorleser and Krankebezoeker	50
6.2 Early burials 1688-1694	55
6.3 Schoolmeesters 1694-1720	55
6.4 Summary Pioneer period within Frontier Model	61

7. BETHLEHEM: OWNERS		
7.1 Pierre Simond	1688 – 1702	65
7.1.1 Origin and family		65
7.1.2 Allocation of farms		66
7.2 Simond settled at Bethlehem		70
7.2.1 Lodgings and structures		70
7.2.2 Main house: Pastorie		72
7.2.3 Naming of farms		74
7.2.4 Bethlehem		75
7.3 Agricultural activities		76
7.3.1 Free Knechten		76
7.3.2 Mererust (Meerrust) versus Zandvliet		77
7.3.3 Labourers		81
7.4 Church activities		85
7.4.1 General		85
7.4.2 The “Babilons Tooren” Barn-church 1694		85
7.4.3 Simond & the church members		88
7.5 Simond prepares to leave		89
7.6 Sale of properties and possessions		90
7.7 Simond and his descendants overseas		91
7.8 Contribution of Simond		93
8. SECUNDE SAMUEL ELSEVIER	1702 – 1707	
8.1 General		95
8.2 Elsenburg and Bethlehem		95
9. CLAAS VAN DE WESTHUIZEN	1707 – 1719	
9.1 Background		97
9.2 Farming conditions		99
10. LANDDROST NICOLAAS VAN DEN HEUVEL	1719 – 1735	
10.1 Background		102
10.2 Farming conditions		103
11. OLOF DE WET	1735 – 1756	
11.1 Family background		104
11.2 Early Zilver-mining exploits >1685		106
11.3 Zilvermine complex >1740		107
11.4 Muller’s marriage and death of spouse		110
11.5 Dissolvement of mining company		111

12. EDUARD CHRISTIAAN HAUMAN	1756 – 1758	
12.1 Background		112
12.2 Interlude at Bethlehem		113
12.3 Return to Simondium		114
12.4 Character of Eduard Hauman		114
13. HENDRIK C. VAN NIEUWKERKEN	1758 – 1775	
13.1 Background		116
13.2 Farming activities		116
14. ANDRIES STEPHANUS DU TOIT	1775 – 1790	118
15. JACOB DANIEL DE VILLIERS	1790 – 1804	
15.1 Background		121
15.2 Farming activities		121
16. JOHANNES JOSUA MIN(N)AAR	1804 – 1829	121
17. JACOB HENDRIK DE VILLIERS J.D. son	1829 – 1840	127
18. THE HAUPT OWNERS	1840 – 1886	
18.1 Carel Albrecht Haupt jr	1840 – 1853	130
18.2 Petrus Johannes Haupt, Carel's son	1853 – 1875	133
18.3 Carel Albrecht Haupt, Philip son	1875 – 1878	133
18.4 Anna Carolina Haupt (born Haupt)	1878 – 1886	134
19. LATER INDIVIDUAL FARMERS	1886 – 1950	
19.1 Walter Herbert Mills	1886 – 1893	137
19.2 Joseph James Hill	1893 – 1919	137
19.3 Percival Ross Frames, Trustee	1919 – 1950	137
20. FINAL INVESTORS	1950 – 2008	
20.1 Bridport Investment Co. (Pty) Ltd	1950 – 1960	139
20.2 From Bridges to Boschendal Estate	1958 – 2003	140
21. SIGNIFICANCE OF BETHLEHEM		141
22. RECOMMENDATIONS		145
23. REFERENCES		146

ADDENDA

- ADD.1 Text of Bethlehem by Fransen & Cook 1965:123.
- ADD.2 Francois Leguat, 1698 at the Cape (*New voyages to the east*, 1703)
(Raven-Hart II 1971:426-438. Pages copied: 431/2).
- ADD.3 Paul Roux 1660-1723. SABW III: 1961:743 (A.M. Hugo).
- ADD.4 Grant of Bethlehem to Petrus Simond 28.3.1696 (SGD 5/1696).
- ADD.5 Bethlehem Diagram (SGD 5/1696), resurveyed by C.D. Wentzel with his annotated subscript of c.1754 (transcription by A. Crzesinski)
(Boschendal Catalogue).
- ADD.6 Conditions in respect of Pierre Simond's employment (RPR III: 195/6).
- ADD.7 Extract from Mentzel's *Description of the Cape* in respect to French refugees.
(Mentzel 1785, Vol I. Published 1921:66-68).
- ADD.8 Letter extract of 15.6.1689 by Simond in context of Khoi on his farm
(Franken1978:197).
- ADD.9 Zilvermine c.1688, Zorgvliet (owner J. Mulder) (Kolbe I 1727:118).
- ADD.10 Zilvermine, Request in 1743 by Olof de Wet (Leibbrandt I 1906:374/5).
- ADD.11 Bethlehem Inventory 19.8.1777, Johanna M. le Roes.
- ADD.12 Bethlehem Inventory 18.9.1777, Johanna M. le Roes.
- ADD.13 Bethlehem: Perpetual Quitrent 6, 12 (SGD 212 / 1822).

TABLES

TABLE 1	Slaves owned by Petrus Simond 1690-1702	82
TABLE 2	Origin of slaves owned by P. Simond	83
TABLE 3	Owners of Bethlehem, Drakenstein 1690-1840	86
TABLE 4	Tax-returns of owners of Bethlehem, 18 th century	96
TABLE 5	Genealogical layout of the early families involved with Bethlehem	100
TABLE 6	Owners of Bethlehem, Drakenstein 1840-2000	129

ABBREVIATIONS

RPR	-	Resolusies van die Politieke Raad		
SABW	-	SA Biografiese Woordeboek		
SABD	-	SA Biographical Dictionary	CA	- Cape Archives
L&H	-	Landdrost & Heemrade	m	- morgen
DV&P	-	De Villiers & Pama	f	- gulden
PS	-	Pierre (Petrus) Simond	Rxd	- Rixdaalder
DS	-	De Savoye	PQ	- Perpetual Quitrent
DO	-	Deeds Office	OSF	- Old Stellenbosch Freehold
T.	-	Transport	SGD	- Surveyor General Diagram

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The farm Bethlehem (1688) is situated in the Bangehoek, Dwars River Valley flood plain, adjacent to Kylemore village, but off the beaten track. Its secluded location has protected it from upscale developments, but its rundown state requires urgent conservation measures. Bethlehem is **significant** for a number of reasons, ranging from perspectives of historic, spiritual, personality, slavery, Khoi empowerment strategies, and archaeological potential values.

Bethlehem is one of the rare **Biblical** names in the Cape, and the only farm that served as a Pastorie during the French refugee congregation period. Pierre or Petrus Simond (wife & 5 children) was as an exemplary leader and mediator with the authorities, and guided his flock of sheep (and goats) remarkably well during his pastorship (1688 – 1702). Simond's two publications in the Netherlands (*Psalms of David* 1700 and a sermon 1697), both sourced to Bethlehem, are the earliest published SA literature (early 1700). *Simondium* village and school are the only reminders of his heritage today. The Barn-church at Simondium was the centre of gravity for all the French settlers for more than two decades (1694-1716). When the church and its activities moved to Paarl, Bethlehem was spiritually side-tracked to obscurity.

Bethlehem is the only farm of 60 morgen that was **partitioned in 3 oblong strips** of land, cultivated primarily by two French free-servants (*knechten*) with Simond sharing in one third of the crop profits. No other farm in Drakenstein or Stellenbosch exhibits these characteristics (see Ch. 7.8, p.93: *Contribution of Simond*). Bethlehem is the only farm with a **building** erected by the **VOC**, the other structures built by its successive owners since 1688.

Two racial issues are of particular relevance, viz. the practice of bought **labour** (slavery), in contrast to the wage employment of the free Khoi. Bethlehem, on the borderline of civilization, was actually the focal point of land rights that were not utilized and an opportunity that slipped by the Khoi in the late 17th century.

Various well-known **personalities** followed after Simond, e.g. the Company official, Secunde Samuel Elsevier of Elsenburg, and ex-landdrost Nicholaas van den Heuvel, managed the cereal and vine farm between 1702 and 1719. Olof de Wet, owner for 20 years, was responsible for the Zilver mining operations and Director of the Cape's worst financial fiasco, fleecing its highest officials during the 1740s. Afterwards, Bethlehem was owned by some rich men, but high mortgages and the economic slump of the 19th century brought the farm a few times to **bankruptcy**. During the 1950s speculative subdivisions into 15 Portions came to naught and by 1958 Rhodes Fruit Farms obtained the properties. Since then the farm has never really played a significant role in any way (see Ch.21, p.141: *Significance of Bethlehem*).

The **heritage value** of the farmyard, the conservation of its 8 **buildings** and the **archaeological** potential of the scattered ruins need to be seriously considered and addressed. Bethlehem could become integrated into various **tourist** related issues of today (see Ch.22, p.145: *Recommendations*).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the following for assisting with material, without which this report would be much poorer in content.

1. Sara Winter of Bauman & Winter Consultants.
2. Consultant Sally Titlestad for access to the Boschendal Estate Catalogue of historical images and evidence (2008).
3. Consultant Mariane Gertenbach for select photographs and material.
4. Franschoek Museum for genealogical information.
5. The work of Jean le Roux and Willem le Roux, *Ons Drakensteinse Erfgrond*, which was invaluable.
6. The staff of the Registrar of Deeds, Cape Town.

1. INTRODUCTION

The farm Bethlehem formed part of the late 20th century stable of farms of *Rhodes Fruit Farms* (established 1902) (**FIG.1**). *Anglo American Farms* formally acquired it in 1958 and in 2003 sold a large portion of its farms to *Boschendal Founders Estate*, under the direction of Mr. Clive Venning. Environmental and heritage impact studies were conducted of the Dwars River Valley farms (e.g. Titlestad 2005; Aikman & Berman 2005; Winter 1999, 2000). Nonetheless, reports on the historical and structural development of individual farms lacked in most cases except for one or two farms (Vos 2004a, 2004b).

Bauman & Winter Heritage Consultants appointed me to fill this vacuum in respect of the Bethlehem farm. Surprisingly, no previous studies or architectural plans for the farm exist. The following Historic Report documents Bethlehem's history, to be followed by a Structural Report on the buildings themselves. The reader is advised to consult the *TABLES OF THE OWNERS* regularly.

© COPYRIGHT OF THIS REPORT BELONGS TO H.N. VOS.

2. GOALS OF REPORT

1. Provide a chronological outline of owners in context of the Drakenstein valley.
2. Emphasize the first owner, Eerw. Pierre Simond and his activities with the Drakenstein congregation.
3. Evaluate the heritage significance of the farm with some recommendations.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE FARM

The farm Bethlehem, also referred to as *Old Bethlehem*, Farm no.153, lies in a secluded valley on the municipal boundary between Stellenbosch and Drakenstein. It is situated south of the tapering flank of Simonsberg, below the old torturous Helshoogte Pass, designated as *Bangehoek* in the late 17th century. Three parallel rectangles of land (total 60m) were granted in 1696, amalgamated into a larger quitrent of 1822, measuring 444m, exclusive of the old freehold (**FIG.2, FIG.3, FIG.4**).

The linear farm werf has become somewhat dilapidated over the last decade or two. The buildings are positioned within the eastern rectangle of OSF land, situated in the flood plain of the Dwars River Valley (**FIG.5, FIG.6**) They include a central, T-shaped building under corrugated roof with a middle 19th century fenestration. It is flanked by a dilapidated “cellar” building on the west, with other old buildings and remnant walls of earlier constructions on the east (in total about 7 constructions)(Fransen & Cook 1981: 213, 215) (**Add.1**).

The farm is much overgrown with dense vegetation and forest-like trees, amongst which a number of ruins, kraals and animal pens are located. In a following structural report the main buildings will be addressed and at a later stage the scattered ruins in an archaeological report. The early history of the farm is intimately connected with one of the most interesting phases of immigrant settlement at the Cape, viz. that of the so-called French Huguenots during the late 17th century.

4. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: DRAKENSTEIN >1680

4.1 DUTCH FARMERS 1680 – 1687

Previously (1680 – 1685), Simon van der Stel allowed the new colonists to choose the best agricultural land along the rivers. Such land procurements resulted in morphological land grants of strange configurations. The farms Zorgvliet (1685), incorporating Nagelegen (1685)(owner Joh. Mulder), and Zeven Rivieren (1787)(owner Albert Holder) fall into this category (Van der Bijl 1963:83, 84A). As a result, subsequent farmers were thus prohibited from gaining access to irrigation waters and therefore new land (see Vos 1993:33 -38).

During the early **1680s** a few Dutch farmers were already settled in the Drakenstein area. The shape of their farms and historical documentation are indicators of these settlements. The following farms (organic layout) were probably given out prior to 1685 in Simondium area (see FIG.3)(**FIG.7**).

FARM	OWNER	DATE REGISTERED
1. Stellengift (Simonsvlei)	J. Blesius & A. Diemer	1691 + 1694
2. Babilonische Toorn	P. van der Bijl	1692
3. Schilpad	W. van der Merwe	1699
4. Werda (Warda)	F. Conradie	1712

When Commissioner Adriaan van Rhee de tot Drakenstein arrived at the Cape in mid-1685, he scolded Simon for this unorthodox manner of farm allocations. He issued new instructions on how farms were to be granted. It is also of interest that not only was ribbon-shaped land allocated, but that they were packed tightly parallel, like soldiers in formation. Khoi-Khoi krales and San attacks were still the order of the day in the frontier region. The land allocations thus also served as a **military buffer zone**.

Since the Stellenbosch valley was rapidly becoming crowded with settlers, Commander Simon van der Stel created new settlements for a growing number of new colonists who arrived since **1687**. On his birthday, 14th October 1687, Van der Stel distributed oxen and calves amongst 23 colonists recently arrived from Europe, and on the 16th October set off with them to their new farms along the Berg River. Van der Stel then “*gav aan dese vermakelyke landstreek den naam van Drakenstein*”, set the boundaries of the Bergriviervallei as “*Simonsberg, de Parel Diamant, en Drakenberg.*” By the latter was meant the Du Toitskloof, Haelhoek and Wemmershoek mountains (Hugo & van der Bijl 1963:20n). Note that *Simonsberg* was named after Simon van der Stel, not the preacher Pierre Simond who arrived in 1688 (see Franken 1978:7, 203).

Who were these first **23 farmers** of Drakenstein? Little is generally known about them, for they were not named. Most were from the Netherlands, as we shall see. Apparently, the hard soil and the labour-intensive agricultural pursuits were just too much during the

summer months for some of these bachelor colonists, and they abandoned their farms within a year. This happened quite regularly during these pioneer days and was a real problem to the Cape government.

One of these 1687 colonists was probably Arie van Wyk (Arie Dirk van Eck). His “ribbon-farm” proved to be very difficult to cultivate and its position will be definitive in the location of the old (1694) Drakenstein Church (see Vos 2009, in preparation).

In 1687 Van der Stel therefore followed commissioner Van Reede’s instructions (of 1685) exactly. The colony had to expand with industrious able men, not traders, preferably married, with a knowledge of farming and in particular viniculture; with a Calvinistic background and morals, who were able to stand together in times of war to defend the country; who intended to settle permanently and not depart from the Cape with their acquired wealth (Hulshof 1941:123-126). These land allocations were now orderly and under supervision, with no individual choice given. They consisted of oblong strips of land, all of equal size (60 morgen), stretching from the river to the mountains, resulting in each case in an imbalanced mix of arable, pasture and barren land. As a tribute to its planner, Van der Stel called the valley *Drakenstein*, after Van Reede tot Drakenstein (Kolbe I:111, 114; Vos 1993:38) (**FIG.8**).

In respect of land allocation, farms were given in full ownership without payment, on condition that it was tilled within a year and built, in order to discourage settlers from abandoning the farms. The emphasis was on cereal production (with a tithe to the Company). As wine production was more lucrative for the burghers and Company, the latter soon established the rule that for every four morgen of land one morgen of vines could be planted. Cultivation of tobacco was prohibited. Initially (<1685) farmland was granted in promise and a number of years later, primarily cultivated land was surveyed and granted in freehold. Thus practically all grants after 1685 took 4 – 10 years before being issued officially (see also Le Roux, et al 2002).

The surveyor went out with his assistant, measured the areas by means of chains, compass, etc., drafted the diagrams in the field, and these were then copied at the Castle as time permitted. Sometimes many years elapsed. As they were finished in trickles or batches, the governor signed them, according to his judgment. The original grant was kept at the Castle (or sometimes at the Drostdy) and the copy was issued to the farmer. Occasionally the owner or surveyor neglected their respective duties, with the result that after the owner’s death, his widow/son/new owner was issued with a grant for the first time. The next transaction was then recorded a few months later. Thus the erroneous impression is created that a particular farm was settled late according to the first OSF (Old Stellenbosch Freehold).

4.2 DUTCH FARMERS >1687

As has been mentioned, in October 1687 the following farms or areas (*standplase*) were allocated to Dutch/Flemish/German burghers. These farms were issued to "Dujtchers" and some bachelors later married some of the French single women. Note the dates are when the land grants were issued, but they were settled earlier (**FIG.9**).

FARM	OWNER	GRANTED	STAYED / LEFT
1. Bloemendal	M. van Staden	1691	stayed
2. Overveen	J. van der Heiden	1690	stayed
3. Kunnenburg	W. van der Merwe	1692	stayed
4. Watervliet	R. van Wyk	1692	
5. Welgevonden	H. Eckhoff	c.1688	(married to French)
6. Zandvliet (Delta)	H. Silberbach	1690	stayed
7. Lubeck	E.F. Walter	1695	stayed
8. Nieuwedorp	5 owners (each 5 x 60m):		stayed
	• J. van As	1689	
	• A. Basson	1689	
	• E. van Lier	1690	
	• W. Basson	1691	
	• P. Meyer (F)	1692	(previously also Dutch)
9. Werda (exception)	F. Conradie	c.1695 (1712)	
10. Eenzaamheid	P. Andresen	1690	stayed
11. Meerrust	T. Munch	1692	stayed
12. Lekkerwyn	Arie Lecrevent (Dutch burger)	1690	stayed
13. Goede Hoop		1688	left

The outlying farms at Bangehoek were probably included:

14. Zeven Rivieren	J. Pleunis, P. Malmer	1708 *	stayed
15. Zorgvliet	Caspar Wilder	1692	stayed
16. Nagelegen	Hans Jes	1692	stayed

* Inventory MOOC 8/2.22 Estate Malmer 1708: cellar with 11 leaguers of wine (Ariy van Wyk bought 2 lots)

In 1687 the following farms were allotted to Dutch settlers, but were **abandoned** within a year or two. They were then occupied by the French refugees (see Le Roux & Le Roux 1999, areas Simondium & Groot Drakenstein).

1a. Zion (A)	D. Hugod	1691	
1b. Sion (B)	<i>Onbequam land</i> (unproductive land separated Dutch from French settlers).	(1694)	(site of church)
2. Langerust	Pierre Lombard	1691	
3. Le Plessis Merle	Charles Marais	1693	
4. Vrede-en-Lust	J. de Savoye	1694	
5. Rust en Vrede	J. de Savoye	1694	(previously to a Frenchman)
6. La Motte	D. Nortier	1694	

It is my contention that the above farms already contained buildings erected by 1687 by the Dutch settlers. Did the French negotiate with some of these settlers, who probably also felt overwhelmed by the influx of the French? This appears to be particularly the case at the cohegent farms of *La Motte*, *Vrede-en-Lust* and *Le Plessis Merle*. Note how the dates of granting were primarily in 1694. Le Plessis Merle already had cultivated lands, as by March 1689 watermelons, corn and vines were growing abundantly (Franken 1978:52, 135).

4.3 FRENCH FARMERS >1687

Between 1687 and 1689 most of the French Refugees arrived and were allocated farms at Simondium / Groot Drakenstein, where, as we have seen, numerous (single) Dutch burghers were already settled. Some of these Dutch settlers had abandoned their farms due to indolence, incompetence, cultivation too arduous, or the land just too stony and barren.

Yet, where could French refugees be settled?

They could not be settled *northwards*, as the 1685/1687 Dutch grants formed a united front (Kunnenburg, Overveen, Bloemendal, Babijlons Toorn, Stellengift, Skilpad).

Van der Stel settled the French *amidst the Dutch burghers* between Babijlons Toorn and the Dwars River Valley. Yet the best land was taken by the Dutch with only poor land in between, viz. Werda, Antonies Fontein, Rachels Fontein, Watergat, Zondernaam and Sion B. Note in particular that the eastern farms adjacent the Berg River were prone to flooding, running in old and new stony courses. It was therefore hazardous to settle adjacent the Berg River, which could become a raging monster during the winter months.

The temperamental French refugees (*France Vlugtelinge*) (they were never called French Huguenots) (Franken 1978), were rather discouraged by the poor soil of their farms when settled in Aug. 1687. After Pierre Simond arrived, he made intercession (a *rekwest* in Sept. 1687) for the refugees to the governor and obtained permission that most, except De Savoye and Charles Marais (respectively *Vrede-en-Lust* and *Le Plessis Merle*), could **resettle on more fertile soils** (Franken 1978:14/5). This meant that those farming in Simondium district, banded together in three distinct clusters. These close-knit land allocations also reflect the unity amongst the French colonists and probably also of family/friend relationships. It is important to note that the French also settled in clusters according to their regions in France (**FIG.10**).

The French who sought out the **foothill farms below Simonsberg** and Kanonkop, wisely choose areas watered by the mountain streams. These were fed by the sandstone aquifers, which topped this mountain range and provided perennial streams, or fountains or at least trickles of water during the summer months.

Besides the four farms already mentioned, viz.

1. Le Plessis Merle
2. Vrede-en-Lust
3. Rust en Vrede and
4. La Motte,

two more farms were added, viz.

- | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 5. Fredericksburg | J. Nortier | 1694 |
| 6. Bergen Henegouwen | J. Durand + J. Pariset | 1694 |

It is this area that particularly interests us as the earliest church services were conducted in the vicinity by Pierre Simond from 1687 – 1694. Note that the two “serfs” of Jacques de Savoye at Vrede-en-Lust, viz. brothers Danie Nortier and Jean Nortier respectively settled on the adjacent farms of La Motte and Fredericksburg.

The farms along the **Dwars River Valley** also formed part of promised grants to free burghers of 1687 (see Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:10, 11). It is therefore no surprise that practically all of them were granted as ‘early’ OSFs between 1689 and 1691 (neglect to register early in case of two farms).

1. Nieuwendorp (5 farms of 60m each between 1689 – 1691) and
2. Goede Hoop (c.1690), we have already mentioned as being granted to Dutch settlers. The remaining four farms were assigned to French burghers between 1685 – 1687, who were at the Cape prior to the French Refugee arrivals. That is why these prime lands were not available to the new arrivals.

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 3. Boschendal (Bos-en-dal) | Jean de Long | c.1690 |
| X Marie Couchet (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:10, 160) | | (registered 1713) |
| 4. Bossendal | Nicholas de Lanoy (jnr) | 1690 |
| X Suzanne Vos in 1698 (Ibid.:8, 9, 150, 153) | | |
| 5. Rhone | Jean Gardè | 1691 |
| 6. Lanquedoc | P. Benezet | 1691 |

Note again that the earliest grants correlate to owners that had settled earlier and had ample time to cultivate the land, where upon the land was granted in freehold.

The vast remainder of the French refugees was settled on farms scattered or grouped towards **Fransche Hoek** (*France Quartier*), in southern **Paarl**, northern Paarl, **Wagenmakersvallei**, **Dal Josafat**, Klein Drakenstein, etc. All of them had to travel to Babilons Toorn area to receive religious instruction. The children possibly received some schooling on Sundays during 1687 – 1700, under the watchful eyes of Paul Roux and ds. Pierre Simond. In total they easily numbered about 120 members, excluding young children.

4.4 CONDITIONS OF FARMERS 1680 – 1710

The ministry of Pierre Simond brought him in close contact with all his parishioners, spread out for many kilometres alongside the Dwars Valley and Berg Rivers. On the extreme south it stretched from the farm La Dauphine of Etienne Nel against the Keerweder Mountains (Franschhoek), to the “church” at Babilons Toorn area; from there to Paarl, Wagenmakersvallei and with Francois du Toit at the furthest, northern outpost at De Kleine Bosch (Dal Josaphat). Nonetheless, we shall direct our attention to Simondium and adjacent area of farmers, as the social, ecclesiastical and economic spheres focused around here, and the elusive church and its cemetery.

Some contemporary sources (Priest Tachard) mentioned the settlement of 80 families, repeated by Valentyn (I:154) as “80 huisgezinnen”, but Kolbe (I 1727:96) refutes this statement (see also Valentyn I:155, n.144). As we have seen, the farmers settled near the Berg River, Dwars Valley River and Simonsberg mountain streams.

In reference to *Drakensteen* (sic), Kolbe divided it basically in three **districts**:

District 1

Stretched from the Keerweder (Franschhoek) mountains where Etienne Nel farmed at La Dauphine and Keerweder (c.1710) (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:193), till the *Drakensteenske Kerk*, “die als midden in dezer Colonie legt” (Kolbe II 1727:115).

District 2

Stretched from the post-1694 church till the “*Wagemakers Valleij*”, of which the southern border is delineated by the farmer or *heemraad* (Kolbe calls them *Burgermeester*) Francois du Toit of De Kleine Bosch at Dal Josaphat.

District 3

Included all of the Wagemakers Valley (Wellington), irrigated by the “*grote Berg Rivier*”.

All the other northern areas were encompassed within District 4.

Klein Drakenstein generally designates farms west of the Berg River, while those east of the river are labelled as *Groot Drakenstein*. At Drakenstein the farmers were separated about half an hour or an hour from one another, with no communal buildings, except for the Church, a watermill and some threshing floors (“*de Kerk, een watermolen en eenige trappen*”) (Kolbe I:115b). The mill probably refers to the one on Stellengift.

Kolbe specifically pointed out in c.1710 that the original simple houses and farm dwellings built in 1687/8 by the *Fransche vluchtelingen* were still standing (Ibid.) (*zy tot nu niet recht in staat geweest, om hunne slechte hutten en geringe boere huizen af te breken ...*). He ascribed it to the poor soil (worse than at Stellenbosch), stony countryside, great debts, little and poor pasture for the flocks and the furious southeaster devastating land and grazing (Ibid.:115, 116).

The following **estates** (Kolbe, *landgoedere*) are basically all those situated on fertile soils and cultivated from c.1685. They included those from Bangehoek to the French Church farmed by *Heemraden* (**FIG.11**).

- Zorgvliet of Johannes Mulder (I:117a, b, 118a).
- Nieuwedorp of Jacob van As (I:118a).
- Bossendal of Abraham de Villiers (I:118b).
- Stellengift of Jan Blesius, ex-fiscal who was the first one in the valley (*deszelfs eerste bewoner* ; I: 118b).
He erected a beautiful house and cellar, a mill and other buildings (*andere nodige gevaarten aldaar oprechten*) (I:118b, 119a).
- Babiloonsche Toren of Pieter van der Bijl (one of the most beautiful estates) (*daaronder het fraaiste, het Landgoed*) (I:119a).
- Adjacent to Babilons Toorn was the estate of *Louis le Grand* (I: 119a). Surprisingly, there is never mention in the documents of a **Louis** (though there was a Gideon le Grand at Paarl).

The above farm was on the way to the church, as the latter is next mentioned by Kolbe, whose descriptions followed a linear pattern. Where was this estate?

On a 1795 French map with an interior outlay of early 1700(!), a *Louis le Grand* is again shown as the (northern) neighbour of Pieter van der Bijl, but all farms are incorrectly placed adjacent *Paarl* mountain (Vos 2001:46). This is a copy of a Kolbe map with the name of *Louis le Grand*, but incorrectly. Kolbe may be wrong and may rather have referred to *Jean Durand* who owned Bergen Henegouwen (Donkerhoek) from 1689 – 1710 (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:26), and the adjacent farms La Motte and Frederiksburg from 1711 – 1727) (Ibid.: 24, 25). This owner appears to be more plausible, as he was rich, high ranking and a *heemraad*.

A possible explanation for this contradiction could be that there was a *Louis le Grand*, but not a registered owner, who managed the farm. It is noteworthy that Kolbe, as secretary to the *Landdrost en Heemrade* at Stellenbosch from 1711 – 1713, knew all these men intimately and visited their farms regularly (I:117a). Note also that it was the influential and rich farmers who obtained these status positions of *heemraaden* (*burgemeesters*), or officers in the military.

Within about 20 years (c.1710) those farmers who applied themselves, built-up relatively large estates and cultivated lands (Coertzen 1988:116/7). Kolbe (I 1727:115 – 116) refers to these as “*landgoederen en Meyeryen*”, while the smaller farms and lands were negated as insignificant in 1710 (“*is hier niet veel merkwaardigs, ten zy men alle kleine bakjes, de overige Meyeryen en wat daarvan afhangt, bezichtigen wilde*”) (Ibid.:118b).

Of course inclement weather, drought, plagues and floods were regular obstacles, including sickness (Coertzen 1988:93, 102/3). The exclusivity of the French and their fluctuating temperament made them no friends of the Dutch, who with disdain stated “*they would rather give bread to a Hottentot or a dog than to a Huguenot*” (Ibid.).

5. BUILDINGS OF THE PIONEER SETTLERS

5.1 CAPE TOWN

Settlement patterns of the Cape generally reflect the social and economic circumstances of the settlers. Conditions at the *De Caabse Vlek* (Kaapstad) were quite different than those of its 18th century satellite villages. Initially the town centred around two forts (mud-fort and stone castle), a large garden, numerous official buildings and pleins, and structures for its high-ranking officialdom. Its harbour situation was unique and critical for trade and so also the numerous taverns. Buildings were erected with VOC funds and in stone or hard-fired bricks, many imported, but all buildings were one storey high and pitched, due to the fierceness of the south-eastern wind.

5.2 STELLENBOSCH

In contrast, the colony of Stellenbosch started solely as a farming community, spread far and wide since the 1680s. It included the areas west of Simonsberg, all along the Eerste River from Jonkershoek to False Bay, and along the Helderberg and Hottentots-Holland mountains. The *Frontier model* of colonization can successfully be applied here in order to explicate the building patterns over time (Vos 1993:11-14).

During the first stage there is a loss of social and economic complexity due to its isolated nature, while the next stage is characterized by geographical dispersal, becoming overwhelming agrarian. Thirdly, a frontier town develops (Stellenbosch), due to administrative, ecclesiastical and educational needs. By 1700 a fully functional town complete with church, political magistrate or Drostdy, school, mill and tradesmen, along well-defined streets had developed.

Three types of buildings were erected somewhat simultaneously, viz. the public VOC buildings (Drostdy, church cum-school and mill); the VOC-built and rented buildings to its officials (*Kolonieshuise*), and finally there were the private dwellings of freeburghers. It is these latter ones that are of interest to us, as well as the pioneer structures on farms (Vos 1993:98-103, 166-191).

The earliest frontier buildings reflect the following characteristics:

1. Simplified and were primarily functional with the bare necessities.
2. The most economic building materials were utilized from the local environment.
3. Buildings would reflect individualism and variation.
4. Placement was according to initial whims based on fatherland traditions.
5. Concentration of buildings for reasons of security, defence and social needs.

5.3 FRENCH REFUGEES: BERG RIVER PIONEERS 1687 – 1710

5.3.1 EARLY CONDITIONS

During the few years from 1685 to early 1688 about two dozen Dutch / French farmers were settled, but obviously hardship, isolation, poverty and the threat of Khoi-San and wild animals led to the abandonment of farms and buildings. The French refugees later resettled some of these buildings and lands. These impermanent buildings were poorly placed or built, and it was such a one that for a time served as a place of worship (see Vos 2009).

Kolbe referred in c.1712 to these early dwellings as “*slechte hutten en geringe boere huizen*” (I:115b). The first French buildings were erected during the Cape winter of 1688 and had to be built within a few weeks. There was no chance to make raw bricks as inclement weather would easily have destroyed them. Without any slaves and only some willing but unreliable Khoi, the men were dependent upon themselves and neighbours to build their dwellings. With practically no transport, they felled the timbers in valleys and dragged it on their backs to their homes.

The aspiring farmers were at least issued by the VOC some equipment on credit, to be used in buildings, like spades, shovels and double-ended picks for digging foundation trenches, trowels and carpentry tools like planes, axes, handsaws, chisels, hammers, pangas and about 50 lbs of nails (Coertzen & Fensham 1988:85; Franken 1978:21; Vos 2001:41). Muskets, shot, flintstones and gunpowder were also issued, as the Drakenstein burgers also formed part of the Stellenbosch militia. Every 14 days after church on Sundays, they mustered together near the Drostdy (Franken 198:29, n.5).

5.3.2 LABOUR FORCE

With the erection of buildings, the French would have assisted each other, or possibly received some assistance from the extant farmers like Pieter van der Bijl and Van As. Practically no one had slaves and nearby Khoikhoi, whose kraals were in the vicinity, assisted. Unfortunately the Khoikhoi only worked when they felt like it or when their supplies of food, tobacco or drink ran out, they nonetheless made a substantial contribution to the labour force of the French settlers, more so than with the other colonists. Biewenga (1999:105-108) gives an extensive summary of the role of Khoi as integrated labourers at the Cape (**FIG.12**). The dissertation of Cliff (1995) should also be consulted and the traveller T. Leguat’s commentary in 1698 (**Add.2**).

We can attribute it to:

1. Non-availability of slaves at the Cape. In 1694 the French still complained about the scarcity of labour (Raven-Hart II 1971:403).
2. The impoverished French could not buy slaves, as they were very expensive.
3. Khoi-kraals were scattered in the area, but seasonal movement limited their availability.
4. Individuals or small families of Khoikhoi without stock found refuge near the farmers’ werfs, and were thus slowly but surely integrated into households and agricultural activities.

The secretary of the Cape Town Political Council, J.G. Grevenbroek, wrote the first full treatise on the Khoikhoi in Latin, based on his personal experiences when he stayed at Welmoed, Stellenbosch, in c.1695 (Smuts (ed.) 1979:372/3). Kolbe used much of this material in his own writings on the Cape Khoi. Grevenbroek noted the Khoi were good labourers, messengers, brick makers and layers, woodcutters, wine-pressing (and drinkers), ploughing, sowing and reaping cereals. They wore European clothing, while the woman helped in the kitchen, washed clothing and cared for the children. They stayed in their huts adjacent the farms (Biewenga 1999:105) (**FIG.13.1**, **FIG.13.2**).

Not only were the French rather emotional and tempers flared quickly between themselves (as noted by Simon van der Stel in 1690s), but interaction with the local Khoi also produced its rows (see Malherbe, et al 1996). At an early stage (1688/9) there developed a great familiarity between these two parties, but sometimes with friction and dire results.

In the watermelon field at *Le Plessis Merle*, Charles Marais was fatally assaulted by Edessha or Dikkop, with Jan and Rooman as witnesses (Ibid.:13) in April 1689. In Wagenmakersvallei in 1707 Jean du Tuillet (of Hexenberg) and another, beat a slave and a Khoi-man named *Caffer* (i.e. non-believer) to death (Ibid.:17). The short, blacksmith at Zion, Daniel Hugo (Hugot), was a particular difficult customer. When Khoi cattle damaged his hard-planted vineyards in May 1702, he walked to his neighbour Hercules des Pres's farm Watervliet and torched the hut of culprit Khoi-captain Jan! (Ibid.:10). Hercules du Preez jr. apparently employed more Khoi than most French, and a number of families settled in huts close by (De Villiers 1947).

At Kapstadt a large Khoi kraal was situated against Leeuwberg (1688) (Raven-Hart II 1971:350), as was noted also by Kolbe and to be seen in his drawing of the town. Most Dutch burghers also employed a Khoi labourer or more, whose relatives camped near the street door for any food scraps coming their way. It was reported by travellers (1691 (p.384), 1694 (p.403)) that they do servile work for little reward, like food or kitchen grease, a great favourite as they smeared their bodies with it.

Cattle and sheep were stolen by both sides and insults were easily exchanged. Examples cited are the worst cases that made it to the Court of Justice of the Landdrost at Stellenbosch. For the most, it was more peaceful with cordial relations predominantly. Similar conditions were to be found at Bethlehem. Pierre Simond got to know the Khoi well and made some startling and salient observations about these independent people by 1689. He advised kindly relations, the wearing of clothes, that they be taught the pursuit of agriculture on their own land and that they be Christianized (Franken 1978:197). It is obvious that Simond also accommodated some Khoi in their huts in exchange for their labour.

During the harvesting season, bands of Khoi moved from farm to farm and brought in the cereal crops (Adam Tas 1705, in Fouché & Böeseken 1970:110, 124, 126, 128; Biewenga 1999:107); vine dressings and plantings formed part of their work (Kolbe 1727 I); we find them ploughing and involved with agricultural pursuits, and not necessarily the slaves.

During the 17th and 18th century conditions were difficult and survival of the fittest and toughest was the law of the land. Persecuted, despised and treated with unfairness in France, the French were seething with anger just below the surface. Emotional and egotistical by nature, they soon became embroiled in arguments and conflicts, or took others of their own kind to court (see Franken 1978). Knifings, murder, swearing, drunkenness, harsh punishment of Khoi workers, adultery and stock-theft were not uncommon, similar to social conditions of many inhabitants at the Cape.

5.3.3 KNECHTEN

There were a few categories of “servants” (*knegte*) at the Cape. One early type was the **free-servant** or *vrykneg*. These were Dutch or French freeburghers who could not make it on their own and rented themselves out to other freeburghers or officials. They could serve in trades, or as teachers, or more commonly as labourers on land, or as shepherds, or as foremen over Khoi or slaves (Schoeman 2001:299). Some of the French, like Jacques de Savoye (Vrede-en-lust) brought the Nortier brothers as “servants”, but they left his employ at the Cape and became farmers adjacent his land, aiding Jacques, but fencing also for themselves. The more reliable Khoimen could also act as vryknechts, receiving money for their services (e.g. in Drakenstein 1745)(Worden (ed.) 2007:7).

We find that Pierre Simond on his farm Bethlehem made use of such two French *leenknegte* from early 1688, which basically managed the farm for him (Franken 1978:52/3). Official contracts were concluded between parties, e.g. they were entitled to about f14 / month, a pound of tobacco, daily meals and clothes, which could include leather pants and one or two blue shirts. After Simond obtained Mererust in 1697, he would have employed a French free-servant to run the farm for him.

The other major category of *knechts* was the superfluous Company soldiers or sailors, who were loaned to the freeburghers, generally for a year. The freeburgher was then fully responsible for the loan-servant’s food, clothes, housing, and remuneration. The other half of his pay went to the Company (Schoeman 2001:299). This rent-a-servant from the VOC worked in the short term fairly well, as the farmer had some “reliable” means of assistance in lieu of slaves.

Some of the more reliable *knechts* were acting as foremen on the loan-farms or *buiteposte* of the more prosperous farmers, where they herded flocks of cattle and sheep, and sowed, reaped and stored the cereals. During the 18th century we find many a knecht on farms, marrying the widow, suddenly becoming the master of lands and great wealth.

5.4 STRUCTURES: PIONEER PERIOD

5.4.1 GENERAL: CAPE AND SIMONDIUM

What did these early buildings look like and how were they constructed? At least three sources can be consulted. Historic journals of the time say little about the structures, but inventories give an indication of furnishings, size, layout and types of buildings. Contemporary drawings and of later years are extremely important. And lastly, well-documented restorations or archaeological investigations are also crucial, but rare. Comparisons with Stellenbosch farms of the same period and excavations of demolished houses and existing old ones like Schreuderhuis (1709) by archaeologists (Vos 1993) give us an indication of what to expect in Drakenstein.

I superficially scanned a number of Drakenstein inventories for the early period century, but few were to be found detailing the layout of houses, or even buildings on the farms. After the manslaughter of Arij Lekkerwijn by Hans, the house of Arij is called “*een kleijn huijsjen*” in Dec.1697, and from the few goods it was merely a 2-roomed house (kitchen and bedroom)(**Add.3**).

Inventories for this period, primarily of Cape Town and environs, have been analysed (Malan 1986, 1990; Woodward 1982; Brink 1992). By 1700 basic one or two-roomed houses were built, sometimes with a barn attached. Meagre furnishings were common, particularly where single men were involved. During the first quarter of the 18th century the *voorhuis* (front hall) with a room (or rooms) on either side were becoming more popular, with a shift from asymmetry to symmetry (Vos 1993:250). We can safely assume that the farming communities at Dal Josaphat, Paarl and Simondium would be quite similar.

Early Cape constructions, of whatever nature, were called “*betimmeringe*” and were not limited to “timber” constructions, as has been alleged (Scheffler 1995:254/5). In all freehold grants the land could be “*bepplanten, bezaaien, bepooten, betimmeren*” (i.e. planted, sowed, planted with vines and trees and be built). In Dutch terminology *timmer* or *betimmer* originally referred to earlier carpentry practices when structures were built in timbers. In forested Europe most houses utilized timber within the wall structures.

Here I would like to quote Bógaert (1708:466). Willem van der Stel and the officials obtained land, “*te bezitten, te betimmeren, te beheeren, wyngaarden ... te pooten, tarwe, rogge en garst te zaayen*”. At Vergelegen (Ibid.:474), the extensive *gebouwen* were *voltimmert* within a few years. These *gevaartens* (buildings) required large amounts of timber, thatch, clay, brick and iron. In 1713 Wessel Pretorious, one of the wealthiest Stellenbosch burghers, his farm Rustenburg (and adjacent Berg Sinai), was described as a “*hofsteede met de daaropstaande timmeragien*”, which certainly pointed to permanent structures in brick and stone.

At the Cape this practice was initially followed but within a few years wood had become extremely scarce. It was particularly during the period 1652 – 1685 that buildings incorporated wooden palisades. After Van Rheeede had inspected Cape Town, the farms and outposts in 1685, wooden structures were forbidden. The threat of fire was also a major consideration. In 1691/2 *placaaten* forbid the erection of any house, barn or kraal with palisaded walls (quoted in Vos 1993:98). Buildings razed by fire and the scarcity of wood (by 1660s) soon led most to build in stone or brick in Cape Town.

Thus those who did not have access to wagons, oxen, tools or labour, could not build in dressed stone. They took recourse to buildings in clay layers or in some cases raw brick or soft-fired bricks. These buildings were also referred to as *timmeragies* in the documents. In rural areas like Stellenbosch and Drakenstein, structures built in clay courses and later stone, were initially the norm. For example, the farm in Paarl of De Savoye was leased to various tenants. On 19.4.1702 a contract mentioned “*timmeringe van een huijs*” of 20 x 10 ft (wide) dimensions; “*timmeragien van huys, hocken, coraalen*” (Franken 1978:49).

In most pioneering situations there is a return to simplicity and economy of materials. Much of my archaeological and structural research have shown that the first structures were rectangular in shape, and one, two or three rooms wide; constructed with shallow foundations in local stone; sometimes built-up for 20 – 30 cm in stone, or even higher (60-80 cm) as a waterproofing measure, followed by courses of clay, stacked one upon another. There is enough evidence that most pioneer buildings in Stellenbosch, Groot Drakenstein, Simondium and Franschoek were built in this fashion.

Walls sometimes consisted of sun-dried bricks and, where plenty of labour was available even of (dressed) stone. The walls were low (2m or slightly more) with hipped roofs thatched with rye straw or thin reeds, but the latter appeared only after the first generation. Lofts (*solders*) were a luxury and only became common after 1730s. Endgables and front gables were rare on farms. Practically all floors were of (greyish or yellowish) clay, applied in thin layers. Hearth walls were not always installed and the kitchen fire could be situated on the floor, as in Europe.

5.4.2 BERGEN HENEGOUWEN (Donkerhoek)

In respect of housing, the case of the farm Bergen Henegouwen is informative. Henegouwen was a District in Belgium from where De Savoye hailed from. It was owned by one of the richest French burghers, Jean Durand, who practised as a doctor (surgeon) and his partner, Jean Pariset, who probably managed the day-to-day farm activities. Durand owned also a house in Cape Town. The history of the farm is documented (Rabe 2006).

In 1710 the farm was sold to Matthys Michelse, one of the more prosperous Swedish / German farmers and wine distributors (Scheffler 1995:25; Hoge 1946:274). Herman was a tavernman in Cape Town selling beer, wine and brandy (Scheffler 1995:41-4), and bought the place for the huge sum of f8500. Note that the two adjacent farms of Frederiksberg and La Motte were only valued at f1300 each. This would indicate that the farm Frederiksberg increased in value from f500 in 1705 to f1300 in 1711, a sure indication of assets like buildings. In 1705 buildings (*betimmeringen*) were already present on Frederiksberg (Ibid.:38).

Bergen Henegouwen (or Donkerhoek) sported a number of buildings (Ibid.), viz.:

1. Dwelling: room on the right, room on the left and a kitchen with no ceiling (solder). One female slave slept probably in the kitchen. Hearth on floor?
2. Bake house (*bakhuijs*) – separate though nearby structure for baking purposes, as there was no oven inside the dwelling. Also contained a bed, a large brandy still, salt kegs and a sieve. Baking, butchering of meat.
3. Wine-cellar, large: wine vats and leaguers, two ox wagons, a horse cart, farming implements, etc. The stable for horses was probably attached.
4. Wine-cellar, smaller, lower down (*wijnkelder om laag*): Housed wine, cereals, old vats, domestic utensils, carpentry, tools, ox hides, 10 beams (round), etc. One could speculate that the 5 male slaves slept here, or otherwise higher up near the dwelling.
5. Barn lower down (*hok om Laegh*): – keg of barley, thatching straw (*dekstroo*), i.e. bundles of wheat / barley, and 4 beams (round). Appears to be a smaller barn, may have housed the stables or space for some cows (there was a churn in Building 3).
6. A kraal – not mentioned (an immovable), but 463 sheep and 77 oxen would require one, possibly with a dividing wall.

Obviously *Bergen Henegouwen* represented a well-managed and prosperous farm, with more than the essentials. We may imagine Bethlehem to be of similar size by this time (c.1710).

5.4.3 FREDERIKSBERG AND LA MOTTE

On the adjacent farms La Motte and Frederiksbergh, a farm werf developed on their dividing line. One of the oldest dwellings is presumably a rectangular structure built in stone, of about 3-rooms. Scheffler gives much attention to this building which was investigated by archaeologists in 1991 (Seeman, et al 1991a; Scheffler 1995:27, 125, 141, 230, 231).

Scheffler dated it on historical extrapolation to between 1705 – 1711, the period Marie Vitou owned the farm, but stayed on adjacent Bergen Henegouwen. Buildings in stone (up to eaves), are rare and can be dated to a period when the farmers became more prosperous, or when an owner was already well-off. Such buildings are very difficult to date but probably fit into the period 1700 – 1740, depending on circumstances of each

owner. On the basis of Scheffler's interpretation, I would date this building therefore at c.1710. These buildings are labour and equipment intensive, wagons needed to fetch the stone and labourers to dress it with tools and strong scaffolding required. These more permanent dwellings have survived, but in form they are still 3-roomed and relatively low in wall height (2.5m to 3m) (**FIG.14**).

According to the archaeological investigation and write-up (1 page), two rooms were added at the southern end, but not dated. Scheffler (1995:116, 124-6) dated the stone structures to c.1710, and the additions in brick to the late 18th century (c.1780). Unfortunately the fabric itself was not fully investigated nor dated by any of the parties. These dates are therefore interpreted on historical evidence. Regrettably Scheffler's functional designations of the "5 rooms" are incorrect, where "rooms" were confused with distinct *separate buildings*.

According to the **1781 inventory** the 3-roomed stone building (already in use as a school building during the 1750s), functioned partially as *de oude School Camer* with a table, two benches, 4 chairs and a "kapstok", and *de nieuwe School Camer* where a bed and sacks of wheat were located. I interpret the building still to be 2- or 3-roomed, with no additions (Rooms 4 - 5). In the inventory **separate buildings** followed, viz. the large coach-house, with probably two rooms adjoining, the *Vleesch kamer* (meat / butcher's room) and *Timmermanswinkel* (Carpentry shop). Then followed a very large wine-cellar, with a smithy and a cooperage appended.

In respect of the main Manor house (Frederiksberg) the archaeologists identified a T-shaped house of about 2nd half of the 18th century (Seeman, et al 1991a, 1991b). In contrast, Scheffler (1995:111-112, 235/6) identified "a *three roomed dwelling*", which once formed part of the northern wing of the house. It was still extant in 1766 and interpreted as a 3-roomed dwelling (rooms are not listed) according to the enumerated contents. Also present was a wine-cellar (9 leaguers for wine, etc.), and a stable would have been in order for 6 horses and a kraal for the oxen and sheep. In addition there were 12 slaves (Ibid.:112/3). It is likely that the 3-roomed stone dwelling may have served as part of the stables or slave quarters. Between 1771 – 1781 (c.1775) the 3-roomed dwelling was enlarged to a T-shape with other additions (**FIG.15**).

The "deduced" 3-room dwelling I have dated to >1725 due to its flattish brick (60 mm?), it being medium-fired to a fine orange colour (need wood, labour, kilns), the unusual height of the eaves (c.3.5m) and the distinct gable edging, where bricks are laid obliquely (see photos).

Buildings in Drakenstein, Paarl and Franschoek, and other references up to 1710, are summarized by Vos (2001: 33-37).

5.4.4 CONCLUSION

Due to the poor economic situation of the refugees, they would only have erected the most functional dwellings when they arrived, building kraals, barns and threshing floors the following years and cellars by the fifth year for wine storage (**FIG.15.1**). They were practically all poor and without any slaves and would have built in traditional clay courses. A number of farms or ruins still display such building examples. Those with more finances (and debt) could afford more labour and equipment, building also in stone, quarried locally. Afterwards, when wood was more available (tree plantings) (>1710?), they would use wood-fired, brick kilns for low-burnt bricks.

Indigenous timbers from the *kloofs* or ravines would have supplied the beams or even, if affordable, from the Company's magazines. Deal and teak were generally available. Hipped buildings were still the most common timber type of thatching, with materials like straw from barley and wheat predominant (see Stade drawing 1710, Drakenstein).

Note at De Goede Hoop, Drakenstein, that an early 18th century outbuilding still exists (Vos 2004a) and at Rhone, Drakenstein, a c.1690 outbuilding with clay courses (wine-cellar) and an early outbuilding of c.1720 are also located (Vos 2004b). These are the building types that one would expect during the Pioneer stage at Bethlehem.

Floors of all constructions were practically all in clay layers, generally in grades of grey to yellowish, depending on the environment. Note that these floors were never finished with a dung surface during the Pioneer period. This practice only gathered momentum towards the very late 18th century and became popular from the 19th century in the rural areas. At Frederiksberg Manor house (T-shaped), the kitchen and side room were smeared (19/20th century) (Seeman, et al 1991b). At Bien Donne there was also a dung-smeared clay floor (late 19th century). Clay floors were the norm in rural areas, even in lavish Cape homes till the early 20th century. Here the example of Schoongezicht, at Dal Josaphat can suffice, visited by Fairbridge (1922:146; quoted in Vos 2001:30).

6. DRAKENSTEIN CONGREGATION

6.1 FARMYARD PERIOD 1687 – 1694

Originally (1688) the refugees were concentrated in the Simondium area, stretching from the Berg River up the slopes of Simonsberg. Due to the poor soil conditions, particularly adjacent the stony river, they moved in late 1688 further along, i.e. east of the Berg River and southwards to the river's end, enclosed by mountains, known as the *France Quartier*, previously *Olifantshoek*.

In their choice of far-flung arable lands, the French sowed the seeds of their disintegration as a united community. Consequently, no central church cum-school followed, which always served as anchors of communal worship and youth education. Though they complained constantly about their wide dispersal, they were themselves primarily responsible (Franken 1978:185).

In the Netherlands, they already requested the services of a French pastor. Note that Pierre Simond was appointed by the DEIC (VOC) in Holland, and he enlisted as a Company official, subject to their rules and regulations. He was therefore treated differently and with greater respect and deference by the Cape officials.

Intrinsically the VOC wanted a greater population to produce adequate food supplies for its ships. Greater knowledge of viticulture was required to improve the bad Cape wines (Botha 1970:142). Very few of the refugees were vine farmers, the three De Villiers brothers being the main exception. No wonder they soon prospered beyond their comrades. In Europe, France and Holland regularly became arch-enemies. The refugees were therefore sent to the Western Cape's eastern frontier (Berg River) to prevent them from turning on the Cape colonists, and to act as a military buffer zone against the indigenous natives (San & Khoi) (Ibid.:41). Transport to church would have been by slow oxwagon, or by horse (single), or on foot (single or multiple). One of the primary deterrents to gatherings was the wide and strong Berg River, isolating families for weeks, especially during the winter months.

6.1.1 PLACEMENT OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP: FARMYARD CHURCH

Settled in a foreign wilderness, the French found security amongst themselves, bound primarily by their Protestant beliefs and mother tongue of French. These found expression in a "central" place of worship, in the form of various buildings, which supposedly could serve also as a school for the youth (At Stellenbosch the Church served as a school during the week) (**FIG.16**).

Jacques de Savoye was one of the oldest French men (born in 1636) and with his strong personality, incorrigible ways and being fluent in both French and Dutch, he was a natural father figure and leader (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:19-20). I therefore conclude that he

specified where to meet and probably conducted the services as he was quite literate, by reading from the French Bible and printed sermons (*preekbundels*). In Ghent, Belgium, his home was regularly used for services (Boucher 1981:266). Thus he acted as “pastor” till Preacher Pierre Simond arrived four months later (19.8.1688) and attended to his refugee flock. It is easy to imagine how these two volatile French characters disagreed on how things should be done.

So where was the earliest church gatherings kept? With extremes of settlement, like Du Toit at Dal Josaphat in the north and Estienne Nel far south in the Fransche Hoek, the “logical” choice was where the families concentrated at Babilons Toorn, the original name of the AREA adjacent the mountain outcrop Babilon’s Toorn (see FIG.8). This locality name, ***Babilon’s Toorn, alias Drakesteijn*** is significant, as the early church was designated as situated at “*Babilon’s Toorn*”, meaning the area (De Villiers 1984:3, 18, 19). Of course, as has been pointed out, Jacques or Jacobus de Savoye’s say would have been decisive in establishing the church close to his properties.

How large was the congregation? With about 150 people (*koppen*) of all ages and gender (Franken 1978:32; Botha 1970:154-5), we can assume that about 60 members would meet, as distances, transport and weather were factors limiting attendance (Franken 1978:194). From about May 1688 till about late 1694, the congregation met in a variety of places. Kolbe (II: 238) related, “*De Fransche Vluchtelingen ... dat dezelve zeer kerkgezind zyn*”, easily traveled two to four hours to hear a good sermon.

They may have met in a home or barn of the Dutch farmers Pieter van der Bijl at Babilons Toorn or nearby at Simonsvlei of Joan Blesius, or even at the adjacent farms of Overveen (Jacobus van der Heyden), Bloemendal (Maartin van Staaden) or Kunnenburg (Willem van der Merwe). It was noted in the Resolution of 8.11.1688, that Simond would preach alternatively to the French in Stellenbosch and at Drakenstein: “*guns in de Kerk, hier in ‘t best gelege en bekwaamste vrijmanshuys*” (RPR III:196) (see also Spoelstra II:600). Meeting in an existing dwelling or outbuilding of one of the Dutch burghers (1685-1687) would be the logical choice, particularly as winter was fast approaching.

It is noteworthy that Kolbe (II: 239b) mentioned that Jacobus van der Heyde, who was well-disposed towards the French, was willing to give a piece of his land freely for the erection of a Rectory (Pastorie) and a Schoolhouse, respectively for the Preacher and Schoolmaster. Jacobus lived at Overveen from 1687-1695, and it highly likely that the 1694-church was to be erected close-by (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:20). Between 1693 and 1700 Jacobus also owned the farms Nantes (Paarl) and from 1696 the prosperous Welmoed (Stellenbosch) (Van der Bijl 1963:66A).

At an early stage relations between the French and some Dutch soured. The French refugees then vowed to allow marriages only between themselves, while the Dutch swore that they rather give bread to a Hottentot or a dog than to a Frenchman (*liever aan hottentot, en een hond een stuk brood geven, als aan een Fransman*) (Franken 1978:169).

Between 1688 and early 1690s the French met in various places, what I have called the Farmyard church period. There was also the option of meeting in buildings which were abandoned by the Dutch colonists. I speculate that some of these buildings were resettled in May 1688 by the French; that Vrede-en-Lust and Le Plessis Merle contained one or two existing buildings. Therefore Jacques de Savoye and Charles Marais (he was about 50 years) (Botha 1970:37), were happy to stay on their land and did not move as all the others did. Their lands would have been cultivated for a year. As the two oldest men with large families they may have had the “right” to the choicest farms and therefore were the only two who had a harvest in early 1689 (Franken 1978:47).

From May 1688 to November 1688 the French were mostly settled around Babilons Toorn (Simondium) area (**FIG16.2**). At behest of Simond’s intervention most of the French were granted permission to relocate to other parts along the Bergh River. Friends stuck together and build structures for themselves, and for all their belongings and equipment they acquired from the VOC.

In his letter of 15.6.1689 Simond referred to a lodge or building in which they met, constructed by one of the Frenchman who moved in late 1688: “*Loge d’un de nos François qui a change de place*”. Franken (1978:175, 187) translated *loge* as a “*pondok of loods*”, or “*hut*”, creating the false impression of a small, flimsy building. Note that at least 60 members out of 150 had to be accommodated and on special occasions at least 120. During the pioneer period 1688 – 1694, they had no fixed “church” abode, and met in an abandoned (desolate) building (*in een verlaaten hutte*), and then gathered sometimes at the one farmer or another, where they obtained a room (... *bij den een landbouwer, of den ander, die ons een kamer leende ...*) (Ibid.).

As this was the time when the Dutch and French were at loggerheads, it was highly unlikely that they continued to meet on Dutch farms. Wagons, horses, oxen and a great amount of traffic would not endear the French to a Dutch farmer. So as the seasons moved, they would use farms, or cellars, or large rooms, as they became available.

Getting the necessary chairs or benches to the relevant building would have been more difficult. Locally made benches may also have been in use. Placing the “chairs” for seating arrangements would be according to rank, i.e. within the social class amongst the French themselves. From 1691, when *heemraden*, church deacons and elders were becoming more common, appointed positions would be respected. Women were

generally seated on chairs in front according to their status and men towards the back or against the sides on benches. We find no references to any quarrels in this regard amongst the French church members.

The French possibly brought at least a Bible per family with them from France. Nonetheless the inventories for the period (first half of 18th century) indicate about one Bible for every 4 families (10 Bibles in 40 estates) (Wijnbeek 2007:102). Psalm books would be easy to carry and brought to services each Sunday, while the preacher would read from his Bible or a printed Sermon book (*preekbundel*). Communion was kept four times a year (January, April, August and December), and presumably each brought his own cup of glass or pewter mug/cup himself. Wine would be presumably served by bottle (onion type) or case bottles (*flessen*), but they easily broke. A small casket may have been more appropriate and functional (**FIG.17**).

Baptism of babies was common and an important tradition of *peterschap* where the godfather / mother accompanied the babe. The preacher and the sexton (*voorleser*) would be seated in front at a table, and sometimes when available, with a *knaap* (reader), or on top of the table, or a separate pulpit stand. While meeting in a building during 1690, Simond caused a commotion. In the presence of about 60 members he refused “elder” Jacques de Savoye as godfather and witness at his grandchild’s baptism.

It should be noted that the sexton was generally addressed as *dominie* (ds) and the preacher as reverend or *Eerwaarde* (Eerw.). Later the term *dominie* became strongly associated with the pastor, particularly when the post of *voorleser* lapsed.

6.1.2 SIMOND VERSUS DE SAVOYE FEUDS

Much has been written on the feuds that developed between these two men and some of their characteristics are contrasted for the year 1688:

Pierre Simond	Jacques de Savoye
1. Born 1651 (therefore 37).	1. Born in 1636 (therefore 52).
2. Married 4 months before, childless.	2. Married second time, 3 children. First wife died and 4 children died.
3. French minister, "pastor" in 1678 (Boucher 1981:174).	3. Merchant, laymember, Calvinist.
4. Spoke and wrote only French, fluent in Latin (Franken 1978:187).	4. Spoke and wrote both French and Dutch.
5. Appointed by VOC on 6.10.1687 at f90/month (Ibid.:177). Well-off.	5. Once very rich (Boucher 1981:265), received no formal aid from Batavia, but heavily in debt.
6. Autocratic, introvert, academic, quiet in disposition, somewhat haughty.	6. Autocratic, extrovert, practical, volatile and tempestuous, but staunch and courageous believer (Ibid.:268).
7. Ambitious, creative.	7. Ambitious, but set in ways, quick to take offence.
8. Privileged, moved amongst high Company officials.	8. Free burgher, made a Heemraad (<i>burgemeester or burgerraad</i>) on 29.12.1690 (RPR III:228).
9. Served on Stellenbosch Church Council but understood little initially. Later (>1692) better versed in Dutch.	9. Joined Stellenbosch congregation since 1689/90.

Pierre (also called Pieter or Petrus) Simond and Jacques (also called Jacob or Jacobus) de Savoye clashed heads over leadership roles. The latter later accused Simond of acting like a "little Pope" (*die kleine Pous*), requiring no deacons or elders and therefore no advisors in a Church Council (Franken 1978:35/6). Consequently, from about December 1688 (Ibid.: 39), the offended De Savoye (abbreviated to DS) and family (wife and daughter) started with a gossip and slander campaign against Simond.

Simond retaliated by refusing to serve De Savoye with the Holy Communion in Dec. 1688, as it was rumoured that DS went bankrupt in Gent, Belgium. Simond regarded this as shameful and a cause for confession, which DS steadfastly withstood as a papal tradition!

DS then left the Drakenstein congregation and became a member of the Stellenbosch church, which was erected in 1687 by the Company (**FIG.18**).

6.1.3 SIMOND ARGUES FOR A CHURCH COUNCIL

Jacob de Savoye was upset and not pleased by meeting separately at Stellenbosch and the rest of his family and friends at Drakenstein. He continued to pester Simond for a separate Church Council at Drakenstein (Franken 1978:187). The Political Council and commander resisted, because the instruction from the Lords 17 stipulated already in 1687 that no French church must develop independently (Franken 1978:27, etc.).

Interestingly enough, from late 1688 Simond implored Commander Simon van der Stel several times for a separate Church Council, which was refused. The “Stellenbosch” pastor, deacon and elder were also to shepherd the French refugees. Simond therefore petitioned by letter (15.6.1689) to the Lords 17 to rectify this matter, explaining that the refugees blame him for their impoverished condition and for not establishing a church council. It is important to note that Simond sincerely desired this, because then he could exercise supervision and censure upon his flock, which they now despised (Franken 1978:186-7).

Free thinking and freedom of expression were not part of the social vocabulary during the late 17th century at the austere Cape. Simond had to govern these unruly French, but he also meddled in numerous affairs unnecessarily, was the conclusion reached by Secretary J.G. de Grevenbroek in 1693 (Franken 1978:40/1, 195).

Finally, overcome with impatience, the refugees under leadership of Jacob de Savoye, with Simond leading the deputation, met the Commander at the Castle on Monday 28.11.1689. The four men represented the four concentrations of refugees: viz. Jacob de Savoye (Vrede-en-Lust at Babilons Toren), Daniel de Ruelle (De Hoop, Daljosaphat), Abraham de Villiers (La Bri, Olifantshoek) and Louis Courtier (Cordier) (Bethel, northern Paarl). As the international relations between France and the Netherlands were poor, the deputation met with sarcasm and opposition by the Political Council, and returned home humiliated and furious (RPR II:214/5).

Undeterred, Simond communicated directly with the Netherlands officials. The Lords 17 responded on 17.12.1690 favourably to Simond’s petition and when their letter arrived in 1691 at the Cape, a Church Council was established at Drakenstein (Franken 1978:35; Botha 1970:152-4). Interestingly enough, on December 14, 1690, the two Frenchmen, Guillaum du Toit (Aan ’t Pad, Stellenbosch) and Claude Marais (Le Plessis Merle), were appointed as deacons at the Stellenbosch Church Council where Simond also officiated (RPR III:227). On December 30, 1691, *Eerw. Petrus Simond (sic) bedienaar des Goddelijken woords in de gemeente an Stellenbosch en Drakenstein*, appointed

Claude Marais (Marré) as elder for Stellenbosch, as well his wife's brother Louijs de Berault and Louijs Cordier as elders. Not surprisingly he appointed four **French** deacons, viz. Abraham de Villiers, Pierre Meÿer, Pierre Benezet and Pierre Rousseau (RPR III:247) (Botha 1970:29). Simond took his revenge and turned the Stellenbosch and Drakenstein Church Councils completely French, so they all could understand each other!

From these appointees in 1691 till 1695, it appears that sometimes the combined councils met at Stellenbosch and not separately e.g. at Drakenstein. Another very obvious point was that Simond never nominated nor appointed Jacobus de Savoye to any church position. Both of them moved to Cape Town in 1702. Note that De Savoye did not have his church confirmation papers from France with him and Simond conveniently kept this against him.

6.1.4 SIMOND OFFENDED DE SAVOYE AT BAPTISMAL CEREMONY

We shall return to Jacobus de Savoye (DS) and Petrus Simond, who were still in the middle of their squabble in 1690. Matters really came to a head when DS's eldest daughter, Marguerite (Margo) and her husband Christoffel Snyman, was to baptise their child on Sunday 19 November 1690, in a building, presumably a barn near Babilons Toren. Jacob de Savoye, his wife and the young couple were all sitting in front near the "pulpit", probably a writing desk with a raised section for reading from the French Bible. The baptismal bowl (original *spoelkom*) was probably a beautiful ceramic bowl, or deep dish, Japanese or Chinese in origin.

Simond was willing to baptise the child, but to the consternation of those present, rejected Jacob as witness ("*peter*") of his own grandchild! This was the last straw for the DS family and all three blasted the pastor with slander and threats! They accused him of being i.a. a false shepherd, a hypocrite, a (catholic) Priest and Jesuit, a Judah and a Kaffer, i.e. unbeliever. They would show this small gentleman a thing or two (*petit Monsieur*) (Franken 1978:37/8). Apparently Simond did not retaliate with harsh words, but in a controlled voice softly answered them. His accusers stomped out of the dusty barn and made their way home to Vrede-en-Lust. Afterwards the child was baptised at Stellenbosch church.

Thoroughly indignant, DS wrote letters of accusation against Simond and his wife, and requested letters of character for himself from his friends in the Netherlands, one a lawyer and the other a minister, Francois Simon. The latter attested DS to be a man of honour, without any blame, whose house in Belgium was often used as a gathering place for religious services (Franken 1978:43).

6.1.5 GOVERNMENT POSITIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE

In spite of these commotions, Commander Simon van der Stel was impressed with Jacob de Savoye and on his recommendation this honourable and hardworking man was appointed as one of four *Heemraden* of Stellenbosch in December 1680 (Ibid.:37; RPR III:228). From January 1691 DS would have gone once a month on horseback to the Drostdy, where the *burgerrade* met with the Landdrost and Secretary Sybrand Mancadan, and heard complaints and issued decrees, etc. in respect of the districts of Stellenbosch and Drakenstein.

Just a word on these *Heemraden*. In the Resolutions of the Political Council they are also called *Burgerrade*, a honorary post of great esteem and leadership. Kolbe (I:118ab) calls them *Burgermeesters*, and this was probably their colloquial designation, representing the burghers as “ward” masters. *Meester* was the general term for those in charge and a sign of showing deference. Even today it is still used by certain groups in the Cape.

Jacobus continued to be appointed as a *Heemraad* (Dec. 1691, p.248) (Dec. 1695, p.298). By December 1695 the militia men increased to such a degree that a “*nieuwe Compagnie infanterie*” could be created solely for Drakenstein with Jacques as captain, Jacobus van der Heyden as lieutenant and Gerrit Cloete as flag carrier (*vaandrager*) (Ibid.:289, 290). In 1696 Jacobus turned 60 years, a ripe old age for any man at the Cape. Afterwards, he probably chose not to involve him further with these tasks, due to health reasons.

In response to DS letters, Simond wrote a few long letters in his defence, even drafting a petition with 58 signatures vindicating his position. All these matters took a long time to resolve and only by 14 October 1693, some final correspondence indicated a subsidence of inflamed tempers (Franken 1978:47).

6.1.6 SIMOND & DE SAVOYE AS BUSINESSMEN

What were the real reasons behind the feud between the burghers versus officials? In retrospect, this localised French contention was a mini-play preceding the national rebellion of farmers against the government officials of Willem van der Stel during 1705/6. On the side of the autocratic officials the main motives were avarice and self-interest, while from the farmers it was economic survival and fair price structures, and having a voice in self-government.

De Savoye was the only one with enough courage to take on these matters, as he did in Gent against the papal structures, forsaking his business and offering up his life (they wanted to murder him), for an uncertain future in the wilderness in old age. We must not forget that Simond and his wife were well-off and shrewd business people with contacts in government and overseas. Since 1689 he regularly sent money into an overseas account and the netto profit of all his dealings amounted to f18 063 -18 -5 by early 1702 (Franken 1978:54-55). That was about 1½ times his salary of f90/month for 12 years.

In addition, Simond wanted all his parishioners to pay him a tenth of their income, a heavy burden on the struggling refugees (Ibid.:36). Furthermore, he seriously considered to import into the community a “*banoond*” or “*dwangoond*” i.e. an oven where all must come and bake their bread, generally associated also with a mill for grinding cereals (Ibid.). Such a communal oven for baking their daily bread would have been the death knell for the refugees, all living far away over very rough terrain with no proper roads and very few transport vehicles.

And finally, De Savoye accused Simond’s wife, Anne de Bérault, of selling goods privately from their house at Bethlehem (Ibid.:36). Why would this concern DS? It is my contention that DS as a seasoned merchant also plied his business from his home at **Vrede-en-Lust**. Competition, though further afield at Bethlehem, was not viewed favourably. DS thus must have had a room or rooms furnished as a shop. After 1700 he struggled somewhat as the disadvantaged farmers could not obtain money for their produce and therefore could not pay for goods (Franken 1978:49).

Confirmation of this practice is found when in January 1702 Willem van Zyl bought his farm and continued as “*winkelier*”. By 1710 Kolbe (I:119-120) refers to Van Zyl’s business (**FIG.19**), which he ran from here, and particularly how well he was supported on Sunday after church. It was more convenient to buy here than at Cape Town, though a trifle more expensive.

Inlas Kolbe 119/20

When DS left Vrede-en-Lust in late 1701 for **Cape Town**, he set up shop in Pierre Simond’s previous house at the corner of Burg and Kasteel Street (Franken 1978:50). Here he continued to sell merchandise “*negotie*”.

DS was also granted another farm in the outlying district of **Wagenmakers Valley** (Wellington) by early 1699 by Wilhelm van der Stel. *Kromriver 2* was slightly more than 30 morgen and registered on 28.2.1699 (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:136). He established a farmyard and house, but at 66 years, DS hired the farm out to Jacques Therond in 1702 who had to improve the land, i.a. with “*Timmeringe van een huijs*” of 20ft long and 10ft wide (m x m), the building of a kraal (*Coraal*) for livestock. By January 1704 the constructions included “*Timmeragien van huijs, hocken, coraalen*” (constructions of dwellings, barns and kraals) (Franken 1978:49).

When the farm was sold in 1708, "*Winkelwaaren, Coopmanschappen*" (shop and trading wares) resided under the items (Ibid.:50). And at his Cape Town house he also traded in wares (*allerhande Coopmanschappen* = handelsware) (P.S. It is noted that Pierre Taillefert managed DS interests on the farm Kromrivier from 1702) (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:134, 136). There is thus ample evidence that DS continued his business ventures at Simondium, Wellington and Cape Town. It is therefore no surprise that he complained of Anna's trading post at Bethlehem. Jacques de Savoyes' son-in-law Pierre Meyer, who married his daughter, Aletta de Savoye in 1705, had also operated as a merchant prior to 1705 (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:58).

In c.1709 Gerrit Meyer was already married to Suzanne Cousteux, who was possibly living with her brother Isaie Cousteau (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:147) at Lanquedoc, Klein Drakenstein (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:162). Otherwise Gerrit and Suzanne might have lived possibly nearby on the *Pastorie gronde*, which was owned by Pieter Jans van Marseveen, whose daughter Anna Marseveen, had married Isaac Cousteux (Ibid.:89) (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:94-95). The latter position might be more likely as it is central to the Paarl inhabitants. An example follows of the goods he sold to Isaie Cousteux (Franken 1978:151):

6.1.7 PAUL ROUX VOORLESER & KRANKE BEZOEKER

Simultaneous with the appointment of Simond by the DEIC, was the employment of Paul Roux by the Political Council in 8.11.1688 as parish clerk (*voorleser*) and schoolmaster (*skoolmeester*) (RPR 3:196). Vrijman Paul was paid f15/month with 3 realen as food subsidy (*kostgeld*) (see also Franken 1978:21; Spoelstra II:600). Paul Roux was born about 1660 (Hugo 1961:743) or 1665 (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:168), and hailed from Orange in southern France (**Add.3**). He was a young, well-learned man of about 23-28 years who was rather independent, not needing help from the Batavian fund (1690). Paul arrived in April 1688, married in 1689 the refugee Claudine Leugnet (born 1671), and they ultimately had 5 sons and two daughters (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:60, 168). He obtained full provisions for farming in 1688/9, something similar to the following (Coertzen 1988:85):

I suspect Paul lived initially in close association with Jacques de Savoye, as no land was granted to him. Did he farm the second 60m portion of Vrede-en-Lust, but which was also allocated to Jacques de Savoye in 1694? Paul had to be near the “church” to organise the place, the hall or barn, seating, the books, etc. and to perform his duties as sexton. Kolbe (II:239) refers to his post as “*Schoolmeester of Ziekentrooster*” and that no *official* building existed for him by c.1710.

His duties automatically increased of course when a more permanent church (>1695) was established. There is very little doubt that Roux was primarily appointed to assist the pastor Simond as parish clerk (*voorleser en koster*) and as sick-comforter (*sieketrooster of krankebezoeker*). His duties will be more fully discussed when the French Barn-church (1694) came into being. His duties as schoolmaster (*schoolmeester*) was never realised due to the primary obstacles, of distance (2-5 hours), safety (wild animals and drosters) and transport (few horses) for the children.

Simond pleaded for a school in his letter of 15.6.1689, but then mentioned the above problems, as well as the swollen Berg River, making it impassable for women and children (Franken 1978:186). Franken (1978:33) concludes that Roux never acted as “teacher” from 1688 – 1723. Nonetheless, Roux would have taught the children of close friends on an *ad hoc* basis in his vicinity (Du Toit 1937:60). We do find that a number of farmers employed *schoolmeesters* or later *vrijknechten* or *leenknechten* (VOC) to teach their children. Of course, the Dutch authorities in Holland and at the Cape discouraged the sole teaching or preaching of French and therefore never assisted with buildings, but promoted teachers proficient in both Dutch and French from 1690 (Franken 1978:60; Du Toit 1937:59).

The earliest teaching was always religious instruction, particularly the catechisms for the youth. Generally after church, questions were asked with scriptural answers (Du Toit 1937:19). Roux probably did the same when time allowed and enough children being present. I suspect that he developed a French catechism here at Vrede-en-Lust but which was seldom officially used. Since 1700 the Dutch children were instructed by a Dutch *voorleser* (Bosman) at Drakenstein. It is possible that Bosman used Roux’s Dutch *katkisasie* also as his official guide.

The official teaching in the French language was no longer tolerated since 1700. It was therefore the second generation of French youth that became Roux’s focus, and they were to be religiously instructed in Dutch, but of course be helped by their French teacher. In 1715 “*Domine Roux ... als koster*”, asked for remuneration equal to the sexton of Stellenbosch church (Spoelstra II:427). There was little opportunity for this to happen prior to 1716. With the arrival of pastor Petrus van Aken in 1715, many aspects of the congregation and services were formalised. I therefore speculate that *Paulus Roux* (sic) perfected his Dutch *katkisasie* ms, *Belijdenis des Geloofs*, shortly after 1716 when he was stationed at Paarl, where the church moved to. It is likely that the new pastor Van Aken oversaw the final document. With the inauguration of the new church in 1720 formal class instruction probably became much easier and regular.

We are fortunate to have access to this catechism document written by Paul Roux, in Dutch, and copied by Heinrich Christoffel von Wieding on May 8, 1743 (**FIG.20**). Heinrich arrived as a German soldier from Harburg (sic) in 1738 and was hired by Francois Joubert for the period 22.9.1740 – 5.1.1745 as a *leenkneg* to teach his children (Hoge 1946:461). Heinrich was obviously well-versed in figures, as the year **1743** and monthly date **18** were written in 3x3 numerical blocks (like Sudoku), followed by **Maijus**. Afterwards, in 1754 he married Maria Jerff and 3 children followed. A freeburgher since 1756, he died destitute in 1772 in Cape Town (Ibid.; Hoge 1934:44, 54). About 53 years after it was copied, the document came into possession of Jacob de Villiers (Petrus son?), of the farm Groeneberg of Bovlei (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:125)(see also Coertzen & Fensham 1988:129, 130).

Paul Roux, as the “*France crankbesoeker en schoolmeester*”, may have sometimes kept a French school at the *Oude Kerk*, for those who could make it. Wilhelm van der Stel wrote on 3.4.1700 to Simond that the Political Council was looking for a teacher proficient in both Dutch and French, as a French teacher was unintelligible to the Dutch children (Du Toit 1937:60).

Consequently, from this date, April 1700, the Political Council appointed for the next 7 years a Dutchman (from Haarlem) **Jacob de Groot**, well-versed in writing and reading in the French language. Politics demanded a conversion to Dutch, and though the authorities still tolerated a mixture of languages, the emphasis was now on Dutch (Du Toit 1937:61). All indications are that he taught in Dutch in the “*kerke en schole*”, i.e. in the Barn-church cum-school and not in a separate school. By March 1702, there is no mention by the Governor of a separate French school (Ibid.: 60, 62).

Pierre Jaubert was a successful farmer at Lormarins from 1727-1732. He had a regular number of schoolmasters to instruct his children. When he died in 1732, his wife Isabeau Richarde continued farming with her youngest son Francois, who bought the place in 1742 and lived there till 1758. He married in 1729, but married again later to Isabeau Cronje in early 1732, by whom he had 6 children by 1744 (De Villiers & Pama 1981:378). He continued the practice of educating his children.

When Paul Roux died in 1723 (Paarl), his son also gave instruction for a short time. Soon the schooling of the French speaking children was discontinued and only a Dutch master was employed by the Company. It appears to me that Francois Joubert had borrowed the tattered original Roux document and had Von Wieding copied it for future use. Or did Von Wieding make the copy for the Rouxs (their descendants are heirs to the 1743 copy) in his spare time to earn some extra income? For more information on this document, the earliest catechism ms in use by the French and Dutch, see d’Assonville (2002) and Coertzen (1988:129, 130).

During the Pioneer period of disorganization, there was no possibility of school tuition during the week. Note that some of the French could read and write well. Merchant Jacques de Savoye was able also to do translations and write in the Dutch language (see e.g. Franken 1978:128-174). Such literate individuals would have taught their family and friends particularly the art of reading, e.g. the Bible and the songbooks. Not all who read could write. A number of French could only write their first name’s initial, while Pierre Joubert tried “*P.J.*”, but reverted later to a signature of a cross (Du Toit 1937:76), the sign of some Dutch and French pioneers. Practically most of the refugees could sign their names and all with a forceful forward stroke, indicating strong-minded men (**FIG.21**) (Botha 1970:58/9).

As the farmers prospered, they could later employ private schoolmasters, i.e. the VOC *leenknegten* or *vrijknechten*. Before 1692 contracts were verbal, but after this date all contracts had to be documented (Du Toit 1937:61). This aspect will be touched on during the discussion of the Oude Kerk period (>1694).

6.2 EARLY BURIALS 1688 – 1694

We find a fine summary on Drakenstein cemeteries in Malan (1998) and Franken (1978:175-181). During the Farmyard church period, between 1688 – 1694, there would have been no one single cemetery, as the congregation moved from place to place, season by season. As the Dutch and French settlers were fiercely independent, we can't assume that some of the dead were buried on extant Dutch farms.

At Babilon's Toorn area (Simondium), there might have been a more centralised area of burials. I was recently informed that there was an old burial site but about a year ago all the graves were relocated to the extant Simondium graveyard. As the distance increased to Paarl, Wellington, Berg River and France Quartier, loved ones and (later) slaves would be buried on farms. Once the Barn-church (1694 - 1716) was abandoned, burials of those nearby would continue there till about 1720s, but those far beyond would continue with burials at their own farms. For this reason we find mid-18th century and later "cemeteries" at La Motte (Wemmershoek), La Cotte, Keerweder, La Bri, Cabriere and La Provence (Le Roux 1978:12-14).

It was the practice to bury the deceased within a day or two as flesh corrupted easily. Distance, rivers and transport wagons over terrible pathways would have played an important limiting role, contributing to burials in the immediate vicinity. Death of babies and children would not necessitate the "congregation" coming together. In the case of adults, we can imagine that men (and women) would arrive by horse or oxwagon for the funeral, at the applicable farm, an important social event.

Note that those French living at Stellenbosch and along the Dwars River may sometimes have buried their dead in the Stellenbosch graveyard (>1685). Remember that from 1690 Jacob de Savoye attended also the Church meetings there. From 1691 when elders for Drakenstein were chosen, a number of monthly church meetings were also held at Stellenbosch. The annual fair in October at Stellenbosch and the monthly meetings at the Drostdy of the Militia and Heemraden, also made everyone familiar with Stellenbosch town and its secure cemetery.

6.3 SCHOOLMEESTERS 1694 – 1720

With the establishment of a permanent building used for church services, meetings and schooling purposes, a certain amount of stability was established during uncertain times. Children also increased (about a hundred), and in addition, there were also more Dutch children. Interaction with the Dutch increased, particularly after the economic rebellion against Company officials during 1700 – 1706.

It appears that Paul Roux began to serve the French congregation exclusively in a religious capacity as sexton, probably engaged in some private tutoring of children. His own son, Paul Roux jnr wrote fluent Dutch by 1730 (Malherbe 1997:33). Jacob de Groot replaced Paul snr as government schoolmaster and sick-comforter to serve primarily the Dutch in the Drakenstein and Paarl area. Some French children, more proficient in Dutch, may also have attended (see Du Toit 1937).

The French would not have been happy with this turn of events. From early 1700 we therefore find that the French, also for practical reasons, hired schoolmasters to instruct their children in French (and Dutch). Du Toit (1937:68-80) gives a fairly extensive account of these “*boere-schoolmeesters*” for these early periods. Between 1692 and 1714, they concluded about 20 contracts (each for about a year) Cape farmers, and some with the French (Ibid.:70). We shall take note of Pierre or Pieter Joubert of the farm La Provence (1688) Franschoek (from 1700 also owned Bellingham) (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:14, 183) (see also Malherbe 1997:7-13). Living so far from the Dutch church-school, Joubert employed a number of 8 *huismeeesters* between 1699 and 1732 (Ibid.:41-42; Du Toit 1937: 77-78). The schoolmaster Francois Migault, who brought a number of school books, was also employed by Willem van Seijl (sic) in about 1718 at Vrede-en-Lust (Ibid.:78). Note that both church and “school” were non-existent from 1716 at Simondium. A succinct summary is given by Liebenberg in Worden (2007:19-22) (Wijsenbeek 2007:99).

Some of the “*boere knegts*” could double as “*schoolmeesters*” and a few also had to mend and make the clothes of their employers (Ibid.:72-74). For example, Gerrit Daveman was employed in this manner on the farm L’Arc D’Orleans of Pierre Rousseau in 1714/15 (Ibid.:74). It appears that schoolmasters could work simultaneously for more than one farmer. Mentzel (I:165) quoted by Du Toit, recounts “*Neighbouring farmers may, with the permission of the employer, send their children to the same tutor, who has to be paid extra by the parents of these children*” (Ibid.)(**FIG.22**). The French and their neighbours could thus club together and have their children instructed in reading, writing and arithmetic (*syfers*) (see also Franken (1934), who provides much information on the private schoolmasters who served French speakers. Much of his work is repeated by Du Toit (1937).

From mid-1707, when De Groot took up a position in Cape Town, **Hermanus Bosman**, also fluent in Dutch and French, taught in the Barn-church / school the Dutch and others. The fact that the Political Council required him to converse and understand French, could only mean that some French children also sat in his classes (Du Toit 1937:64).

Hermanus Bosman, born 19.4.1682, arrived at the Cape on 19.4.1707, and at age 25 years was appointed as “*krankbesoeker, voorzanger en voorlezer*” at the “*gemeynte van Drakenstein daar nog kerk of huijs vor mij of predikant was*”. In a letter of 1754, he

reminisced about his work here (De Kock, et al 1968:22). At the Oude Kerk, “*in een slegt hutkje*” his duties on Sunday included to read a sermon and say the necessary prayers (*een predikatie den volke voor te leese benevens de gebede daartoe behoorende*). He resides with elder Abraham de Villiers at Mererust / Eenzaamheid, and soon marries his eldest daughter, Elizabeth on 4.3.1708 (Ibid.:22, 23). Out of this marriage of “love and peace” 11 children followed between 1709 and 1734. He continued to stay at Meerrust, though his father-in-law also acquired Bossendael (in 1710), but sold the latter in 1717 (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:10).

Abraham was married to Suzanne Gardiol, who owned a French “*Statebybel*”, still in possession of a descendant (Ibid.:4). This appears to be the oldest known Bible from the French refugee period. Another ancient book of 1725 in Dutch, was in use by Hermanus Bosman as a sermon book (*preekbundel*), titled *Leere der Waarheid* (Ibid.:4, 5). We find summaries of the early French writings (letters, poems, notices, etc.) in Pheiffer (1983), Franken (1978) and Malherbe (1989/90). The latter gives a summary of the books they used and read, as well as a list of owners with books they possessed at the time of their death.

When the Barn-church fell into disuse in 1716, all activities shifted to below Paarl mountain. Prior to this, on 21.5.1715, Bosman obtained a grant of land at De Nieuwe Plantagie (*hof of hoewe*) (De Kock, et al 1968:10), where his father-in-law helped him to build a large house at great cost (Ibid.:24)(**FIG.23**). The complete shift of the Church and school from Babilon’s Toorn to De Paarl is intimately connected with the coming of rev. Petrus van Aken in 1714.

In 1713 the authorities reprimanded the French for not having learned the Dutch language. They submissively agreed and promised to do it in love and obedience (Du Toit 1937:65, n.66). A full discussion on private schoolmasters for all of the 18th century, with extensive name lists, is provided by Hoge (1934).

Towards the latter part of the 18th century we still find the practice of schooling at Simondium. At Fredericksberg / La Motte, in a 1781 inventory, they specify “*de oude School camer*”, “*de Nieuwe School Camer*”, the latter with a table, two benches, 4 chairs and a hall-stand (*kapstok*) in the foyer (Scheffler 1995:261, 267, 124/5) (Scheffler’s interpretation of the buildings is faulty).

We can conclude that practically all the French immigrants could read French, most could write, judging from their signatures and possessed additional books for reading or references. Some were already proficient in reading and writing Dutch (learnt in Holland), while some learned these skills over the years. A few could converse brokenly with the Khoi, who also knew some rudimentary Dutch.

In summary, **THE SCHOOLING HISTORY OF DRAKENSTEIN 1688 – 1720.**

PERIOD	DATE	SCHOOLMASTER	LANGUAGE	TITLE	ACTIVITIES
A. PIONEER	1688-1695	Paul Roux	French	Voorleser	Schoolmeester, Krankebezoeker.
	1695	Oude Kerk built (Barn-church)	French	Voorleser	Oversee church gatherings with Petrus Simond.
	1695-1700	Paul Roux	French	Voorleser	Duties of sexton at Oude Kerk with Simond. Possible teaching of catechisms.
B. FLEXIBLE	1700-1707	Jacob de Groot	Dutch	Voorleser	Schoolmeester, Krankebezoeker with Simond, serving Dutch in Drakenstein.
		Paul Roux	French	Voorleser	Serve French alternately Simond would prefer Roux till 1702. Beck (1702-1707) would prefer De Groot.
	March-June 1707	Paul Roux Jacob de Groot	French Dutch	Voorleser Voorleser	Served French with Le Boucq Served Dutch & French
	8.6.1707-1716	Hermanus Bosman Paul Roux	Dutch Dutch & French	Voorleser	Schoolmeester, krankebezoeker with pastor Beck. Read sermons in French. Teach French youth the catechisms in Dutch.
	1708-1714				Duties of Voorlesers, deacons and elders continue. Bosman sole teacher of youth at Barn-church. Communion served every quarter by Beck from C.T.
	Oct. 1716 1713				Oude Kerk in ruins, "dismantled" for timbers in 1717. French admonished to learn Dutch; they heed call.
	1714				Dutch Pastor Petrus van Aken settled at Paarl Pastoriegronde, existing farmhouse since 1689 Served at Oude Kerk till its collapse in 1716.
	1714/5	Ds Herm. Bosman	Dutch	Voorleser, etc.	settled at Paarl, De Nieuwe Plantagie Teach youth at school.
	1714-1717	Paul Roux	French	Krankebezoeker?	Stayed in Simondium area
	1717	Paul Roux	French	Krankenbezoeker	Settled at Paarl, Oranje. Teach catechisms in Dutch.
	1716-1720	Ds H. Bosman	Dutch	Voorleser, etc.	Served Dutch/French scholars at Oude Pastorie woning.
	1717	Ds Paul Roux	French	Voorleser, etc.	Served French at Oude Pastorie woning: adults in French, youth in Dutch.
C. CONSOLIDATED	2.6.1720- 1748	Hermanus Bosman	Dutch	Voorleser, etc.	Served Dutch at Nieuwe Kerk with Van Aken (-1724) Slicher (1723-30), Herzogenraedt (1731-36), Van Echten (1738-53).
	1720 - Feb.1723	Paul Roux (died 1723)	French	Voorleser	Served 26 French adults who can't speak Dutch. Teach French youth in Dutch. No more French men officially appointed >1723. End of French era.

6.4 SUMMARY OF PIONEER PERIOD WITHIN FRONTIER MODEL

Much of what transpired at Drakenstein amongst the French settlers can be characterized within an adapted *Frontier Model*, as a means of explication of events in a generalised manner (Vos 1993:11-14). I have adapted the Stellenbosch paradigm to the *Drakenstein context* for this purpose.

Stage 1 Transplantation into a rural context 1684 – 1720

(From the conceptualisation of the Drakenstein settlement by Simon van der Stel, commencing with the 1685 visit of Van Reede, inclusive of the abandonment of the Barn-church (Oude Kerk), and ending with the permanent new church at Paarl in 1720)

A parent culture (European, French) was transferred with cultural simplification to an unfamiliar landscape at the Cape (>1684). At Drakenstein the intrusive colonization was characterized by an initial Dutch and then a French scattered population with dispersed landholdings. Strong nuclear family traditions meant that there were little integration and acculturation with the indigenous population (Khoi-khoi). The French lived in symbiotic collaboration with the Khoi who was relatively easily displaced or integrated. The settlers followed a simplified lifestyle, trying to meet their immediate needs. The granting of cheap land was provisional and by promise. The farming community became self-sufficient as regards staple foods such as grain and meat though labour was expensive.

Institutional controls (state and church) were exercised via Stellenbosch, but a separate church council was soon established 1690/1 and a Barn-church built (1694/5) in the frontier settlement with its low population. Land was only granted after being officially surveyed and this led to at least five nucleated settlement patterns (Babilon's Toorn, Dwars River/Berg River, France Quartier, Paarl and Wagenmakersvallei). In this new environment the colonists had some success in constructing substantial, permanent buildings. Their traditional skills, combined with little economic resources, resulted also in flimsy buildings which did not last. Included within this period is a decade when the members were shepherdless (1706-1716). In tandem with the Drostdy and church of Stellenbosch, their own church building was temporarily destroyed between 1710 – 1720, followed by a new reconstruction.

Stage 2 A period of experimentation results in functional diversity 1720 - 1745

(From the new church at Paarl to sub-division of the Drakenstein district)

The founding of a New Church at Paarl inaugurated a period of adjustment and experimentation by the community. This is evident from the variety of shapes and spatial configurations of farm structures. Population growth was slow, land was subdivided and the village branched out into the surrounding farmlands, all along the long trunk of the main wagon road, parallel to the Berg River. Industry was limited to a few basic trades.

Agricultural overproduction (cereals and wine) led to poor markets (Cape Town) and stifled economic advancement. Opportunities to acquire land around the Cape decreased notably and new farmers had to move further inland. In the rural landscape everything was simplified, resulting in a farming community that was egalitarian and homogenous in many respects. Colonization continued with the creation of satellite settlements at Tulbagh (1745) and Swellendam (1785).

Stage 3 A period of consolidation leads to standardization 1745 - 1805

(From the building of the new Paarl mill to shortly before the second occupation of the Cape by the British)

The third stage was marked by an increasing population and the consequent greater competition leading to even higher land prices. Social stratification developed where private ownership and family ideals were accentuated in material symbols of status and wealth. In Paarl village the clustering of buildings and access roads continued, particularly near the New Church. Traditional concepts were gradually combined with newly developed approaches, inaugurating a period of consolidation and ultimately, standardization in architectural methods. Export markets improved and trade was given greater impetus by the quartering of garrisons at the Cape during the European and American wars of the late 18th century. Slave labour became more available. A wealthy class of landowners controlled most of the economic and political power in the villages. Government control, exercised from Stellenbosch over Drakenstein and the interior, began to diminish markedly.

Stage 4 Innovation and adaptation 1805 - 1838

(From the period of European troops stationed at the Cape, through the British takeover to the drastic decline in labour)

The Cape became somewhat destabilized because of the European troops and occupation by the British (1795), whose material and ideological cultures were quickly emulated. The change in government and new ideas was also expressed through the architecture of a rising middle-class and a wealthy élite, who generally adopted the classical ("Georgian") style. This involved mediation with the local building traditions. Dated gables (with owner's initials in some cases), became conspicuous and served as symbols of status expressing family lineages. The population of the villages increased substantially while farm produce, wine in particular, found a ready overseas market due to lower tariffs. Competition increased with other urban centres like Roodezand (Tulbagh), Swellendam and Graaff-Reinet. The area administered from Stellenbosch therefore contracted rapidly, also due to the poor situation of Stellenbosch town with respect to the major trade routes to the interior. Paarl flourished due to its geographical situation on the main road to the north and became a major manufacturing source of transport vehicles.

Stage 5 Intensification of land use and economic decline 1838 – 1860

(From the freed labour force to the introduction of modern communications)

In 1838 the emancipation of the slaves had a dramatic impact on the labour force of the Cape colony. Stellenbosch, Paarl and Drakenstein were primarily negatively affected due to their labour intensive agricultural activities. The population growth reached a plateau as all satellite towns entered an economic recession from the 1840s. Weak export markets led to economic stagnation till the advent of the first railway lines from 1860. Buildings and their construction and embellishment in the Victorian style then became standardized and cast-iron work became prevalent in towns and also on farmyards in Drakenstein. Unfortunately much of these Cape-Anglo layering was later removed during the Purist restoration purge of 1970s to 1990s (**FIG.24**).

7. BETHLEHEM: OWNERS

7.1 PIERRE SIMOND 1688 – 1702

7.1.1 ORIGIN AND FAMILY

A number of sources describe Pierre Simond's origins and life story (Schoeman 2006; Boucher 1981; Fensham 1968; Smuts (ed) 1979:362/3 and Franken 1978). Portions of it will merely be summarized as it applies, as we have already dealt frequently with him.

Pierre Simond was born into a well-to-do family, in about 1651 at Nyons in the far south of the SE Province of Dauphiné, France (Boucher 1981:174). In his youth he travelled to the islands of the West Indies, where the slave and sugar markets were closely intertwined. We shall later see how his son capitalised on this venture. Simond was an astute businessman and excelled academically, also being fluent in French and Latin. By age 27 he qualified as a minister in the *Academy of Die* in the Calvinistic Reformed Church. He served since 1678 in various congregations before exiled to the Netherlands in early 1685. At the coastal town of **Zierikzee** in Zeeland, he pastored the Walloon church from February 1686, where he came into contact with numerous French refugees destined for the Cape and other parts of the world (Ibid.:176)(**FIG.25**).

Pierre's future wife was Anne Bérault, also from a very old established family, who hailed from L' Aigle in Normandy. Her elder brother Louis had already joined the DEIC as a sergeant in 1679. Anne probably joined him soon afterwards and both stayed at Middelburg on the island of Walcheren in Zeeland. It is quite likely that Anne met Simond here in 1686. By means of Louis, Simond was introduced to officials of the VOC, at the Chamber of Middelburg where the Lords 17 (*Here 17*) also gathered (Ibid.:121) (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:44, 149).

Simond took compassion on the shepherdless refugees and requested to be their pastor. Consequently, the Lords 17 appointed Pierre on 27 October 1687 as a minister in their employ at f90 / month. Pierre was thus subject to all the rights and regulations as a Company employee. The erudite Simond also published a sermon in Leyden in 1687, *La Discipline de Jesus-Christ*, indicating his creativeness and also his wealth and status (Boucher 1981:176).

Anne de Bérault, described as *Demoiselle des Fontaines* (Ibid.:121), was clearly in two minds as what to do: stay or away to the Cape with the man she loved? Only within the last month or two (marriage vows had to be read for about three Sundays), she acquiesced. Practically four days before the *Zuid-Bevelandt* sailed, the two were married in Middelburg on 18 April 1688 (Ibid.:177). It must have been a decisive factor that Louis accompanied them, as brother and sister were quite close. Louis never married and when he died in 1698, his worldly goods were left to his sister (Ibid.:346).

Pierre at 36 years of age and Anne at 24 years, departed on 22 April 1688 departed from Texel with 11 male refugees, 4 women and 10 children aboard. For the next four months the honeymoon couple endured a cloistered cabin till they anchored at Table Bay on a stormy 19th August (Franken 1978:196; Le Roux & Lombard 1988:175). Only on the 22nd Pierre and his wife could disembark. The *Vranse vlugtelingen* were possibly sheltered together in buildings of the VOC, but Pierre and Anne were quartered in a freeburgher's house (Coertzen & Fensham 1988:80). On Sundays he would have looked to the spiritual needs of the immigrants.

Those settlers, about 126, who had arrived prior to Simond (Ibid.:81), were settled in the dead of winter at Drakenstein (alias Babilon's Toorn). Most were dissatisfied with their poor land, except Savoye and Marais. Simond's party (25) and those of the ship *China* (42 passengers) (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:174) were all transported by means of 12 wagons to Simondium to be settled by 9 September 1688 (Franken 1978:191/2, 14/15). Here they had to subsist on ship's biscuit (*beskuit*), peas and salted meat (Franken 1978:15).

According to the *Dagregister* of 1688, the Commander, Simond and others set out on the 15th October, sleeping over at De Cuilen, quartered the next day at the Drostdy. On Sunday 17th Simond gave a very edifying sermon in the Stellenbosch church to the Commander, the French Refugees and some Dutch settlers who could understand French (Raven-Hart II 1971:355/6). Two days later the combined Dutch and French burghers kept the militia exercises, held in front of the Drostdy on 19th October. Simon then left the group and travelled over the *Kloof* to the interior and only returned the 23rd.

Simon van der Stel inspected the Bergriver area on October 24, 1688, where many were resettled along the Berg River at Simon's request (Franken 1978:91). The Commander "allotting to each of the French and Dutch Freeman his place" [French difficult; afterwards Simon] "crossing the Berg River to the Babilonsche Toren and into the district of Drakensteijn, arrived at nightfall, camping in the open". The next day the 120 draught oxen, 20 pigs and 100 sheep were divided amongst the French freeburghers. The next morning Simond crossed the hillock to Klapmuts (Raven-Hart II 1971:356).

7.1.2 ALLOCATION OF FARMS

During the Frontier period (1680 – 1700) at Stellenbosch, most farms were allocated prior to 1685. Consequently, the layout of farms followed an *organic* form. Since Van Rheeде objected to these "chaotic" grants, the lands granted to the French refugees and to Pierre Simond were *ribbon* in form.

It is rather unusual that the land alongside Banhoek, south of the Dwars Rivier, had not been allocated prior to 1688, except for Zeven Rivieren (1687). The areas of *Bethlehem* and adjacent *De Bordje Uitspan*, may have been too far off the Bange Hoek Pass, too overgrown, or too difficult to cultivate for any previous colonist. Or did Simon van der Stel

reserve this land since October 1687 for pastor Simond, seeing Simon knew since early 1687 that such an appointee was made.

Where did Simond stay for the period September 1688 till early 1689?

The Bethlehem farm was allocated by the Company of their own inclination, without any request by Simond, as officials were not allowed to own land (*landt en sandt*). They ratified their decision in 1688 and also the use of wagon and building materials (Franken 1978:52). On 8.9.1694 the diagram was made (Ibid.:192) and the farm was officially granted on 28.3.1696 (OSF I, 421) (**FIG.26, FIG.28**) (**Add.4**).

This grant is certainly the most unusual of all the farm allocations since 1687. It follows the same ribbon pattern, but is divided in 3 oblong, parallel strips and the eastern one with a small square pimple. All three made a total of 60m 277r². Note that the diagram is not on the first page, which was highly irregular. A resurvey of c.1754 was made by Wentzel, which serves as the “original” diagram, with his annotation (**Add.5**).

My interpretation is as follows:

Simond was no farmer and primarily concentrated on his writings and the church services. His two freemen, acting as *knechten*, “rented” their “own” portions of land on the west for which they were responsible. Both worked on “Simond’s” broad strip, where the old buildings of today are situated. Within the small rectangle, on the periphery, the first dwellings (1688/9) were situated and were measured into the 1694 grant. The three agricultural zones can therefore be directly linked to the tripartite, crop sharing activities introduced by Simond. Similar practices were followed by other French men (**FIG.27**).

It should be noted that Pierre's farming activities via his foremen were so successful that his monthly salary of *f*90 - *f*100, etc., was paid directly into his Netherlands account from 1691 – 1700. These amounts totalled in 1702 to about *f*18 063, a vast sum for those days. The business acumen of Pierre and Anne were very astute (Ibid.:654/5).

In 1939, the original date of the article in Franken (1978:192), there was still large oak avenues visible in the form of a cruciform. This was probably an indication of the farm's spiritual symbolism. At Stellenbosch, a similar oak avenue in the form of a cross was to be found in the large Pastorie garden (>1736) in upper Dorp Street.

7.2 SIMOND SETTLED AT BETHLEHEM

7.2.1 LODGINGS AND STRUCTURES

When Simond's party and others moved to Simondium, it is quite probable that he moved to Stellenbosch. The Political Council had resolved on 8.11.1688 that he could stay in a room at the house of the *landdrost*, viz. the double storeyed Drostdy (RPR III:195/6). As there were no other private houses of any consequence at Stellenbosch, the status Drostdy of Johannes Mulder was the only option (see **Add.6**).

This same resolution stipulated that:

Note that an average piece of land (60m 277r²) was granted to him, situated between Drakenstein (Babilons Toorn) and the fledgling Stellenbosch town, so that he could divide his time between these two congregations. Without any dwelling he had to be assisted immediately with the loan of two carpenters, a wagon with six oxen, for carting the locally cut timbers to the building site. Other necessary materials would be provided out of the Company's magazine, as Simond was a company employee. The dimensions of the main house would be 60 ft long, 20 ft wide and 8 ft high (eaves) (18.3 x 6.1 x 2.4 m) (Franken 1978:192). Note the rather low eaves (Recently I investigated a house of the same period in Diep River (Waterford) with an interior ceiling of about 2.2 m high)(Vos 2008).

On 22.9.1688 the Political Council instructed landdrost Mulder at Stellenbosch (Franken 1978:191/2):

“Twee timmerluij hebben wij nevens een wagen uijt Hottentots holland (the Company post) na drakenstein ten dienste van mons^r Simond gesonden, 't gund sij tot den opbouw van desselvs huijs en wes meer benoodigd zijn, kan bij een ordonnantie bekend gemaakt en deselve herward gesonden worden.”

The two carpenters came and presumably a company slaves with them, to dig the foundations, carting the stones and making and firing bricks as required, etc. Mulder confirmed on 24.12.1688 to the governor that the men had been sent to build the house. Unfortunately news of a war with France necessitated the recall of the men to Cape Town in about December 1688.

During this period, late September to late December 1688, Simond had himself a dwelling built, which in his French he called a “*loge*” (Ibid.:192). Franken unfortunately calls it a “*pondokkie*”. The main house lay unfinished, but Simond and his wife lived in the “lodge” of fair proportions, probably a three roomed, clay-built “*hok*”. Khoi tribesman frequented the farm site daily, as Simond recounted in his letter of 15.6.1689. They helped with the farm work in exchange for tobacco, food and drink (Ibid.:197). He had also bought one or more slaves by this time, as we shall see.

At this period Anne was already with child. Pierre and she probably stayed in Cape Town during the last stages of the pregnancy. Pierre had the privilege to stay in a room with a kitchen with the Cape Pastor Van Andel (Ibid.:21). Catherine was born about late March and she was baptized in the Church hall of the Castle on Sunday, 17 April 1689, with Governor Simon van der Stel acting as godfather (Boucher 1981:357).

The oxwagon in loan to Simond possibly became a permanent possession. With it he transported all his possessions (*meubles*) to his own-built dwelling. He also used it to cart him and his wife and labourers (two Frenchman and others) (*my mense*) to “church” at Simondium (letter 15.6.1689) (Franken 1978:15, 193). As soon as the winter rains of 1689 abated, work was again resumed on the main house. By October it only needed to be thatched with reeds, cut at the Company’s posts at either Klapmuts or Hottentots Holland. (Ibid.:192):

This instruction of 16.10.1689 implied that the thatching would be completed within a week or two. This meant that by November the family of three could move into a more comfortable and commodious house, which was either a three or four-roomed house. If the 18.3 m (60ft) length is an exterior measurement, the plans may have looked like this (**FIG.29**).

7.2.2 MAIN HOUSE: PASTORIE

What did this house look like? One of the closest examples of such a vernacular dwelling is Schreuderhuis (1709), though built in a town (Vos & Boshoff 1988; Vos 1993). The exterior measurement of Schreuderhuis (though altered) are about 5.8m x 20.5m. As a Company dwelling with superior craftsmen and enough labour available, the pastorie was probably built with stone foundations (cobblestones), with raised walls in stone (up to 1m) with fired brickwork for the remainder. Otherwise the upper walls could have been fully built in dressed granite, a favourite method of building in Stellenbosch due to the granite outcrops at mountain foot slopes. Double and single casements were the norm, but the thin, greenish window glass would be encased in lead strips. A low ceiling of 2.4 meters was probably accompanied by a loft, but possibly not over the kitchen room. Locally cut beams would have been adzed square-like [], with presumably deal boards from the Company magazines.

A separate bakehouse may have been likely (see Governmenthouse c.1700 (Kolbe), in Vos 2008:36). This appears to be feasible as De Savoye accused Simond in early 1689 of forcing the French community to use his baking oven at a fee (Franken 1978:36, 194, 195). The hearth could easily have been a floor hearth for ordinary cooking and providing heat during the cold evenings. All floors would have consisted of mud layering, common to all dwellings. Tiling would later have become an option. Practically all houses were built with fully hipped endgables, as the waterproofing of built gables was a technical problem and also more expensive (see Stade drawings of 1710).

Another room, presumably die *voorhuis* (entrance hall), where guests were also received, served also as a rudimentary shop for fine things, which his wife operated. This was one of the primary reasons Pierre and Jacobus de Savoye clashed (Franken 1978:36). One of the (end) rooms would have served fully as a small *study*, where he could prepare his sermons, which he took quite seriously. He would also have a bookcase with numerous books as references. On two occasions, Pierre received cases of books (*cas met boucken*) from the Netherlands, in 1694 and 1700 (Franken 1978:198). He, like all preachers, would also have had musical ability.

Then he was also preparing a new translation of the Psalm hymnal, which took much of his time, which writing was known amongst the French (Franken 1978:55-57). Francois Leguat recounted during his visit of 1698, "*I was told ... while I was with that good People, that the Pastor of this Church, a very honest and sensible Man, was making a new Translation of the Psalms in verse, or at least correcting, to the best of his Power, that of Marot and Beza, to render those sacred Pages more intelligible ...*" (Raven-Hart II 1971:431).

7.2.3 NAMING OF FARMS

With a few exceptions, all early Cape (OCF), Stellenbosch and Drakenstein (OSF) farms were not given names, but were merely known by the name of the consecutive owners. This practice continued for most of the 18th century and practically all maps identified the contemporary owner of the farm as its “name”. When the land grants were issued after 1685, the year when Com. Van Rheeде instituted a registration of land grants, the compass descriptions became the geographical key to the farm’s location.

Early in 1700 when Willem van der Stel became governor (11.2.1699), he issued instructions (not traced) that all farms should be given a singular name. This procedure naturally took a number of years, but by 1715 most were named. The land grants prior to the name-giving was edited, by inserting the farm name above the line in a different handwriting than the original (**FIG.30**). After about 1715 the names of farms formed part of the original text. It depended on who the owner was when the official came to register the name, or who the owner was when he went to register the name at the Drostdy or in Cape Town. Prior to about 1715, all the early grants (OSF) were copied by a single clerk and bound in a book. Such an original “copy” was still locked in the safe of the Registrar of Deeds (1990s). Could it have something to do as a security measure with the fire that gutted the Drostdy and Stellenbosch in December 1710?

Lieutenant O.F. Mentzel who was at the Cape from 1733 to Jan. 1741 (about 7 years) records in his 1785 published book how this name-giving process was done in the early years. The commissioned official must have been well-educated and trustworthy. I speculate that it could have been Willem Helot, employed by the Company as assistant since 1694 and clerk since 1699, the year Willem van der Stel became governor (SABW III:395). Generally a new man meant new thinking and changes. Willem also changed the way new title deeds were to be issued (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:1-2). I therefore connect the precise and orderly Willem with the new naming process of farms in the Cape.

“The Government had therefore decided to keep a regular land-roll, in which the names of the farms would be recorded, such names to be definitive and permanent for official purposes” (**Add.7**). This information was given in c.1740 to Mentzel on good authority by Madame Mouton, the wife of refugee Jacques Mouton, at the Cape since 1688. Francine Beverage (Mouton) was described by Mentzel as *“a sprightly and cheerful lady of over 70”*. The Moutons were farming at Steinbeck near Porterville and Piquet berg (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:80).

Most of the French compatriots (43 farms) gave their farms names from their fatherland. Only two other farm names were Biblical, viz. Zion and Bethel, whose significance will be discussed later (Coertzen & Fensham 1988:12; see also pp. 119 - 121 for a full analysis of all French farms).

A short listing of farm name types will suffice:

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Place names in France | (heritage)(provinces & towns) | (La Provence) |
| 2. | Biblical names | (spiritual) | (Bethel) |
| 3. | Emotive names | (personal circumstances) | (Vrede-en-Lust) |
| 4. | Geographical names | (countryside) | (Keerweder) |
| 5. | Owners name | (personal, egotistical) | (Salmon's Vallei) |
| 6. | Animal names | (land animals) | (De Wilde Paardejagt) |

7.2.4 BETHLEHEM

Simond gave his farm not a French name, but a Bible name, **Bethlehem**. Pierre (Petrus) probably saw himself as a shepherd and saviour of his scattered flock. This lonely, small farm was guarded by the towering mountains of Drakenstein and Simonsberg, with the clarity of sparkling stars unknown to him in Europe. Could anything worthwhile come from such humble origins?

We should take note of certain Bible prophecies that apply.

- Micah 5:2 *But you **Bethlehem** Ephratah, though you be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of you shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel.*
- Matthew 2:6 *And you **Bethlehem**, in the land of Judah, are not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of you shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel.*

At the Cape, Simond felt academically isolated and sought acknowledgement of his abilities. Later his Psalm rhyming became an obsession with him, which he deemed to be accepted by the Dutch Church Synod, so that all could admire his great talents.

It was therefore his intent to depart from the Cape by 1700, but leave was refused him. When he finally landed in Holland in 1702, and his life's work rejected, it was a great personal blow to all his labours and particularly his ego. Greatly hurt, he continued undaunted to have his *Psalms of David* published in 1703: *Les Veillées Africaines ou les Psaumes de David mis vers francais* (The watchful house in Africa, the Psalms of David in French) (Coertzen & Fensham 1988:144).

Franken, Boucher and others presume that this publication in 1703 financially ruined him, but I differ. There must have been some financial outlay, but both he and his wife were prosperous, when they returned to the Netherlands. He also published a sermon in 1707 (Haarlem), which he had delivered at the Cape on 25.6.1699 (Franken 1978:200). We know Simond was a businessman and I presume that he invested heavily in the West-Indian trade. A ship disaster could have contributed to a temporary setback prior to 1708/9. By mid to late 1709 he was making a comeback (Ibid.). The wheel of fortune had turned fully, as he once accused (falsely) De Savoye of the shameful condition of bankruptcy, it had come to haunt him as well!

7.3 AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES

7.3.1 FREE KNECHTEN

Prior to June 1689, probably by October 1688, Simond employed two Frenchmen who could not make a living from their own land (presumably at Simondium), to farm at Bethlehem. Who they were is not known. Their contractual agreement gave them a lot of leeway:

1. They could leave at any time of their free will.
2. They could sign up for 6 years. They apparently did from 1688/9 to about 1694.
3. A flock of sheep and a few cows were in their care, with $\frac{2}{3}$ of the increase for their taking.
4. Oxen and equipment (plough, spades, picks, etc.) would be supplied with $\frac{2}{3}$ of the harvest for their taking.
5. In both conditions 3 & 4, Simond would have a right to $\frac{1}{3}$.

This form of crop sharing (*métairie*) is an ancient European system and some of the other refugees cultivated the land on the same principle, e.g. De Savoye with others (Franken 1978:52, 53,193). In addition, the men enjoyed lodging, presumably in a building of their own or took up residence in the old dwelling (1688/9) of Simond. Pierre wrote he needed two men to guard his farm against fierce animals and antagonistic Khoi, both plentiful within the Bangehoek area. When Simond needed provisions, and I presume stock for his wife's shop, he could send one of them to Cape Town to fetch it by wagon (Ibid.). After the refugees arrived in 1688, Simond was the exception in not requiring financial assistance. As a matter of fact, he acquired 10 oxen (for a wagon and ploughing) at f240 and the next year another 8 oxen at f192 (Ibid.). The knechten had thus ample animals at their disposal for ploughing and carting purposes.

There is no record in the *opgaafrolle* of Simond paying taxes in produce or summaries of his stocks (1688 – 1702). The pastors were apparently exempt from taxes. Interestingly enough his home served as the registry point where the French refugees gave up the figures of their annual cereal production, and presumably all other tax information (Franken 1978:46).

There are only a few references to Pierre Simond lending money to other French speakers. In 1697 Pierre de Lorriet was indebted to Simond and had to pay him when he arrived in Holland. He also loaned money to the blacksmith Gauch in 1699 (Boucher 1981:292, 356).

Simond also employed free knechten from amongst the Dutch and the French burghers e.g. (Ibid.: 193):

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| 1. 1693 – 1694 | Jan Anard |
| 2. 1694 – 1696 | Jean Troullat |
| 3. 1696 – 1698 | Willem de Raat |
| 4. 1699 – 1700* | Jean Roux |

* From 1700 he started to dismantle his possessions in anticipation of his return to Europe.

7.3.2 MERERUST (MEERRUST) versus ZANDVLIET

The history of the two adjacent farms Mererust and Eenzaam(heid) are intertwined since 1687. Both were 60m in extent. According to Le Roux & Le Roux (1999:10), **Mererust** was obtained in c.1687 by German Peter Andresen on 2.12.1690. He hailed from Tönning, a coastal port near Holstein and became a Cape freeburgher by December 1684 (Hoge 1946:7). Apparently he clashed with the law (Dec. 1692) and I assume the farm was then sold to Hans Silverbag (or Silverbach, Silberbach). He was married to *Ansela van de Caab*, i.e. a woman of colour born at the Cape. Ansela was a common name, probably derived from the French *Angelique* (later Angela, Ansela, Ansiela or Engela), meaning angel. Hans lived from 1685 – 1693 in the Stellenbosch district and in 1693, with the acquisition of Mererust, became a burgher of Drakenstein (Hoge 1946:399). This purchase was never registered (**FIG.31**).

Since 1687 Arie Lecrevent, a Dutchman from Boskoop, southern Holland, was living on the neighbouring farm Lekkerwyn, a derivation from his Dutch name Arij Leckerwijn (De Wet 1981:160). He was officially granted **Lekkerwyn on 25.10.1690** (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:9). He was married to the French refugee Marie de Lanoy in 1692 and by 1697 had 4 children (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:96).

Now what is of particularly interest is that the farm **Zandvliet** was also granted **on 25.10.1690**, occupied by Hans Silverbach and his associate **Callus Louw** since Oct. 1687 (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:8). Callus (Callis, Calus) was surnamed Lau or Laur, with a silent “r”, and was later commonly known as Louw. As a German from Rothensee, he arrived (1687?) as a free man and became the primary partner with Hans of the farm (later called Zandvliet or Delta). Callus Laur was well-educated, while Hans could not write, but signed his name with a cross [+] (see Randle 2005:10). Louw was actually a surgeon (*chirurgijn*) and practised privately as such between 1691 – 1707 (De Wet 1981:98-99).

To augment his income, Louw participated, as many freeburghers, in the illegal bartering of stock with the Khoi, but was caught and brought to trial on 15.3.1696 (Ibid.:220). In the very next year, his partner Hans was involved with his neighbour Arij Lekkerwyn in a dispute. As they lived for the past 10 years within walking distance, they must have been good friends. As in many cases, drinking wine may have led to an argument and unbridled anger between the two one evening in midwinter of 6.7.1697. Hans took up a heavy club and struck Arij above his temple so that his cranium cracked, which led to his death the next morning (Randle 2005:11). Sobered by his callous deed, Hans fled to the interior, never to be seen again, and he was declared “*veldvlugtig en vogelvry*.”

Louw as a surgeon had relied on Hans to do the farming. Consequently, the farm was sold on public auction to “*den Eerw. Predikt. Petrus Simond*” on 8.11.1697 (T.565, 9.5.1702, pages in pencil no. 522, 523).

The land bought by Simond is described as:

“seekere wooninge en annexe landeryen gelegen onder Drakensteijn, bewesten der Bergrivier, groot 60 morgen met het opstaande gewas van ongeveer nege mudden tarwu ... geseijde wooninge en landen ... streckende:

WZW opwaarts tegen het land van Erasmus Jansen van Lier
ONO nederwaarts tegen de Berg Rivier
NNW tegen het land van Arij Leckerwijn
ZZO tegen dat van (left blanco in original)

On p.524: The *erfgrondbrief* is dated 25 October 1690, purchased at f1000 Ind. Val., signed by Adriaan van Reede, Hugo de Goijer and Joan Rotterdam, but not by Simond. What is extra-ordinary about this document is that the land described is identical to Zandvliet (sold in 1692 to Snyman), and not the land of Mererust!

Company officials were not allowed to have “private” farms. Simond could have used one of his *knechten* and slaves to run this farm for him on the sly, till he finally left in May 1702 (see also Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:10). Note that Simond was particularly successful at farming, so that all his acquisitions at the Cape were obtained by this means and not by his salary, the latter which he deposited overseas. The produce of Meerrust must have been a great help.

[As a note of interest, Louw apparently stayed in Drakenstein till September 18, 1704, when he joined the ranks of the VOC as junior surgeon (De Wet 1981:98). A few months later he became a *vrijknecht* to Willem van der Stel at Vergelegen on 10.12.1704, probably to care for all the hordes of freemen and slaves. After the 1706 debacle he returned to the ranks of the VOC where he was still practising in 1710 (Hoge 1946:249)].

Note the description of land of **Zandvliet** (Randle 2005:10) (SGD 18/1690):

seekere stuk land gelegen an Drakesteijn ^[genaamd Zandvliet] bewesten der Bergrivier strekkend

WZW opwards tegen het land von Erasmus Jansz: van Lier
ONO nederwards tegen de Bergrivier
NNO tegen het land van Arij Lekkerwijn, en
ZZO tegen dat van ... (left blanco in original)

My interpretation of this blunder is as follows:

Hans Silverbach was living since 1693 at Mererust, but obtained no official grant for it from Peter Andresen (2.12.1690). When Hans fled in mid-1697, the only record of his “land” was the grant of Zandvliet (1690) which the clerk in the Castle merely copied, not realizing that the land was different.

The next transport of Mererust (T.566 9.5.1702) (pencil no. 525-528), is directly then from Simond to Abraham de Villiers for 60m land for f1300. The name *Mererust* is written above the text in a different pen and hand. Farm names were allocated from about 1705 on a regular basis and then added to the old grants and transports. This document is signed by “*Petrus Simond predikant .*” On p.528 the terms “*seekere wooninge en annexe*” are used again. Abraham would pay the mortgage in two equal payments over the next two years. Abraham also obtained in a separate transaction the adjacent *Eenzaamheid* on the same day (De Villiers 1976:11).

7.3.3 LABOURERS

As we have noted, Bethlehem’s proximity to the Drakenstein valley, made it easily accessible to the Khoi who had some “*kraale*” in the vicinity (see FIG.11)(**FIG.32**). When the settlers arrived, many of the Khoi families shifted to these farms, which were a source of “income” for them in exchange for their labour. Goods they desired included available food, clothing decorations (beads, brass, etc.), drink and particularly tobacco (**FIG.33**).

The Khoi regularly came in contact with Simond at Bethlehem and he was therefore able to express a practical and humane opinion on how to approach them (**Add.8**). With their intermittent aid they would have been involved in tilling the ground, planting, pruning, shepherding flocks, ploughing, etc., all under the supervision of the two foremen.

Nonetheless, the Khoi generally only worked as it pleased themselves (see e.g. records in Raven-Hart II 1971:321 (1687), 387 (1691), 395 (1693)). For more permanent labour, Simond acquired slaves, which was slowly becoming an integrated part of Cape life. Slaves were still exorbitantly expensive, as there was a shortage of supply. As all prosperous officials, Simond immediately (1688/9) bought a few slaves, but their names are not known to us. In September 1690 one of them deserted him for the interior (Franken 1978:54). These wandering drosters later became a scourge to the countryside for decades to come.

The first official slave acquisitions have been documented by Böeseken (1977:157-183): An extract is made as follows of the slaves Simond bought while at the Cape (**Table 1**).

TABLE 1 SLAVES OWNED BY PETRUS SIMOND 1690 – 1702

	Date	Slave	Age	Bought from	Price	Page
					Rxd.	
1.	13.11.1690	Florien from Coromandel	22	Thomas van Engelen	100	157
2.	28.12.1693	Jacob from Madras	13	Will Gutter, captain of the English vessel Josias	73	164
3.	8.4.1694	Jacob from Cochin	18/19	Jan Kakelaar, skipper of the Carthago	80	164
4.	24.5.1694	Luddi from Bengal	9/10	William Mackdowall, doctor of medicine on the English ship Charles II	50	165/6
5.	3.3.1695	Claas from Bengal	25	Agate Cornelia Six, widow of Johan Dous of Batavia	100	166
6.	5.3.1695	* Anthonij de Cola from the West Coast [of India]	22	Anna P. Popink, widow of Willem Padt	90	167
7.	8.2.1696	Phillebe from Madagascar	20	Richard Glover, captain of the English vessel, Amity	90	172
8.	8.2.1696	Matetee from Madagascar	21	Do.	90	172
9.	30.11.1697	Claas from Madagascar	19	Jan Cotze	110	181
10.	30.11.1697	Christoffel from Malabar	25	Jan Cotze	84	181
11.	26.2.1698	Aron from Madras	22	Jan Cotze (paid on 1.3.1701)	110	182
	11.4.1698	* Anthonij from the West Coast	27	Petrus Simond sold to Christiaan Coetzee	f350	183
				TOTAL Rxd.	997	
12.	1697	Aron from Madagascar	7	Sold to Claas Holder (Boucher 1981:379)	50*	
13.	>1700	Judith from Bengalen	7	(Boucher 1981:379)		
	9.5.1702	Do	c.9	Sold to Pieter Meijer (T.565, 9.5.1702)	f290	

* Biewenga 1999:108, 124

Rxd = Rixdaalder

f = gulden (f3 = 1 Rxd)

There were thus **at least** 14 slaves (1 unnamed, 13 named) who worked for Simond during his 13 years at Bethlehem (and Meerrust), which made him the largest owner of slaves of the French speakers. The last slave to be sold was the *slavinne* Judith van Bengalen to the *vrijburger* Pieter Meijer. Note this transaction was signed *Petrus Simond*, indicating Pierre had fully accepted his Dutch status at the Cape.

The origin of the 13 known slaves are tabulated (Table 2).

TABLE 2 COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF P. SIMOND'S SLAVES

A. INDIA

a. Eastern	Coromandel Coast	Florien	1	
	Madras	Jacob	1	
	Madras	Aron	1	
b. Western	Cochin	Jacob	1	
	West Coast	Anthonij	1	
	Malabar	Christoffel	1	
c. Northern	Bengal	Luddi	1	
	Bengal	Claas	1	
	Bengalen	<u>Judith</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>

B. MADAGASCAR

Phillebe	1	
Matete	1	
Claas	1	
<u>Aron</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>

Total 13

From the above we can see that Simond preferred young slaves who were impressible and willing to learn. Those from India and Madagascar were preferred over these from East Asia, who were more refractory and stubborn. Indian slaves were also more favoured for their beauty and lighter skin.

As time progressed, Simond replaced the part-time Khoi with permanent labourers. It is of interest that the first slave was a girl Florien of 22, who would have assisted in the household and acted as Anne Berault's right-hand. When they intended to sell the farm, slaves and possessions by 1700, they moved to Cape Town to their own house. I presume this is the time they acquired Judith from Bengalen for the period 1700 to May 1702.

As slaves were so expensive, they were generally treated well, being the most important investment after property. We note that Simond spent well over *f*3600 (1 Rixdaalder = 3 gulden) on slaves, the price of a very well-to-do farm with buildings. Note that the farm Bethlehem only attained this value after 1775 (see Table 3, owners).

7.4 CHURCH ACTIVITIES

7.4.1 GENERAL

From the writings of Petrus Simond it is abundantly clear that his motives for coming to the Cape as a minister to see to the needs of the French refugees were above reproach. He was genuinely concerned about their condition and he had great empathy for them due to the miserable conditions under which they were dumped at Drakenstein. As a talented writer and diplomat he even opposed Simon van der Stel when it came to the welfare of his flock. As one of the top academics and officials at the Cape, he quickly learned to play the field to his advantage. Strong in personality, sharp as a quill, but also a bit high-minded and status conscious, he managed the scattered flock with adeptness and a firm hand, not overlooking offences of the Ten Commandments and placed erring members under censure.

7.4.2 THE “BABILONS TOOREN” BARN-CHURCH 1694

From 1688 to 1694 the congregation met in various homes or unused barns or cellars, which were of sufficient size to accommodate up to 70-100 members. Since 1691 a separate Drakenstein Church Council, held in the French language, consisted of two elders, two deacons and the pastor, Simond. Paul Roux, was employed by the Company as a sexton (*Voorleser*) and potentially as schoolmaster, at Drakenstein.

During the initial, disorderly Pioneer period (1688-1694), when they regularly changed place of worship, the church registry was presumably kept by Simond (1688 -1691). With the formation of the *Consistorie* (1691-1694), Simond presumably also kept the register or notes of the baptisms, deaths, communions, etc. Unfortunately, they are all lost to us or taken by Simond to Europe in 1702.

Simond pastored both the Drakenstein and Stellenbosch congregations, both about 2 hours by cart from Bethlehem. He preached alternatively every 14 days at Stellenbosch and Drakenstein. When Pierre arrived at the Cape, he could speak or write very little Dutch and understood little of the Dutch *Consistorie* which he joined from 1688-1691. Presumably he “read” sermons from the Dutch *preekbundels* from 1688-1690. He was a fast learner and by early 1690s became much more proficient in the Dutch language, as his writings testify.

The Drakenstein Church Council desperately needed a proper church building, as their numbers were increasing and children getting older. Simond and Jacobus de Savoye had made their “peace” to some degree and it is probably due to both their efforts that land was obtained for a permanent church and graveyard. The official grant was made on 22.12.1694 for 48m 100r² (170r² x 170r²) (De Villiers 1984:18-22) (SGD 35/1694, OSF 1694 1 403) (**FIG.34, FIG.35**).

The exact location of the 1694 Church land has eluded positive identification, in spite of in depth research by De Villiers (1984). The likely position he has identified was on the eastern portion of the farm *Rust en Vrede* (**FIG.36**). Governor Simon van der Stel did not make Company funds available for the erection of the church. Consequently, the French speakers had to build the church at their own expense. By this time, most farmers had experience in building and with a few slaves and Khoi labourers, those nearby probably pitched in.

When was the church built?

Though the land was granted on 22.12.1694, the area would have been deliberated and chosen, and then surveyed months ahead. Administrative tasks and issues were completed some time later. Possibly the church building was already standing by August 1694. I base this reasoning on the fact that the issue of grants was generally late, long after colonists were living on a site. Secondly, the *Baptismal Register* kept by Paul Roux starts with the date of 29 August 1694 and runs on (with a break between 1701-1709) till 5 March 1713 (Botha 1919:101, 110).

I argue that a new official document (Baptismal Register) would begin with the inauguration of a new, permanent church. It was kept fastidiously by Paul Roux in French, on loose papers, which he kept till his resignation in 1719, when the new Paarl Church (a *strooidakkerk*) was built. If correct, then the building's foundation stones may have been dug and the walls erected by early March 1694. There may have been delays for the roof timbers, doors and windows, which could explain why it was finished during winter. A report dealing more fully with the 1694 church is in preparation (Vos 2009), and therefore much of the details won't be commented on.

7.4.3 SIMOND AND THE CHURCH MEMBERS

Simond completely identified with his congregation. His second, third and fifth children were baptized at Simondium during the Farmyard Church period (1688-1694).

1. Catherine, baptized on 17.4.1689 in Castle, CT.
2. Pierre, later called Peter, baptized in c.1691.
3. Jacques-Cléopas, baptized in c.1692.
4. Marie-Elisabeth, baptized in c.1694 (before August) in Castle, CT.*
5. Lydie (Lidie, Lide) baptized on 25.8.1697 in the 1694 church:

* *“fille de Monsieur pierre Simond minstre a Drakenstein et de Mademoiselle hanna de beúrau, le temoins et Isac Taillefer & Marie Elizabet”* (Botha 1919:103; Boucher 1981:3).

The official baptismal and death records for September 1688 – August 1694 for Drakenstein were “lost” and could not be traced, even as early as February 1726 (Franken 1978:57) (Spoelstra II: 448).

During the early period each settler, including Simond, had to “fight” for their survival in a rough society where it was everyone for himself. Economic survival was foremost, but for Simond social status was equally important. He was accused by Jacobus de Savoye in 1689/90 of exercising “*papal authority*” and an “economic stranglehold”, by asking tithes and desiring to establish a bake-oven for profit. Accusations of social snobbery, high-handed methods and stubbornness were common against the officialdom of the time (Boucher 1981:177-178).

In early 1691, when Peter Simond was leading the full Council meeting in the church at Stellenbosch, he crossed swords (or pens) with the Company Secretary and sexton Sybrand (Sibrandus) Mancadan. Simond wanted Sybrand to add corrections to the minutes, but this was illegal and Sybrand remonstrated. Infuriated and red in the face [*colere uijtberstende*], he slapped the hands of the secretary, reprimanding him for his insubordination. This must have caused quite a scene in the “*Kercken raed*”!

Consequently, Simond rewrote the necessary duplicates and took them to Mancadan’s home in Ryneveld Street for authentication. The offended Mancadan then asked money for this obligation and deplored the fact that there were as many spelling mistakes as words! (We should remember Dutch was only recently learned by Simond). As a minister and Company official, Simond retorted, “*hier werd men meer getiranniseert als men oijt in Vrankrijk getiranniseert is!*”. Simond took exception to these affronts and the matter landed before the judicial authorities at the Cape (Franken 1978:196). Here we see another side to the “meek and mild” pastor of the French (see also Secretary J.G. de Grevenbroek’s comment on all the infightings) (Franken 1978:40-41).

Note that a bilingual “*schoolmeester en crankbesoeker*” i.e. one speaking both Dutch and French, was employed on 3.4.1700 by the Company to basically take charge of the Drakenstein youth (Franken 1978:198). Was this an additional reason for Simond to reconsider his value at the Cape? Slowly but surely the Dutch language infiltrated and replaced the French language, in accordance with the policy of the Cape authorities. There were thus a number of negative factors that motivated Simond to reconsider his stay at the Cape.

7.5 SIMOND PREPARES TO LEAVE

Simond decided to leave the Cape already by November 1700, but was refused as his congregation wanted his successor to arrive first (Boucher 1981:358; Franken 1978:54-55). There are a few reasons which he gave for departing to the Netherlands:

1. He desired to lay his newly translated **Psalms** to the Synod of the French Churches in the Netherlands. This was his life’s work which would redeem him in the eyes of French religious circles.
2. He intimated that he has little earthly possessions here at the Cape and that his family will be **ruined** if he is not to present himself soon in the Netherlands. In a way this was true for by mid-1701 he had sold practically all his Cape possessions and sent the money overseas by May 1702.
3. He mentioned the “**disorder**” at the Cape. As a Company official with farming interests, a monthly salary of *f*100, and trade/shop interests via his wife, he also became a target of the growing distrust and enmity of the Cape burghers, particularly the farming community.
4. The slumbering **dispute** and antagonism between him and Jacob de Savoye was still a thorn in his flesh. This personality clash, wrote Petrus Kalden, pastor at Cape Town, was a primary reason for Simond’s departure (Boucher 1981:357)
5. Anne Berault’s brother, **Louis**, the support of her life, **died** at an early age in 1699 (his will was dated 10.3.1699). It is quite probable that this sad event influenced the Simond couple to re-evaluate their stay at the Cape, where burghers increasingly voiced dissatisfaction with the officialdom (Boucher 1981:346).

Disappointed at the delays, Simond, his wife and five children had moved house to Cape Town by March 5, 1701 (Franken 1978:55). The Dutch return fleet from the Indies was on the horizon and Simond gave his last sermon in the Castle’s Church hall on Sunday 9.4.1702. His successor Henricus Beck, arrived with the fleet on 13 April, who initially lodged in Cape Town, but soon moved to Stellenbosch town (Ibid.:56).

At Stellenbosch there was already a Dutch minister, Hercules van Loon, since April 1700 whose *pastorie* was on the NE corner of Ryneveld and Dorp Street. As colleagues, Hercules and Pierre must have met each other regularly at Church and council meetings in Stellenbosch from April 1700 – March 1702. Hercules had a sense of humour, but was restless and spend much of his time on his two farms, Waarburg and Hercules Pilaar. His contentious wife finally sent him into deep depression and in 1704 he cut his throat with a penknife used for sharpening quilts (Fensham 1986:13-14).

Finally on May 7, Simond stood as “witness” to the baptism of Abraham de Villiers’s daughter Marie in Cape Town. On 16 May 1702 bade the Cape farewell, sailing on the ship, *Abe de Klerk* of the return fleet.

7.6 SALE OF PROPERTIES AND POSSESSIONS

There is little doubt that by mid 1700 Simond was already intent on making preparations to leave the Cape. In November 1700 he officially requested his transfer, and by early 1701 (summer) he had already sold on auction all his Bethlehem possessions. On 20.3.1701 and 5.3.1702 he again begged to return to the Netherlands (Franken 1978:198/9). By March 1701, he was ready to board the return fleet, because everything he possessed, land and household items, had been sold (“*zoo huijs als Hoff, en meubelen verkogt, mitsg^s zijn gantsche huijshoudinge van drakestijn opgebroken*”) (Ibid.:199). For a fine description and analysis of an auction in 1729 in Cape Town, see Randle (2007).

The auction must have been at his farm in Bangehoek. All the French and surrounding Dutch/German settlers would have attended. Wine was served to loosen the bidders grip on their pockets and a festive, but competitive spirit would have reigned. Scheffler (1995) gives a good description of how the auction would have been conducted. Livestock like sheep, cows and oxen would account also for much income. It is uncertain whether vineyards and therefore leaguers of wine were included. During their 12 years at Bethlehem, Pierre and Anne would have accumulated relatively large amounts of furniture, crockery, kitchen equipment, books and paintings. The amount generated was possibly about f4200 (Franken 1978:54).

Generally, such a day was a sad day for the owners and slaves, having to bid their sentimental possessions and homestead farewell. The dozen or so slaves, who had laboured on the farm, constituted the biggest investment. They had probably occupied at least one large room as part of a building (barn/stable). They were probably in tears, to be dispersed to different owners and farms. They knew that the like of the kindly, but stern preacher-owner, they would not see again.

His farm Bethlehem was sold to Secunde Samuel Elsevier in c.1701 and registered on 17.2.1702 (T.159). Both Elsevier and Willem van Putten, magazine master, were given Power of Attorney to finalize all his finances on 23.02.1702 (Ibid.:54).

Then there was the last minute sale of **Meerrust**, Drakenstein and its sale and registration on 9 May 1702. This sale must have been completed in Cape Town and caused quite a bit of stress for Simond. Simond also owned a **house in the Caabse Vlek**, which he acquired in the 1690s. It would also have been furnished and these items must also have been auctioned. Surprisingly, the house was already sold in late 1699 and registered on January 6, 1700. The buyer was none other than Jacques de Savoye, his old enemy! (Boucher 1981:348). It was mortgaged to Jacques and as soon as he sold Vrede-en-Lust to Willem van Zijl in 1702, the payment was transferred to Simond's account. Liquidity in cash was always a problem at the Cape.

It appears therefore that Simond rented from early 1700 a house in Cape Town till he left in May 1702. This would have cost him in rent (not cheap), food and transport. This probably accounted for the acquisition of the slave girl, Judith of Bengalen (India) to assist Anne with the household and five children.

7.7 SIMOND AND HIS DESCENDANTS OVERSEAS

What happened to Simond after they returned to the Netherlands? Take note that about 10% of French speakers had left the Cape by this time (Boucher 1981:344). In about September 1702 Simond settled at the great port city Amsterdam. His submission in 1703 of the Psalms was not accepted and it must have been a great blow to him. Between 1704 and 1708 he ministered to the Amsterdam and Haarlem churches.

At this time (1708/9) his fortunes turned (due to bad West Indian investments?) and he faced liquidity problems. By October 1709 he was appointed as second pastor to Lille on French soil, but in 1713 Lille was returned to the French (Ibid.:358/9). Designated as a military Captain, Simond served from 13 June 1713 at Furnes, being now 62 years of age. Unfortunately, no further record has been traced of him (Ibid.:360). It appears to me that stress and sickness may have taken him soon afterwards.

As the Simonds and Beraults had relatives and business contacts in London, England, the remaining family soon settled there. **Peter Simond (jnr)** inherited his parents ability in business ventures and in July 1717 became a naturalized citizen of Britain. At age 26, he soon made his mark on the London commercial world as a merchant, banker and on the stock market. He married in 1724 Suzanne Groteste de la Buffière and they had about 5 children. Anne Berault died at the age of 72 in London in about 1732. Peter "was engaged in the West Indian and American sugar and slave trades", where e.g. Negroes were imported at £10/head to South Carolina in 1734 (Boucher 1981:361-366). He probably owned the slave ship. Peter progressively made a great fortune for he could e.g. lend the Bank of England £30 000! (Ibid.:366). It is of interest that Peter's father Pierre, in

his youth had visited the West Indies and in later life at the Cape owned the most slaves of all the French. There must certainly be a connection here for Peter grew up amongst and over many slaves and was much exposed to slavery at the Cape.

There exists a portrait of Peter Simond in his 40s, "*bewigged in the fashion of the day and somewhat heavy jowled, but of benign expression*" (Ibid.: 368/9). From the 1720s he was obsessed with his Trading Firm and finances, with no reference ever to his family in his writings. This picture is the only one of a French resident of the Cape during the late 17th century (1691-1702). We can assume that he had some of his father Pierre's features and therefore reflect somewhat Pierre's countenance (**FIG.37**). Peter ironically died in the very centenary year of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in November 23, 1785 at age 94! (Ibid.:368).

What of the older children?

Catherine (17.4.1689) never married and went blind in old age, giving up the spirit in 1786 at age 97. She certainly became the oldest French refugee who lived at the Cape (Ibid.:363). Jacques-Clopas (1692) also ventured into the commercial business in England and appeared to have made a success. Marie-Elizabeth married well and had a number of children. Lydi (1697) also married, but died in 1758. The family "Simond" did live on in the descendants of Peter Simond of England.

7.8 CONTRIBUTION OF SIMOND

Dominus Pierre [Petrus] Simond set an example typical of the late 17th century pioneers. His mixture of moral duty, self-sacrifice, personal ambition, family preservation and economic survival were all being tested on the individual and community level, within the melting pot of danger and isolation of frontier conditions.

He was an outstanding intellectual with overseas family and relatives, with business contacts in the great commercial cities of the Netherlands and England. He could easily have carved out a prosperous career amongst equals, but the plight of the impoverished French Calvinists, with their numerous small children, must have moved him with **compassion**. At the Cape, his strength of convictions and empathy for the refugees under harsh conditions spurred him into action. He made **supplication** to the commander to redeploy the farmers to more fertile lands and for the Batavian monies to be distributed to the needy.

He repeatedly asked the commander for the establishment of a **separate Church** and Council. Though he was repeatedly rebuffed by Simon van der Stel (due to VOC policy), he rebounded and wrote to the Classis of Amsterdam and Lords 17. They granted the formation of a French *consistorie* in 1691, whose appointment of elders and deacons assisted Simond to control his scattered constituency with a firm hand.

His strong **moral and intellectual force** which he exerted over the families and single men and women, kept them in line most of the time. Drinking, adultery, fornication, abusive conduct, swearing, vindictive libel and gossip, and even murder amongst the French, were merely symptoms of human nature amongst trying pioneer conditions.

Simond's farm was on the **dividing line** between civilization and the wilderness. On his west lay the fledgling administrative town Stellenbosch and beyond the commercial Caabse Vlek and its port to foreign lands. On his east lay the dispersed, struggling French colonists, with Khoi kraals and wandering men, ferocious wild animals, all hemmed in by the towering Drakenstein mountains. These contrasting, physical environmental conditions always placed him on the crossroads of how to mediate between the wild and civilized. Did he see himself as a **mediator** and saviour, born at the unpretentious and forlorn Bethlehem?

Like the French he was **emotional**, easily given to depression or outbursts, or as Van der Stel said "*onrustig*", i.e. easily agitated, and yet steadfast or stubborn in temperament. Nonetheless, for the most he lived a controlled, introverted life with an **academic** interest in the Bible. The isolated farm siting was conducive to this spiritual meditations, reading, preparation of sermons, laborious study and rhyming of the Psalms, and the many letters, apologies and requests he wrote.

Two sermons saw **publication**, and the one at the Cape (1699) is the earliest and only full sermon we have of that period. His lifework was the newly rhymed Psalms of David, with musical annotation, which he published at his own cost as a book in 1703 in Amsterdam. This also counts as the earliest “residential” publication written at the Cape (Grevenbroek’s early 1700 Latin writing on the Khoi were only published much later (1933) in SA). In addition, a 1711 publication of his Psalms (without musical annotation) in Ryssel (Lille) has been located. Simond was preacher in this town between 1709 and 1713. This copy is located at the Comte August Library at Wolfenbuttel, near Berlin (Coertzen 2004).

In order to devote him to his higher calling, Simond accepted the Bethlehem farm (unsolicited), as the farm generated income that freed himself for his spiritual work. Thus his farm is also the general 60m, but divided in three unequal portions, worked by two other free Frenchmen on the basis of **crop sharing**. They all benefited each with ⅓ stock and cereal production increases. This old European method of helping one another benefited all.

In respect of behaviour towards the Khoi, he was as far as I know, the earliest visionary who showed any real long-term **concern for the Khoi** who eked out a rather precarious, nomad existence in the countryside. Simond saw their strait conditions during winter and recommended warm clothing. Their conversion to agricultural activities would make them self sufficient in food, beyond the milk and meat from their livestock. It was their unwillingness to settle on the land to cultivate their own crops which led to their landless state. They rather choose to work freelance for the colonists to obtain food, drink and tobacco. Agriculture leads to a structured way of life, with permanent homes and the passing on of accumulated wealth to family and posterity (see Add.8).

Economic prosperity is of course critical to determine class structure and social standing. Already prosperous with a good salary (*f*90/month), Pierre and Anne also sought other means to complement their income. Church pastors **always** invoked the **tenth-payment** principle of the Old Testament, but an impoverished community rebelled against this injunction. Secondly, a large **baking oven** was in place at Bethlehem, which Simond desired to become the communal “ban-oond”, reaping the profit of sales. This could only mean that most early (1688/9) houses did not have this amenity. With farms so far separated, it was impractical and was thus rejected by all. And finally, his wife Anne operated a “**shop**” in their 1690 home, where at a slight profit articles could be bought. De Savoye resented their shop, as he as merchant was supposed to be the sole supplier of goods. In addition, Simond operated the farm **Meerrust** for profit since 1697, apparently without the knowledge of most French. He acquired a house in Cape Town, a common requisite for most rural farmers of this period and later.

It is his personal ambition, low-keyed farming and social status as a Company official that slowly irked the lay-community all over the Cape. In 1705/6 this simmering discontent erupted in an all-out rebellion against the Cape government and its corrupt officials. Simond had already experienced such contentious matters from 1689/90 within the French community. As an astute observer, he could see what was coming and left before the storm broke.

8. SECUNDE SAMUEL ELSEVIER 1702-1707

8.1 GENERAL

Samuel Elzevier (sic) was born at Den Haag in about 1651, and was therefore about the same age as Pierre Simond. At age 24, Samuel joined the VOC and served in Ceylon and the island Madoera, before returning to the Netherlands in 1689, when his first wife was deceased. He had two daughters by Anna Maria Six, viz. Johanna Constantia (bapt. 1686), who later married ds H. Beck on 13.2.1707. Her sister was Samielia Jacoba (bapt. 1688?), who was to inherit some of Anna's jewellery (Franken 1978:64).

In 1691 Elzevier married Anna Christina Mulder who accompanied him to the Cape, where the family arrived on 19.4.1697 on the ship *Ijsselmonde* (Böeseken 1977:279-280). Elzevier was appointed as Secunde, second in command of the Cape after the Governor, and Manager of the Company magazines ("*secunde en administrateur van de negocië*"). He also had a son Johannes, who had married the widow Magareta Voogd with two children (9 and 16) by her late husband Jan Kneppel. She died in early 1709 and their estate inventory was at Diederick house, Stellenbosch (today Java Café) (SE corner of Church and Andringa Street). Johannes must have also been born at Ceylon (1685?) and possibly married in his early 20s (MOOC 8/2 1705-1714, 3/9 No.31; pp. 262-267).

Samuel quickly learnt the ropes and how to pull them to his advantage. By the next year he had obtained a portion of the old VOC post De Klapmuts of 1684 (Franken 1978:65). Apparently after 14 years the Post had become dilapidated and was abandoned, as the Company servants abused their charge, selling privately the produce of stock and cereals! (Ibid.:n.28). Elsenburg (the Fort of Elsevier) measured 110m (OCF I, 117, 23.9.1698) and in 1701 he obtained another large portion of 70m $339r^2$ 72ft² (OSF I, 141) (Van der Bijl 1963:79).

8.2 ELSENBURG AND BETHLEHEM

The primary purpose of the Company Post at De Klapmuts was to provide winter fodder for the Company's animals in Cape Town, as well as stabling for horses. By 1706 it was hardly worth saving, or so it was presented. The large old barn (1684) was designated after 22 years as the "*oude en bouwvallige hok*". On 1.7.1706 Elzevier acted as auctioneer from De Kat at the Castle and "sold" it to himself for Rxds. 300 (f900)! (Transport, 2.3.1708, which included 70m). In response to the complaints of the Cape burghers, an investigation by Commissioner Simonds in 1708, found that not only the building was sold, but also the "land", the latter "presented" to Elzevier by Wilhelm van der Stel! (Sleigh 2004:202/3).

Elzevier boasted that the effective and intensive farming methods of the few officials would soon make the farming efforts of the colonists obsolete. He was probably right, but the way the officials monopolized the sales of produce was wrong. Elzevier established a large farmyard complex at Elsenburg, which included a mill (unlawfully), a well-furnished house, barns, stables, a wagon maker's building (with smithy) and a pressing-cum-barrel storage barn by 1707 (Ibid.:203) (see also Fagan 1984). He also had slave quarters built for all his workers and tradesmen. In 1709, the tax-roll mentions 42 males, 3 females and two slave boys. It also stipulates two knechten (see **Table 4**).

In early 1702 the farm Bethlehem was registered on Elzevier's name, but he was possibly farming it already by March 1701, when Simond dismantled his possessions. Elzevier would certainly not have stayed at Bethlehem, but put the place in charge of an overseer (free or loan knecht) and some slaves. This latter option was already part and parcel of the farming process for a decade.

Research into contracts with foremen and into the tax-rolls might identify the inhabitant and produce. In my view cereal farming would have played a major role at Bethlehem. It is unlikely that Elzevier would have invested in new buildings. I suspect that his prosperous son, Johannes Elzevier, who also had a fancy Cape Town house, but who lived at Stellenbosch, actually managed Bethlehem farm for his own benefit. In this way it appeared that Johannes was the owner, and not his father.

9. CLAAS VAN DE WESTHUIZEN 1707 – 1719

9.1 BACKGROUND

On Saturday, 16 April 1707, the Kattendyk anchored at Table Bay, bringing the official news (of 30.10.1706) that the Company's top officials were recalled to the Netherlands. They included the Governor, the Secunde Elzevier, Predikant Kalden, Stellenbosch Landdrost Starrenburg and Francois van der Stel (Franken 1978:100, 103). Though Elzevier desired to stay on at the Cape as a private resident, he was refused. Elsenburg was managed for him by a capable citizen till 1718.

A few months earlier, the ship *Pieter en Paul* entered the Bay before Cape Town on 20 February 1707. It carried private letters of the decision of the Lords 17, which was still to arrive. Wilhelm van der Stel also received a communication of what was to follow. Consternation and joy engulfed the Cape. Distressed officials like Secunde Elzevier soon set the wheels turning. In haste he sold-off Bethlehem two months later in April 1707 to Claas van de Westhuizen.

The Van de Westhuizens trace their genealogy back to Pieter van de Westhuizen of Brugge in Vlaandere, who arrived at the Cape as a soldier in 1662. Joining the DEIC as a soldier at a salary of *f*9 per month was the most economical way of a "free" passage, but

you had to serve 5 years at the Cape. He married Maria Winkelhausen in 1673 and had seven children, i.a. Maria (6.10.1675), Jan (9.5.1677), Nicholaas (7.5.1679), Barend (16.3.1681), and Helena (27.6.1683) who married Heinrich Segers.

Pieter apparently became quite prosperous and with some social status (see **Table 4**: Tax returns). I could not trace his business or farms. His son, Nicholaas or Claas, must have farmed somewhere in the Cape Peninsula, possibly with his father, for he married relatively late in his life at 28 years. Shortly after February 1707, he bought Bethlehem from Elzevier.

9.2 FARMING CONDITIONS

Claas van de (sic) Westhuizen was described as “*Vryburger en Landbouwer*”, buying the “*plaatz oft hofsteede genaamd Bethlehem ... in de district van Draakenstein aan de Simonsbergen*” with the Dwars River on its north (T.53, 5.4.1707). An average price of f2700 Indiese valuation was asked, of which Claas paid f300 in cash, the remainder to be paid in four instalments of f600 each to the Company (!), starting in 1708 (Mortgage, T.54, 5.4.1707). Both documents were signed by Willem van der Stel, Willem Helot, the secretary and Adriaan van Reede, while Claas signed the mortgage with a cross [X] (**FIG.38**). On the same date of registration, Claas also acquired a male slave from Elzevier for 80 Rxd 60 “*ligte stuiwers*”. Due to the scrawled handwriting, the name is not clear, but the slave [Birou?] was from Madagascar (T.52, 5.4.1707).

Shortly afterwards (1708) Claas married Catharina Olivier and they had 19 children between 1709 and 1734. The following children were born at Bethlehem and baptized presumably at Stellenbosch Church (DV&P 1981:1120/1):

1. Pieter (3.2.1709)
2. Maria Magdalena (16.1.1710) married Gerrit Olivier of Rustplaas, Riebeeck Kasteel
3. Aletta (15.1.1713) who died young, probably in the small pox epidemic of 1713
4. Nicolaas (24.6.1714)
5. Cornelis (30.8.1716)
6. Petrus (4.9.1718)
7. Aletta (23.6.1720), born at Strand and
8. Pieter van der Bijl (27.12.1744) of De Vyffontein, Swartland (Van der Bijl 1968:8).

Claas slowly built up the farm, which was as most, of mixed arable type, i.e. cereals, vineyards, and stock to fertilize the land. In 1709 he is listed with two sons (one must have died early) and two male slaves to assist on the land, with Khoi also available. With greater access to the free markets, he kept in a kraal 30 cattle and 300 sheep. From 8000 vines he produced a good 6 leaguers of wine, which indicate a wine-cellar and pressing

equipment. His 6 horses indicate a stable, possibly part of a barn for the cereals and straw, including 40 mud corn. He owned the usual musket, pistol and sword, all part of his official duties for the annual militia mustering.

During the early fall of April 1713, a ship arrived with sailors sick with small-pox. Their clothes were washed by slaves in the stream above Cape Town, also contaminating the drinking water. Consequently many slaves and Europeans died. The Khoi living in a kraal against Vlaggeberg, and those in the Peninsula fled with their stock to the interior, spreading the disease as they went, exterminating thousands of them (Malherbe, et al 1996:8).

From here after all farmers, including Claas would have to rely heavily on slave labour and *knechten* to accomplish their work. Over the next few years, progress was slow, but steady, as revealed in the 1712 tax-return. He “prospered” to such a degree that he could buy the farms of Parel Vallei (120m) and Paarde Vallei (40m 65r²) on the same day (27.10.1717, T.1203 & T. 1208) (Van der Bijl 1963:60). Both farms were well-to-do and belonged to Frans van der Stel, one of the most hated men at the Cape in 1707. He was called *Don Francisco* by the French, or otherwise *Jonker Francois* (Böeseken 1964:234). He was forced to leave the Cape in April 1708, but his wife Johanna Wessels looked after his interests till 1717 (Ibid.:235), when Claas bought the farms.

In mid-1717 Landdrost Nicolaas van den Heuvel reigned over the Stellenbosch district. He was already in the soup as a Company official, when in 1716 he bought two morgen of garden land in Cape Town. He justified it as necessary for him to overnight his carriage and 6 horses, when he had to report to the Castle authorities (Biewenga 1999:51)(**FIG.39**).

Van den Heuvel was already planning his retirement to become a farmer in 1717, when Frans van der Stel’s two properties came on the market. As he was not allowed to own farmland, he induced Claas van de Westhuizen to buy the two farms and when it was registered in his name, Van den Heuvel had retired from his Company post. Therefore he could buy and register (22.11.1717) the two farms a month later from Claas! (Van der Bijl 1963:60).

I presume that after 1719, Claas and his family acquired another farm in the Cape, possibly near Riebeeck Kasteel. He died about late 1730s and his widow, Catharina Olivier went to live with her daughter, Maria Magdalena van de Westhuizen, who had married Gerrit Olivier, brother of Catharina Olivier’s father, Ockert Olivier (see **Table 5**). At Gerrits’ death (c.1747), Maria was already deceased, and Catharina had incurred f2000 of debt (MOOC 8/6 1738-1748 15/16 124 [pp. 1435, 1440]), for which her goods had to be sold.

10. LANDDROST NICOLAAS VAN DEN HEUVEL 1719 – 1735

10.1 BACKGROUND

In 1685 Commissioner Adriaan van Reede tot Drakenstein instituted the office of Landdrost, with its numerous civil and judiciary responsibilities. In 1687 the Drostdy on the “Island of Stellenbosch” was built as a double-storey, rebuilt as a single storey in 1709 and then it burnt down in Dec. 1710 with most of the town buildings, including the church (1687). The Drostdy was only rebuilt by 1719, and the landdrost stayed in a *Kolonieshuis* for the interim period. Nicolaas served as landdrost from 16.5.1713 to 15.5.1717 at Stellenbosch.

Van den Heuwel, baptized on 15.2.1690 in Amsterdam, stepped ashore at the Cape on 31.12.1709 as ensign in the VOC. He was particularly bright and erudite, with great writing skills (Biewenga 1999:52). Promoted to Orphan Master and then lieutenant, he was appointed at the age of 23 as Landdrost at Stellenbosch (De Wet 1987:792). A few months later he and Marice Segers (25.4.1700), she at the tender age 13, “married” on 26.11.1713, presumably in the old wine-cellar of Jan Botma, reused as a church since 1711 (DV&P 1981:313). Maria was the daughter of Helena van de Westhuizen (brother to Claas) and Heindrich Segers (see Table 5).

Heinrich Segers of Ochtrup in Westphalia, Germany, was already by 1692 a freeburgher at the Cape. In 1696 he was at Drakenstein, and became acquainted with the Van de Westhuizens, and married Helena on 23.11.1698, and only one daughter, Maria Seegers (sic) was born on 25.6.1700 (Hoge 1946:26). For some reason Heinrich died early in 1703, leaving the widow with the young child. Did both of them stay with her brother at Bethlehem? This was highly likely and this is where Nicolaas van den Heuwel would have met them in 1713.

Why did Maria (at 13) marry Nicolaas, but they only had children when she was 18? Did something ontoward happen and marriage vows had to be taken? Did she stay in the care of her mother at Bethlehem till she was 19? We shall probably never know, but the two families were quite close. The couple did not have children till she was nineteen, and then they had 7 children between 1719 and 1730 (DV&P 1981:313):

1. Elizabeth Catharina (17.09.1719)
2. Helena Maria (25.05.1721)
3. Johanna Petronella (30.05.1723)
4. Aletta Hendrina (25.02.1725) x c.1745 Barend van Niekerk
5. Margaretha Anna (24.11.1726)
6. Anna Elizabeth (25.09.1728)
7. Nicolaas (03.12.1730)

10.2 FARMING CONDITIONS

Though Nicolaas lived in a Kolonieshuis from 1713-1717, he may have moved to Parel Vallei between 1717-1719. Otherwise he stayed also at Bethlehem with his young wife. When Maria was pregnant, Nicolaas then bought Bethlehem (sic) from Claas van de Westhuizen and it was registered on 24.4.1719 (T.1288), as “*Hofsteede genaamt Betlehem*” (sic), everything on it “*aard en nagelvas*” for a low f1000, “*den laasten penning bij den eersten*”. Claas again signs with a cross [+]. What happened to Claas van de Westhuizen? Did he possibly act as foreman for Van den Heuvel’s farms at Parel Vallei and Paardevlei? The tax-rolls indicate that in 1725 Claas had moved to the Cape Town district.

Via the select computerized tax-rolls, I could locate Van den Heuvel only once, and that in 1723. As he owned besides Bethlehem also Parel Vallei and Paardevlei, it is uncertain whether the produce are from one or all three farms. His male labourers (slaves) are not mentioned, but he would have owned a number (10?), as well as 3 female and 5 youngsters. For 15 horses a stable was required and the 83 cattle and 420 sheep would have been spread over the farms. Pigs manure was good fertilizer for the soil. It looks as though the 25 000 vines could be from a single farm (Bethlehem), but the exceptional 40 leaguers of wine are just too good to be true for one farm (1000 vines = 1 leaguer). Similarly, the corn production (20 : 250) was exceptional. From the 4 muskets we can infer at least 3 other men acting as knechten or overseers.

In about 1733 it is recorded that his slaves totalled 35, but they would be doing duty at all three farms. Nonetheless, even if 15-20 lived at Bethlehem, it could have meant separate quarters (rooms) or a full building. He also had a total of 120 cattle, 600 sheep and 40000 vines (De Wet 1987:792). By all standards Nicolaas was very prosperous. Buildings on the farm would have been numerous and well-kept. There is mentioned that Nicolaas suffered from poor health in 1717. He lasted another 15 years and died on 26.4.1732, leaving a widow with seven children to run three farms. He was laid to rest within the Stellenbosch church (Hugo & Van der Bijl 1963:230).

Van den Heuvel was an upstanding citizen and served four times on the Church Council at Stellenbosch. It was he who laid the proposed plan for the new church before the *heemraden* in March 1717, with probably the same designer Hutspot as that of the Drakenstein Church, which was also under construction (Hugo & Van der Bijl 1963:61,62). When the new cross-structured church was inaugurated, Nicolaas served as elder. Hugo initially noted that he “lived” at Paarde Vallei, but rectified it later on when he stated Nicolaas lived at Bethlehem (Ibid.:88, 230).

11. OLOF DE WET 1735 – 1756

11.1 FAMILY BACKGROUND

Widow Maria Seegers (Van den Heuvel) moved in high social circles at the Cape. With three farms to her name and many possessions, pretty and young, she was a good catch. One of the leading families in Cape Town was the De Wet clan. Olof (Oloff) Bergh, originally from Sweden, and his wife, Anna de Koning, born at the Cape, were one of the most colourful couples of the time (>1676) (De Wet 1968:69-70). They had 11 children and their first-born, Christina (bapt. 18.6.1679), married the prosperous Jacobus de Wet (1673-1710).

They had 11 children, and Martinus (child no.9) (bapt. 2.11.1696) became Landdrost at Stellenbosch from 1721-1729. Anna's first born was Christina (bapt. 18.6.1679) and she married the prosperous Jacobus de Wet (1673-1710) (DV&P 1981:41-42). The De Wet couple had 6 children of which Johannes Carolus (no.6) (1709-1748) married (in 1732) Maria Magdalena Blanckenberg, her father farming at Meerlust (DV&P 1981:1126). **Olof de Wet** was their second son (Nov. 1699) and he would have visited his relations at the Drostdy in Stellenbosch, and met the Van den Heuvel couple.

Olof joined the VOC as a soldier in 1718, but was soon promoted to clerk (1719), bookkeeper (*soldeij boekhouder*)(1723) and *Onder-coopman* (1726). He held the high post of *Opper-coopman* till 1734 when he became a freeburgher (RPR 9:64, n.104; RPR 9:375) He kept the title *Opper-coopman* and must have had close ties with his younger brother, Johannes, who also followed the same VOC course, but was even more prosperous. With his Scandinavian background, he concentrated on provisioning the *Danish West India and Guinea Company's* shipping trade (Boucher 1987:195).

It appears that Olof was involved with the "shipping" in False Bay and the profitable fishing rights. Through his marriage he acquired *Paardevlei* and in 1736 he bought *Vlooibaai*, i.e. Somerset Strand (T.2306, 15.3.1736) (Van der Bijl 1963:63A). Soon afterwards he asked for exemption from paying 286 Rxd 25 stuyvers as tax on a request to Batavia, apparently because of an estate account (RPR 9, 10.4.1736, pp.64/5). Prior to 1737 he lend some money (ƒ300) to the heer Blanckenberg (SB Mus. Invent.: 418).

Olof abided his time and requested to become a freeburgher in October 1734, and three years after Maria (Seegers) was widowed, he married her on May 8, 1735, gaining also 7 children! Olof and Maria had two children, but both apparently died young, viz. Christina Helena (1738) and Jacobus Matthias (1741) (DV&P 1981:1126)(**FIG.40**). They continued to stay at Bethlehem, and Olof became a respected member of the Stellenbosch and Drakenstein community. He served later as elder in the Stellenbosch church from January 1741 to December 1742. In about 1741, Olof and Maria were at the height of prosperity, according to his tax-return (see **Table 4**).

His 3 *knechten* probably managed respectively his 3 outlying farms, whilst his slaves would also have been divided among the four farms.

Notice the amount of slaves:

Male	30		
Female	<u>7</u>	37	
Boys	6		
Girls	<u>10</u>	16	53

His animal stocks would also have been distributed amongst his farms (48 horses, 180 cattle, 450 sheep, 10 pigs), which needed adequate barns/stables/krale, as he had also large cereals increases (corn, rye and barley). Of greater interest is of course his 40 000 vines which produced 18 leaguers of wine, indicating a fully operational wine-cellar for pressing and storage.

11.2 EARLY ZILVER-MINING EXPLOITS >1685

North of Bethlehem, the Simonsberg range towers over the landscape, dividing the districts of Stellenbosch from Drakenstein. The Bangehoek Pass, later Helshoogte Pass, snakes along the foothills past Pniel (founded 1843) and the adjacent Goede Hoop (1687), situated higher up the eastern slope. High above Goede Hoop, the mountain has invited mineral explorations since the early VOC days. Johannes Mulder as the first landdrost at Stellenbosch (1685-1691), surveyed many farms, and laid out his own farm Zorgvliet in the valley.

Secretary to the L&H, Peter Kolbe (1727 I:118), writes that not far above the land of Heemraad Abraham [de] Villiers (Bossendaal), some good quality coal (*beste steenkolen*) was excavated. Mulder has taken a sample and found it to be good. As no coal has been found in the vicinity, this statement has been scorned by most. Nonetheless, I think there could have been a surface seam, which was quickly exploited. Kolbe continues that not far from Zorgvliet, a silver mine (*zilver-myn*) was discovered in 1680s, from which some ore was extracted (**FIG.41**) (**Add.9**).

It is apparent that some shafts were dug in the mountainside (c.1687), but the sample send to Holland must have proved inconsequential and all work stopped. I connect this exercise with the silvermine exploits during the 1680s in the Steenberge, Cape Town. Complex shafts were dug, visited in 1688 by Johan Vogel. He commented on the mine-overseer Gabriel Möller's work and the fallen-in shafts (Raven-Hart II 1971:337/8).

One of the main objectives of the VOC was to search for precious minerals (silver and gold), some of the few payments acceptable in the Asian and Chinese trade networks. In 1661 Van Riebeeck had a book on the *History of Precious Stones* in his possession (Varley 1949:18).

11.3 ZILVERMINE COMPLEX >1740

One of the Cape's greatest commercial projects picked-up steam with the arrival in 1740 of German adelborst **Franz Dietrich Müller**, from Worms, on the ship Horssen. He was born 1714 in Nassau-Weilburg, and as an ambitious single man sought his fortune at the Cape. I suspect that he came with premeditated reasons. Kolbe's German edition of 1719 describing the Cape's customs, people and places, was widely circulated and very popular. Müller was no fool and could read and write particularly well. Did he have contact also with Möller? Potential of treasure and riches fascinated one and all, poor and rich, as we shall see. At the Cape he joined as soldier for the five year contract (1740 – 1745) and by no accident was stationed at the VOC Outpost at Clapmuts (Hooge 1946:284; Leibbrandt 1906: Requesten II:751).

Within a few weeks or months he had come to know most of the farmers. He traveled to the southern end of Simonsberg and located the old silver mine shaft of four decades earlier. Himself somewhat of an amateur mineralogist, he saw the potential of the mine and had to find the right sponsors. Müller had the gift of the gab and with his forceful personality he convinced the owner of Bethlehem, Olof de Weth (sic) to participate by November 1740. The documentary research by Janine de Villiers (Lucas, et al 2001:29-52), forms the basis of the following extracts.

The DEIC shrewdly did not involve themselves in the operations, but allowed De Wet and some other farmers to dig the shafts with the help of **Frans Diederik Muller** (his name at the Cape) for at least the next two years (1740-42). Muller's efforts at gathering "ore" samples were enough to convince De Wet to form a *Chartered Mining Company*, with him as chief director, in early 1743 (**Add.10**). On 22 February he applied for this charter to mine gold, silver, quicksilver (mercury), copper, lead, tin, iron and cobalt, in the mountain ranges of Simonsberg, Paarl and Hottentots-Holland. Precious metal fever must have run high with such an optimistic report. On what was it based? : a few shafts, some ore, imagination and desire, all well-mixed with Muller's rosy reports on the potential treasures awaiting the investors. He must have also produced some tangible but small amounts of "silver", to launch the *CM Company*.

From all evidence he "salted" the mining operations (Jan. 1740-Dec. to 1742) with melted down silver coins, easily obtainable at the Cape. He possibly argued that with more intensive mining, they would certainly strike it rich at some time, making it all worthwhile. What had he to lose? He was working as a labourer (at a soldier's wage of f9/month) at Klappmuts, looking after oxen and stock, and involved in sowing, reaping and storing corn and hay for the Company's animals (see Sleight 2004:197, etc.). In contrast he could be in charge of all the buildings and mining operations as *bergmeester*, in charge of all the men, with his own house and provisions!

Governor Hendrik Swellengrebel had also inspected the mining site and was convinced of its potential. It is of significance that the *Directors* of the *Octrooieerde Societijt der Mynwerken aan de Simonsberg* were some of the most powerful and wealthiest men at the Cape:

1. Governor Hendrik Swellengrebel.
2. Secunde Rijk Tulbagh (second in command).
3. Oud-oppercoopman (Deputy Merchant) Olof de Weth.
4. Burgher Lieutenant Jan Louwrens Bestbier (married in 1737 to Catharina van de Heuvel, of Bethlehem) (appointed *brandmeester / boekhouder* in 1738, and *Commissioner to Civil and Matrimonial Matters* (RPR 9:209, 238).
5. Former Heemraad Jacob Cloete.
(One of the wealthiest Cape burghers, owner of Nooitgedacht and four other farms) (Van der Bijl 1963:74, 75A, 81).
6. Burgher Jan Phillip Giebelar
(Owner of Elsenburg, the most prestigious farm beyond Cape Town, as well as the farm Muldersvlei (Van der Bijl 1963:79, 81A).
7. Secretary of the Orphan Chamber, Joachim N. van Dessin.
To act as secretary, bookkeeper and cashier.
8. Heemraad Johannes Louw [Pieters].
Deputized as cashier near the site to pay all the monthly wages
(Owner of Zorgvliet, below Simonsberg, closest neighbour to Olof de Wet).

As a result of the Mining Company's formation (Leibbrandt I 1906:374, 375), huge amounts of money were now invested in a variety of structures to make the venture economically feasible (Lucas 2001:53) (**FIG.42**). These included between 1744 and 1747:

CONSTRUCTIONS	DIMENSIONS (in metres)
1. An ore washhouse (<i>bochwerk</i>)	(18.4 x 6.1)
2. A water mill (<i>water muragie</i>)	(18.4 x ?)
3. Smelt house/shed/smithy	(15.3 x 12.2)
4. Assay oven (for purifying) (<i>asaaij oventje</i>)	
5. Coal store (<i>koolhuis</i>)	
6. Charcoal house (<i>roosthuis</i>)	
7. Melting oven	
8. Bergmeester's House	(15.3 x 5.8)
9. Workers' Houses/Slave Room	

As operational manager closest to the site, Olof de Wet must have spent a fair amount of time inspecting the mining operations (1743-6). He also delivered loads of barley muids to the workmen in December 1743 / January 1744 (1 muid = 160 lbs).

In November 1744 Olof was promoted to Captain of the militia company of Stellenbosch and Drakenstein. This was an high official, status post within the community, investing him with greater respect and authority (Lucas, et al 2001:30). A fair amount of building materials like thatch and brick were delivered by the Directors (Cloete, Giebelaar), whilst the farmer Carel Just (Zevenrivieren), Matiam le Roux (Roes) (Brandwacht), Jan le Roux (Welgevallen) and Johannes Louw (Zorgvliet) also delivered beams, timbers, limework, etc. (Ibid.:51).

Vast quantities of mining materials (coal, iron rods, fat, explosives, etc.) and animals (oxen, cows, sheep), cereals (rice, wheat, barley), coffee, tobacco, wine and brandy were supplied from the VOC's stores for the account of the Directors. The mine shafts appeared to have been black holes absorbing money and delivering no ores, except empty promises.

Apparently the labourers, i.e. soldiers, were sent directly from the Cape or from the garrison stationed at Klapmuts, which Muller probably also frequented. Note how the men increased from 1741/2 from about 5 to 19 (Sleigh 2004:207). Sleigh speculates some buildings were erected at Klapmuts, but I believe the men were used at the Zilvermine venture. In 1743 they (the soldiers) were diminished to 7 men, the rest now constantly at work at the *Mynwerken*. Note how 5 men from the Clapmuts garrison were transferred to the Zilvermine in September 1745 (Lucas, et al 2001:46).

11.4 MULLER'S MARRIAGE AND DEATH OF SPOUSE

Willem van Staden was married on 14.2.1717 to Cornelia Venter and they had nine children on the farm Zevenrivieren, Bangehoek. Catharina Geertruida (bapt. 14.7.1726) was the 6th child (DV&P 1981:918). In 1742 the widow Venter married Carel Titus Just, who started to deliver thatch and timbers to the mining site for the constructions. It was during this time that Frans Muller and Catharina became more intimately acquainted. In 1744 Frans Muller asked to be remitted and about mid-1745 he received his freeburgher status (Leibbrandt Requesten II 1906:751). Soon afterwards (in late August 1745) he married Geertruyda and they moved into his *Bergmeester's* house.

At about the same time Olof de Wet's wife Maria Seegers became sickly and she died in 1746. Her one or both daughters by Olof de Wet were already buried in vault No.50, below the floor of the Stellenbosch Church. Maria was probably buried in vault 71, "*D' vrou van Olof de Wet*" (Hugo & Van der Bijl 1963: 230, 233). In Vault 72 a "Maria van den Heuvel" was buried, but there is no mention in DV&P of such a child. Since Olof married Maria (1735), there were three deaths, i.e. his own two children of his deceased wife. One wonders if this marriage was really happy. At her death, he also made his own testament. I could not find the inventory of Maria's estate, which would be of great historical interest.

Olof had invested heavily into the spurious Zilvermine and his losses must have been great. As soon as his wife's estate was wrapped up, he negotiated the sale of his farms by late 1747 and registration was early in 1748:

Parel Vallei on	26.3.1748
: Paarde Vallei on	25.3.1748
: Vlooibaai on	29.3.1748.

He retained Bethlehem with the underage children of Maria, where they continued to live till late 1755 when he sold the farm.

11.5 DISSOLVEMENT OF MINING COMPANY

Things did not go well at the Zilvermine. Practically no silver was forthcoming, other metals were non-existent and Muller was becoming worried. He stubbornly continued in his ruse of promising rich metal finds, and dug new horizontal shafts into the base of the mountain by 1746, but to no good effect (Lucas, et al 2001:37). He continued to lie about good deposits of copper and silver ore, to keep his investors motivated. Finally on 30 September, with the smelting shed in operation, he now turned the copper ores into gold! (Ibid.:43). His cover was substantiated a few weeks earlier when Jacob Cloete (of Nooitgedacht) visited the site on 7th September. Muller showed him a piece of 7lb ore with thick "gold" seams. Jacob brought the Secretary, Joachim van Dessin along by 11 September and they were now shown 16 lbs of ore with much "gold" in the matrix. This last enticement kept the suspicious investors enchanted for another four months (Ibid.:45).

Samples were sent to Holland and finally, the results by a competent chemist dispelled all doubt and proved the samples were worthless in early 1750 (Ibid.:45). Muller's final trial became a long, drawn-out affair (CJ 283, CJ 805, CJ 809). He was accused of fraud, sent to Batavia for trial and sentenced by the Council of India (on 30.11.1751) to be banished for life and was sent to Holland (Hoge 1946:284).

The Directors, the cream of the colony, become the laughing stock of the Cape. Lust blinded their eyes to the slight of hand of the conman Muller, who hoped his feverish digging and smelting would turn up something worthwhile. Olof de Wet as manager, must have been close to bankruptcy and had extricated him out of the mess by early 1748. When his tax-return for 1752 is compared to 10 years earlier, we note that his assets diminished substantially. He was a widower (since 1746) and one son and daughter and two female slaves kept house with them. Only 3 male slaves laboured on the farm with two children also helping out. Surprisingly, only 5000 vines are mentioned, with a low production of 3 leaguers.

The mention of a son and daughter are intriguing. Was the daughter from his marriage to Maria? There is no mention of a second wife, yet he had a very young son in 1752. Was the child's mother a slave girl?

The younger brother of Olof was Johannes Carolus (bapt. 1709), the very successful shipping merchant. His son Olof(f) Godlieb (11.10.1739 – 6.12.1811) became Landdrost of Stellenbosch from 23.12.1778 – 25.3.1782) (DV&P 1981:1126-1127). Olof may have become involved with the ventures of his brother in the commercial world and acquired property in Cape Town. He started to neglect the farm and finally decided to sell in 1755 when he was about 56 years of age.

During De Wet's ownership, something happened to the original diagram of the old grant in Cape Town. As it was on a separate sheet, it may have become damaged or possibly lost. The result was a "new" survey by Carel David Wentzel (b.1725 – d.1776), presumably in 1754/5, when De Wet wanted to sell Bethlehem. Wentzel arrived at the Cape in 1768 and for the next decade was the official surveyor of the Company. He produced some valuable maps of Cape Town and the eastern frontier (Forbes 1981:811).

12. EDUARD CHRISTIAAN HAUMAN 1756 – 1758

12.1 BACKGROUND

Eduard Hauman(n) hailed from the harbour town of Riga in Letland, but was actually born in Moscow, Russia, between 1721 – 1725, son of a Lutheran Pastor ministering in various places. His mother died in 1733 and his father the next year, but the orphan, at age 24 had "qualified" as a surgeon (*chirurgijn*) (Scheffler 1995:98, 99). Years later (1772) he admitted that he studied to be a surgeon, but ran away, caught by the *zielverkoopers*, and contracted as a soldier to the Dutch, outward-bound ships (Sparrman 1772; Forbes 1975:99). He arrived on the Vreeland in 1745 at the Cape, and became, due to his "rank" a freeburgher the next year. He had the good fortune to buy at the same time the medical equipment from the Meerrust estate of the late surgeon Johann Schaborts (Scheffler 1995: 99) (Scheffler made extensive use of R. Hauman's book *Van Riga tot Drakenstein*).

Eduard turned his steps to the rural Drakenstein and probably rented a room or outbuilding on one of the farms, possibly Meerrust, travelling by horse to minister to his patients. He was of a lively, choleric, temperament and soon made a fair amount of money and the acquaintance of all the eligible girls in the area. I conjecture he stayed near Simondium or Paarl, where the greatest concentrations of inhabitants were. By early 1749 (31 July) he obtained *Diamant* from *Jan van die Kus*, and a month later married Susanne Taillefer, daughter of Pierre Taillefer and Marie Marais (1692 – 1766) of Leeuwvallei at Wamakersvallei (Le Roux & Lombard 1988:64, 139; (Le Roux & le Roux 1999:68)

Eduard and Suzanne were of the same age and they had a son, Pieter Eduard (baptized 2.4.1750, or 1752). Apparently she was frail and died soon afterwards (DV&P 1981:289). He already owned two slaves and two slave children and 9 horses. Was there a slave woman who cared for baby Pieter? (Scheffler 1995:99, 100). During his travels, Eduard had contact with the Marais's of Vrede-en-Lust and on 3.12.1752 he married Susanna Marais (baptized 1723), (a niece of his wife), who was 29 years old, who bore him a daughter, Maria Elizabeth (baptized 30.6.1754).

12.2 INTERLUDE AT BETHLEHEM 1756 – 1758

I speculate that Eduard desired to be near the village of Stellenbosch, or that his wife desired to be closer to relatives in the Simondium area. As we have seen, Olof de Wet, the subject of shame and gossip after the Zilvermine fiasco, decided to sell Bethlehem in 1755, having met the surgeon on his rounds or in town. At Leeuwenvallei, Wellington, Olof fell for Suzanne Taillefer (baptized 1721) his own age, the daughter of Pierre Taillefer and Marie Marais.

Bethlehem (sic) was sold for f2000, which indicate just the necessary buildings (house, barn/stables, cellar and kraal). The document is signed **O. de Wet**, and the mortgage by *Eduard Christian Hauman*, who owned Jan de Villiers the full amount of f2000, at 5% interest per year (T.3179, 22.1.1756) (**FIG.43**). The whole family moved to Bethlehem, to be closer to Stellenbosch village. Diamant was in the market, but only sold and registered to Theodor Kleinhans on 16.12.1757. With the f4000 he immediately acquired another 8 morgen of property against the slopes of Table Mountain, called Belvidere (Bellvue) for f8500 (Scheffler 1995:100).

It appears to me that his frail wife was not well. After he had bought Bethlehem, he deemed it better to acquire the Cape Town property and moved there soon afterwards (1757/8). In his haste he “sold” Bethlehem at f1800, a loss of f200 plus interest, and the farm was registered on 14.2.1758 (DO). Alas, the removal to Cape Town was in vain, for Susanna died on 30 June 1758 at 35 years of age (Scheffler 1995:101).

Though no tax-return was located for 1758, there is one for 1761 which gives some idea of his possessions (see **Table 4**). He then owned 7 male slaves, one female and 4 slave children. His love for horses, which probably pulled also a carriage (6 horses), implied also stables at Bethlehem (1756 – 58).

12.3 RETURN TO SIMONDIUM

Eduard, the restless soul, bought the farm *Conterman* in Tiggervallei, registered on 11.4.1759 (Ibid.). He probably never stayed there, but lived in Cape Town. He desired to return to the Drakenstein valley and in an exchange transaction obtained on 10.1.1761 Fredericksburg / La Motte on the slope of Simonsberg near the old French Church site. Why? He had a new prospective wife in his vision, the lovely Maria Rousseau of La Concorde in southern Paarl! (Le Roux & Le Roux 1999:803/4). A few months later, the surgeon married Maria Rousseau, age 25, in Paarl Church, and a son, Eduard Christiaan followed on 6.3.1763 (DV&P 1981:289). Unfortunately the son was not healthy and died on 16.4.1765.

Finally, Hauman decided to acquire the nearby Simonsvallei / Stellengift, which he did on 11 January 1764 (**FIG.44**). A few days earlier (19.1.1764) he had sold Fredericksburg and La Motte for f8250 (T.3915) (Scheffler 1995:102). In spite of all his funds, Hauman had to negotiate a mortgage of f21 500 on the buying sum of f120 000!

Further tragedy befell the couple when his lovely Maria unfortunately died in childbirth on 14.7.1766. At 28 years, Maria and her baby were buried in a single coffin (Ibid.:103). When Hauman married for the 4th time on 8.2.1767, it was to the 17 year old Helena Krugel when, Hauman was himself 42. Hauman lasted till 24.4.1782, but his widow (who married twice) only died on 5.11.1828, at the age of 78 years in Cape Town (Ibid.:105/6).

12.4 CHARACTER OF EDUARD HAUMAN

Scheffler (1995:106-107) gives a fine summary on the doings of Hauman. This German emigrant was probably never fully qualified as a surgeon, but in the rural outback of the Cape, none would have noticed. Yet with the death of his three young brides, two in birth, and a child of two years, one has one's doubts about his competence as a doctor. This is probably why he invested in the Cape (plots) and at Drakenstein (farms). He was possibly a perfectionist in farming, with a love of horses.

Note that the botanist, Anders Sparrman (Forbes 1975:98-100) visited Eduard and his wife Helena at Simons Valeij in 1772. He remarked on Helena as being very good natured, with a quiet, phlegmatic temperament, but Hauman being an opposite choleric, always busy and about, "*a very brisk lively old fellow*" (p.98). Hauman had a large bookcase with numerous books on scientific matters, and read from the popular *Antiquities of the Jews*, by Flavius Josephus (p.99). Two slaves, who did not do their duty of bringing in the horses in the evening, were thrashed the next morning (p.99). Sparrman who critically reviewed the *boers*, made unfounded statements of Hauman having beaten slaves to death, a complete untruth (p.100). As an orphan since 10, Hauman had to fight his way through the tough and brutal 18th century. He was sharp, well-educated, but restless and a good observer of people, women, animals and land, all used to his advantage where possible. Bethlehem was but a stop-over in a number of tragedies in his career in the Drakenstein district.

13. HENDRIK C. VAN NIEUWKERKEN 1758 – 1775

13.1 BACKGROUND

Cornelis Gerritsz [zoon] van Nieuwkerken of Gelderland arrived at the Cape by the late 17th century. He married Maria van de Westhuijzen on 1.4.1691 (DV&P 1981:634). She was the eldest daughter of the third owner of Bethlehem, Nicolaas van de Westhuijzen. Cornelis and Maria had 6 children between 1693 and 1708. Their third child was Johannes van Nieuwkerken (born 15.9.1697) who married (21.12.1727) Engela Plooy by whom he had 7 children. **Hendrik Cornelis van Nieuwkerken** was the first born (bapt. 6.3.1729), who married on 26.4.1750 Aletta Heyns (bapt. 30.9.1725), and they produced 7 children between 1752 and 1766 (Ibid.:647, 635, 317/8).

13.2 FARMING ACTIVITIES

Hendrik had tried his hand at farming for he was termed “*landbouwer*” when he acquired Betlehem (sic) on 14.2.1758 (T.3321) from Hauman, who was in a crisis to sell, with his wife sick. Hendrik was not well-off, for he took a full f1800 mortgage, once again indebted to the creditor Jan de Villiers, an ex-heemraad (**FIG.45**). In the computerized tax-rolls of the Cape Archives, Hendrik is not listed in 1761, which is rather unusual. For 1762, he is listed, but residing in the Cape Town area, not Drakenstein or Stellenbosch. And in 1773, when Hendrik had died, his widow was again listed as residing in the Cape Town district (consult **Table 4**, 1762/1773).

Note the labourers:

	Male	Female	Boys	Girls	
1762	10	2	1	1	: 14
1773	14	4	2	2	: 22

Over 10 years time there was an increase in slaves, totalling 18 adults and 4 children at the last census. Apparently Hendrik was fairly prosperous, but the fact that no vineyards were mentioned, indicate he made his money in other ways. One wonders if he kept his horses and stock at Bethlehem, with a few trusted slaves to manage the farm. It appears to me as if Bethlehem was more of a sideline, though I may be mistaken.

Though the Van Nieuwkerkens owned the farm for about a dozen years, it looks as though not much building activities or improvement were made. Consequently, the farm sold for f2000 in 1775, the price paid in 1756. During this period (1758-75), the name *Van Nieuwkerken* was simplified to *Van Niekerk*. In the T.4751 (28.7.1775) the name was spelled Van Nieuwkerken, but the extra letters (in bold) were scratched through.

14. ANDRIES STEPHANUS DU TOIT 1775 – 1790

The progenitor of the Du Toit family in SA was Francois, who had settled in 1686 at De Kleine Bosch, Dal Josaphat. Their first-born son, Andries and wife, Martha Rossouw, had 7 children, Gabriël (bapt. 2.7.1729) being no.6. He and his wife (Claudina van Hoeting) were quite prosperous by 1775 and he owned a number of farms in his lifetime. Their second child and eldest son was Andries Stephanus du Toit (bapt. 30.4.1752), married first to Johanna Margaretha le Roes on 4 June 1775, a few days before the farm was transferred to him (DV&P 1981:980/1). The farm was valued in 1775 at f2000, but apparently quite rundown. A peculiarity is that the widow of Hendrik van Niekerk was written down as Alletta Steijn (not Heyns), the farm reverted to its old spelling *Bethlehem* (sic) and signed by M.H. van Niekerk (T.4751, 28.7.1775).

Andries had great plans for the old farm and took immediately out two mortgages, both indebted to ex-heemraad Jan de Villiers, presumably Jean or Jan of Bossendaal. The first was for f4000, which meant the availability of an extra f2000, and the second amounted to f9000, “*onaangetelde geld by Companje*”, apparently, monies in cash held in security by the Company. These mortgages were to be guaranteed by Andries’s father, Gabriel, and thus both father and son signed (**FIG.46**).

Andries and Johanna had only one child, viz. Johanna Claudina (bapt. 20.7.1777), but the mother may have died shortly after childbirth (DV&P 1981:981)(see Titlestad 2008:12). On 19.8.1777 an inventory and fiscal evaluation was made by Johannes de Villiers (d’ oude), as the couple Du Toit owed him about Rxd.1400! (**Add.11**). This evaluation was officially confirmed a month later when it was submitted to the Orphan chamber in Cape Town (**Add.12**). Both evaluations merely list the contents of the house (with no room designation) and the stock and equipment on the farm. Nonetheless from the items listed I deduce the following:

1. A coach-house/stable/cellar (one building).

The coach-house could accommodate the oxwagon and farming equipment, including the *sparren*; the stable the 3 horses (and if need be the 2 cows and 4 calves); and the cellar the 4 leaguers, the 2 press vats, 3 buckets, etc.

2. *Frans van Mosambicq* may have slept in the outbuilding or on the loft of the main house (a common practice). He alone was worth more than all the household goods, cellar and farm equipment!

3. What has disappeared from the second inventory is a “*bet met sijn toebehoor*”, presumably the marriage bed, a four-poster being valued at f36. The remaining two beds (2 *katels*), I conclude the existence of one large bedroom and probably another smaller (childrens’) room.

4. The 3 square / rectangular tables and five chairs may have been in the *voorhuis* and kitchen. The amount of eating utensils (6 spoons and 6 forks) with the ceramic plates and bowls, indicate at least 6 people eating regularly at home.

5. What is of interest is that the “10 *borden in soort* ” were previously specified as 1 *tinne schotel*, 2 *borden* and 7 *aarde schootels* (1 pewter dish, two plates (pewter?) and 7 earthenware dishes). The Chinese blue-and-white crockery (8 plates, 1½ sets of teacups & saucers and 6 bowls) were listed separately, also stored in racks.

6. A hearth was indicated by the trivet (*rooster*), iron pots and other cooking vessels.

7. The absence of luxury items were conspicuous, e.g. paintings, curtains, jewellery or precious metals, guns, linen, etc., indicating the family was just starting out with the necessities.

According to me the house contained at least 3 rooms, probably 4, also likely with a lean-to (*afdak*). The fact that the farm was valued at Rxds 1166 or about *f*3498, indicates its true value that Andries paid two years earlier (*f*2000). Cereals and wines were produced but not on a large scale, indicating a mediocre farm.

The baby girl Johanna that survived in 1777, grew up and married David Kuhl. About a year later, on 11 October 1778, Andries married for the second time, viz. Susanna Claudina Joubert, and they had three children, Magdalena (1779), Gabriel (1782) and Susanna (1791).

With an amount of *f*11 000 in hand, it is apparent that Andries embarked on a renovation and rebuilding program to make the farm profitable. A structural analysis of the buildings will show approximately the periods of ownership. The tax-roll (*opgaafrol*) for 1782 lists only a few entries with only a 3 male and 1 female slave and a slave girl, the latter two assisting in the house. A mere 10 cattle, no sheep or horses are listed, or vines, or cereals, which are most unusual. How did Andries make a living? I suspect that these entries were not correctly filled in.

Maybe the young Andries was too ambitious or sickly, but the greatest asset appeared to be the farm's buildings. During the war of the Dutch/French alliance against the English during the 1780s, most farmers prospered due to the demand and sale of their produce supplied to ships and troops stationed in Cape Town. To what extent Bethlehem's owners profited, we don't know. Additional archival research would inform us.

For the next century (1790 – 1886) the farm stayed within the hands of two families, that of De Villiers and Haupt. Identifying the real genealogical owners was difficult, even with the Franschhoek Museum's assistance. Thus the owners are correct, but placed provisionally within a family relationship that fits the known facts.

15. JACOB DANIEL DE VILLIERS 1790 – 1804

15.1 BACKGROUND

Jean (or Jan) de Villiers (bapt. 21.3.1717, died 6.6.1796) was married twice, first to Elizabeth Joubert (1721-1760) and then 5.12.1762 to Gertruida du Toit (1738-1819), giving him respectively 12 and 10 children! (DV&P 1981:1054/5). Their eldest son, Jacob (x Maria Marais) had 12 children and child no.4 (d4) was Jacob Daniel, born in Paarl 7.2.1768 and died 29.1.1841 (Heese & Lombard 1992:4). Note that Jan de Villiers (born 1717) was married a second time, in December 1762 to Gertruida du Toit, which provides us with the link why Andries Stephanus du Toit obtained Bethlehem, with Jan as *guarantor* (**FIG.47.1**).

But Andries was apparently not a successful farmer. Jan de Villiers at 73 years of age, decided to exercise “*erfkoopregt*” on the farm Bethlehem (sic) and bought it back into the De Villiers family via his grandson, Jacob Daniel de Villiers, for f16 000 (T.6507, 9.11.1790). Jacob was a mere 22 years old, but had married a month earlier at Paarl on 3.10.1790 the lady Jacoba Maria de Villiers (1767–1805).

The price of f16 000 indicates a well-to-do farm with good buildings and vineyaRxd. Andries who had a mortgage of f11 000, only paid off f1000 and still owed f10 000, now payable to Jacob Daniel “*sonder korting of delaij*, by April 6, 1791.” Relations were obviously strained between the two families.

15.2 FARMING ACTIVITIES

Jacob Daniel de Villiers had the backing of his rich relatives and over the next 14 years made some substantial investments and improvements. In 1795 the British took over the Cape (battle at Muizenberg) and the additional troops would have meant more produce to be supplied. Though the VOC was bankrupt, the English introduced new measures and generally the Cape Peninsula farmers flourished. We have no specific details of activities at Bethlehem, though research in the Archives would be profitable.

Jacob and Jacoba had 3 children, Catharina (1791), Jacob (1793) and Johannes (1797) (DV&P 1981:1054). Jacoba was not well and the family moved to the Paarl, where she died in 1804/05. Due to her illness, Jacob already negotiated the sale of Bethlehem in mid-1804 to Johannes Minnaar (**FIG.47.2**).

16. JOHANNES JOSUA MIN(N)AAR 1804 – 1829

The progenitor of the Minnaars, *Jean Mesnard* came out with the French refugees in 1688 (see Malherbe 2001). Their 5th child, Philippe (1681) had a (second) son called Jan (1715-1781), who was married on 15.10.1752 to Anna C. Nieuwoudt (1732-1795). Their second child Johannes (5.7.1735) married in 1777 Catharina M. de Villiers (bapt. 1754) and they had three children, the last being **Johannes Josua Minnaar**, baptized 4.11.1781 at Paarl.

At 21 he married (24.10.1802) Johanna Susanna de Villiers (bapt. 6.4.1783) (Heese & Lombard >1992: Franschhoek Museum ms.). Johannes Minnaar bought Bethlehem for f28 000 in 1804, but paid only f2000 in cash. He was deeply indebted to widow Gertruyda du Toit (wife of late Jan de Villiers) for f8 000 and the remaining f18 000 to Sophia van der Poel, the wealthiest private banker in the Cape (T.98, 30.8.1804)(**FIG.48**).

In 1808 surveyor L.M. Thibault completed a military map of Drakenstein, with the names of farms and their occupants, where Bethlehem is included (see Titlestad 2008:14)(**FIG.49**).

Between 1790 and 1804 the farm increased in value from *f*16 000 to *f*28 000, which is quite significant, even taking into account the inflation, which was steadily rising at the Cape. The increased value may be due to larger wine-cellars, as wine was now one of the most lucrative crops of farmers. In July 1813, the Cape wines were given preferential import deductions of about 60% below their competitors. Farmers immediately invested in the wine industry, and up to 1830 many new wine-cellars were added (Scheffler 1995:154).

In the same year (1813) Governor Cradock issued a decree that all lands (Quitrents) around farms had to be amalgamated into the freeholds. For many years surveyors struggled to resurvey the entire Cape. On 15.12.1822 a Perpetual Quitrent of 444m 209r² expanded Bethlehem to over 500 morgen of agricultural and grazing land (**FIG.50**) (**Add.13**). At the very height of the economic boom in 1829, Minnaar sold Bethlehem to Jacob de Villiers for a pricey *f*60 000. This sum probably included about *f*20 000 worth of farm equipment (**FIG.51**).

17. JACOB HENDRIK DE VILLIERS, J.D. son 1829 – 1840

Jan de Villiers (24.10.1745 to 22.2.1788) farmed at Zorgvliet and was married to Anna de Villiers (17.11.54 to 1818). They had 9 children and Jan Daniël de Villiers (18.7.1779) was child no.5 (d5), who inherited Zorgvliet. He was married (1800) to Cecilia Maria van der Merwe (20.8.1781 to 18.4.1813), and they had 4 children (one died young). **Jacob Hendrik** was offspring no.3 (e3), born 20.1.1805 and married on 6.5.1826 Anna Susanna de Villiers (10.5.1808 to 10.12.1870) (Heese & Lombard >1992: Franschoek Museum ms.). I do not have details of their children (**FIG.52, FIG.53**).

Johannes Minnaar's signature was still firm when he signed the 1829 transfer when he sold everything on the farm for f60 101 or £1502, 105.6 s. (T.270, 25.9.1829).

Jacob Hendrik de Villiers, Jan Daniels son, had to make 3 loans to afford the place:

1. Mortgage to Sophia van der Poel	$f18^{000}$	(£450)
2. Mortgage to Jan Hendrik Bam	$f12^{000}$	(£300)
3. Mortgage to Johan David Piton*	<u>$f13^{000}$</u>	(£325)
Total	$f43^{000}$	

*B.J.D. Piton was a German who married in 1783 Maria Engela Haupt.
(Heese & Lombard, Franschoek Museum notes).

The remainder of about $f17^{000}$ was probably for farm equipment like wine presses, leaguers, oxwagons, ploughs, etc. (**FIG.54**).

During Jacob's tenure the Cape had to weather the economic wine slump, increasing debts and the full emancipation of the slaves on 1 December 1838. Farmers struggled to survive with labour shortages and general difficulties. Jacob died prematurely at age 30 on 15 January 1835 at Bethlehem. His widow remarried on 22.4.1837 Roelof Petrus van der Merwe (**FIG.55**).

18. THE HAUPT OWNERS 1840 – 1886

For the next 46 years, the Haupt family owned Bethlehem (**Table 6**). I had difficulty tracing the genealogical family ties for them. RecoRxd are incomplete and details are thus tentative.

18.1 CAREL ALBRECHT HAUPT jr 1840 – 1853

The German Carel Albrecht Haupt arrived in 1724 at the Cape and a number of his offspring and generations carried his name. In 1804 a Carel Albrecht Haupt (c1) farmed at Languedoc and Rhone, married to Gertruida de Villiers. They had 12 children of which Carel Albrecht Haupt jr was the third (d3). Baptised in 1810 (died 1885) he married on 14.12.1841 at Stellenbosch Cornelia Tiba van Blommenstein (bapt. 23.9.1822). It is likely that they are the couple who owned Bethlehem [There is other C.A. Haupt jr. (bapt. 24.5.1807), who also might be a candidate] (DV&P 1981:290).

The transaction was as follows.

The previous owner Jacob Hendrik de Villiers died on January 15, 1835. His widow, Anna S. de Villiers (Paul's daughter) married on 22.4.1837, Roelof Petrus van der Merwe (Roelof Petrus son). They were obviously considering removing to a new place and sold Bethlehem on 9.10.1839 lock stock and barrel for f40 000 (£1000) (T.234, 1.3.1840). The transfer stipulates the farm (OSF + PQ), "*met de daaropstaande gebouwen, alsook losse goederen van f36 000.*" They obviously did not want to continue farming, particularly after the emancipation of their labour force. Carel Albrecht Haupt junior paid a very large amount for a farm which was no longer economically viable during the depressed markets.

To obtain the necessary finances, Carel took out two mortgages, viz. for £1250 and £625. Carel owed Jacobus Stephanus du Toit, Andries zn f25 000 (£625) for which the guarantors were Carel Albrecht Haupt sr (his father) and Johannes Jacobus Haupt, Carel's son (his brother). Carel and his family tried for 12 years to make ends meet, but without success. He was finally declared *insolvent* in 1852 (**FIG.56**).

18.2 PETRUS JOHANNES HAUPT, CAREL'S SON 1853 – 1875

The creditors of Carel A. Haupt hounded him and had him declared insolvent by the Supreme Court on 10.5.1852. The joint trustees of his Insolvent Estate were managed by Johannes Carolus Gie and George Steytler. Apparently Carel's son, Petrus Johannes Haupt, took over the bankrupt farm for £1500, owing *The Board of Executors* £1000, as well as the mortgage of £625 (*f*2500) to J.S. du Toit (T.259, 21.10.1853) (**FIG.57, FIG.58**). Petrus Haupt and his family relations I did not trace. I assume his aging parents continued to live with him on the farm.

Farmers had to cope with the overproduction of poor quality wine and generally had a brandy still to distil these bad wines. The brandy itself could be stored for years, but it was also infamous for its fiery taste. Since the mid 1850s fruit trees were being planted on a larger scale, but only for local consumption. Petrus managed the farm for another 12 years and died about in 1874.

18.3 CAREL ALBRECHT HAUPT, Philip son 1875 – 1878

After the death of Petrus J. Haupt in 1874, his heir, Daniel Egbertus Pheil Haupt, acted as executor of his testament and estate. He bought the insolvent estate for £1600, but took a large mortgage bond of £2926 to pay for the house and goods. The household and farm equipment therefore amounted to £1326, indicating a very comfortable lifestyle (T.246, 20.1.1875)(**FIG.59**). Carel Albrecht was married to Anna C. Haupt (born Haupt), but she wisely married out of community of property. Within 2 years, Carel Albrecht was declared insolvent, and his wife bought his property.

18.4 ANNA CAROLINA HAUPT (born Haupt) 1878 – 1886

The Haupt's desperately clung to Bethlehem and tried to keep it in the family. With her husband insolvent, his wife Anna C. Haupt (born Haupt) bought the farm for a much "lower" price of £1375 (previously it was £1600), and the household goods just stayed with them. She took out a mortgage bond of £1545, still owed to Daniel E.P. Haupt. Towards the late 19th century insurance of the thatched buildings became common. They were insured by the *Protecteur Fire Assurance Co.*

Anna Haupt had bought on 22.9.1880 a "*certain piece of land, part of Papiere Molen*" against the slopes of Simonsberg. In the transport (T.141, 8.4.1878) the two farms, Lanquedoc and Rhone are also mentioned, but I am unsure how they fit into this ownership. The dreaded phylloxera disease, of mites sucking the vines dry, spread from the Cape to all the farms in the Boland, including Drakenstein. Bethlehem would not have escaped. Apparently Anna Carolina Haupt was not too well during the 1880s. Though she and her husband kept the farm afloat, they could see that in case of her death, things would be worse (**FIG.60**).

On 7.12.1885 they wrote a 6 page "*Deed of Assignment*" of their combined estate of debts and of the property, as they found themselves "*in embarrassed circumstances*" (T.303, 29.1.1886). The Assignor was Eduard Ridge of Syfret to whom they surrendered the Insolvent Estate to be liquidated and the creditors to be satisfied. It was sold either by auction or private sale on 20 January 1886 to a newcomer to the Valley, Walter Mills.

19. LATER INDIVIDUAL FARMERS 1886 – 1950

19.1 WALTER HERBERT MILLS 1886 – 1893

From the insolvent Haupt estate, Walter Herbert Mills bought the “*farm called Bethlehem with the buildings thereon ... at Drakenstein*” for £1500 (T.303, 29.1.1886). He was obviously well-to-do, paying in cash. In order to finance some project, he invested in a mortgage of £4000 on 5.12.1891, which he paid off within 2 years on 31.12.1893, after he had sold the farm in late 1892. As he sold the farm for £1275, a loss of £225 on his purchase price, he apparently did not invest the £4000 in the farm. On the contrary, it appears that he left the farm scourged by disease to its fate, probably letting it to a manager.

19.2 JOSEPH JAMES HILL 1893 – 1919

Joseph Hill had bought the farm on 23.11.1892 and it was transferred on 19.1.1893 (T.64). Once again it looks as though the farm was bought by a businessman, who probably did not live there, but left it under supervision of a manager. During his ownership, fruit trees were extensively planted in the Drakenstein valley, replacing many of the infested vines. It is highly likely that the export of fruit in packing cases to England had become a flourishing trading business.

On 29.1.1893 he had a bond of £1000, a large sum of money, invested in the farm. He must have turned the farm into a lucrative concern. After the Anglo-Boer War of 1899 – 1902, farms started to prosper slowly, with more export markets opening up (**FIG.61**). It is uncertain what role vines and wines played. Surprisingly, a year before he sold the farm, which was highly valued, he obtained a bond of £6000 against it. Did he invest within the farm in buildings or crops? The fact that he sold the farm for £20 000, indicate that he improved the buildings and farmland extensively.

19.3 PERCIVAL ROSS FRAMES, TRUSTEE 1919 – 1950

Shortly after World War I, Joseph Hill had given Dame Gordon Mills, *Power of Attorney* to sell Bethlehem, which happened on 3.11.1919, the papers signed at Kalk Bay on 18.11.1919. Transfer was formalized a few days later on 28.11.1919 (T.13918).

The buyer was Percival Ross Frames who acted as Trustee for **two daughters** of the family Frames:

1. Ethel Dorothy Frames, married out of community of property to Thomas Nathaniel Micklem
2. Gwendolen Joyce Ross Frames (a minor).

The Frame girls had obviously inherited a great deal of money. There is also a *Deed of Donation* by Percival Frames on behalf of the two girls. Little is known about the ownership of the Frames between 1919 and 1950.

In Franken (1978:51, n.2), there is a reference that Ross Frames had appointed Captain L. D'Urban Cloete as manager, who also lived on the farm in 1926. There was later a *Deed of Servitude* (4/5.6.1934) in respect of an Electrical line running over the property. It is apparent that the farm was well managed far by 1950 it had increased in value to £33 000.

20. FINAL INVESTORS 1950 – 2008

20.1 BRIDPORT INVESTMENT CO (PTY) LTD 1950 – 1960

The well-run farm was acquired in a private sale by *Bridport Investment Company (Pty) Ltd*, on 30.10.1950 for £33 000, with a mortgage of £10 000 (T.17460, 13.11.1950). There were some conditions of sale, including a servitude of 7.3.1931, and the Electricity servitude of 1934. The Director of BIC was a certain Arthur Edmund Bridges (born 8.3.1900).

A number of subdivisions were made between 1952 and 1954, viz. Portion 1 to Portion 15. It was probably all part of a speculative deal (**FIG.62**). In 1954 all the land (OSF + PQ) was consolidated under a *Certificate of Uniform Title* (CUT) by the above Director for £34 750 (T.275, 19.01.1954). The land measured now 501,1457 morgen, subject to water and electricity rights, all rights to gold, silver and precious stones in or under the land, and a servitude road. Apparently *Portion 2* (23,6958m) went from "CUT" to BIC, who managed this Portion 2 for five years (**FIG.63, FIG.64**). It was transferred in 1960 to an intermediary (Doris A.C. Dumbar) and then in 1960 to Anglo American Farms (see **Table 6**).

20.2 FROM BRIDGES TO BOSCHENDAL ESTATES 1958 – 2002

The "*Remainder of Old Bethlehem*" (477.4499m, Farm no.153) was sold by BIC (Bridges) first to Werner Hinder (born 13.6.1912) on 15.3.1955 (T.3476), and within three years to *Rhodes Fruit Farms*, which controlled more than 20 Farms in the Drakenstein district. The official transfer (T.1970, 18.2.1958) meant that Bethlehem was run by one manager as part of a large stable of land. For some reason it never featured as an important farmstead, and was possibly already in a neglected state. When it was recently (2003) transferred into the Boschendal Estate, the farm was still being rented out to a private individual. The buildings and land are in need of urgent conservation measures.

21. SIGNIFICANCE OF BETHLEHEM

The farm Bethlehem can be regarded as highly significant for the following reasons, in accordance with the NHRA of 1999, no.25 section ? It has a high social, personality and cultural historic value, as well as strong Khoi and slave connotations.

1. The name **Bethlehem** is probably **the only Biblical-derived farm name in the Stellenbosch district**. As the name implies, it was originally small and insignificant, hidden below the *Bange Hoek* Pass, but it would ultimately become internationally known, due to the personalities that owned it (**FIG.65, FIG.66**).

2. Bethlehem lies on the border between the two farming communities and two churches, viz. of Drakenstein (alias Babilons Toorn) (1688) for the French Refugees, and the Dutch freeburghers of Stellenbosch village (1687). This **ambivalence between French and Dutch** and associated conflicts, were thus resident within Bethlehem's history. Due to the political policies of the DEIC and the Cape government, the French language and "culture" were deliberately suppressed and replaced with the Dutch language and material world. Bethlehem also symbolizes the **freedom of faith** the emigrants desired within a Calvinist religious context.

3. Bethlehem's historic value should not be minimized. Of all the French farms it is the only one where the **DEIC was involved during the initial building programme**. The French minister was of course a VOC employee and entitled to such assistance.

4. The existing structures (not yet documented) are thus representative of the **oldest French farm** and buildings closest to Stellenbosch and the Cape. Their investigation and documentation, including the **numerous ruins** scattered over the farm, are thus of great historic importance.

5. Primary to Bethlehem's heritage significance is the number of early, well-known **personalities** associated with the farm. Reverend **Pierre Simond**, the first permanent French pastor to make his abode at the Cape, exerted a tremendous spiritual and moral influence on the French community. For the period August 1688 – May 1702 he guided the flock, bound them spiritually and culturally together, intervened for them with the governor in finding better farms, set the example in farming lucratively on the principle of crop-sharing; and his wife setting up the first (competitive?!) shop on the outskirts of the village.

In addition, his new translation of the Psalms in French was the first South African text to be published, though in the Netherlands in 1703. The sermon which he delivered at Cape Town in 1697 was also the first full sermon we have record of and also the first one published (1707)(see also chapter 7.8 *Contribution of Simond*).

6. Another famous or infamous Company official at the Cape was the Secunde **Samuel Elsevier**, who bought Bethlehem and owned it for five years (1702-1707). Elsevier was one of the hated Company officials who overstepped their privileges by owning large tracts of land. Consequently, Bethlehem also became the focus of the burgher rebellion against the corrupt officialdom of the Cape during Wilhelm van der Stel's reign as governor (1699-1707). Elsevier probably never lived on the farm but had it managed by others.
7. The landdrost at Stellenbosch was after that of governor, the most influential post, exerting rule over all land beyond the peninsula. **Nicolaas van den Heuvel**, ex-landdrost (1707-1716) was an important official residing at Bethlehem (1719-1735).
8. Ownership of Bethlehem by the **Rhodes Fruit Farms** and Anglo American (1958-2002) also gave the farm international exposure and prestige.
9. Slavery was just beginning to come into its own during the late 17th century at the Cape. It is noteworthy that the prosperous Simond could afford up to 10 slaves within a decade or so, and thus the pastor represents the **largest slaveholder** of the French speakers.
10. Bethlehem, situated in the narrow bottleneck pass beyond Stellenbosch, was much visited by the Khoi who were still living in isolated kraals within the Drakenstein district. Pierre Simond was also the first to make the suggestion of "civilizing" them with clothes during the winter months and to teach them to become self-supportive. If this was accomplished by c.1700, they would have become landowners in their own right and changed the course of history. Unfortunately the free, pastoral lifestyle of centuries of independence, was too strong. They therefore never built permanent houses for themselves, the first step in claiming the land, nor became self-supportive through tillage.
11. One of the most controversial financial ventures for mineral exploration at the Cape was directly connected with Bethlehem. The Director of the *Octroyeerde Zilvern Mynwerken van Simonsberg*, the *Opper-coopman* **Olof de Wet**, was owner of Bethlehem. He was directly involved during the mining operations from 1740 -1743, and Director of the Company operating from 1743 -1748, which failed disastrously. The **Industrial Zilvermine** shafts and exploits are worthy a book on their own.
12. The **social** significance of Bethlehem in the context of the Bangehoek, Drakenstein and Stellenbosch areas, was higher during the **first half of the 18th century**. When the social centre of gravity was removed to Paarl in 1716, Bethlehem became isolated in the shadow of Simonsberg. Even though some rich owners followed, the influence of its owners waned, and debts and insolvency increasingly played a part.

22. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the significance of Bethlehem be recognized by means of immediate proclamation under the heritage law of SAHRA.
2. The report be used as a marketing tool to stress the importance of Bethlehem in the context of the French freeburgher settlement, an international event.
3. The buildings of the farmyard are rather neglected and some in a poor condition. Rehabilitation or conservations measures are to be implement as soon as possible to stabilize the structures.
4. A structural analysis of the extant farmyard of about 6 buildings should be undertaken as soon as possible to identify, date and sequence their development (**FIG.67**, **FIG.68**).
5. A surveyed site plan of the farmyard is needed to place the structures in context.
6. An accurate ground plan (1:100) of each of the buildings is required, including elevations and cross-sections before any further research can be done.
7. An environmental study should be done on the trees and vegetation.
8. I also located a number of ruins on the northwestern side of the werf. All of them are much overgrown and damaged by fallen trees. They are located amidst some very ancient oaks and poplar trees. There are sure to be more ruins.
 - .1 There is a long rectangular **building**, built in stone, but plastered with raised quoins of a rectangular fashion.
 - .2 West of it is another very large rectangular **kraal** built in stone for about 1½ metres high. A gate is present and a portion has been rebuilt in brickwork of c.1900.
 - .3 West of the kraal is another **ruinous building**, much overgrown.
 - .4 West of that is a rectangular **kraal** in stone but also in a bad state. Inside there are numerous partitions in cement blocks, presumably as pig sties.
 - .5 Adjacent I saw 2-3 clay remnants of what could be a **wall** of early age.
9. A separate First Phase archaeological study should be done on the various ruins, determining the significance of each. Old dwellings should receive priority within a Phase II investigation and excavations.
10. Bethlehem farm should be accessible and not become an off-limit area for South Africans. It should be incorporated within a tourist route, e.g. within the following categories:
 - a) Rhodes Fruit Farms Route
 - b) French Refugee Farm Route
 - c) Heritage Tourist Route
 - d) Khoi / slavery Route

23. REFERENCES

AIKMAN, H. & BERMAN, A.

- 2005a Boschendal Heritage Assessment. Built environment survey and evaluation. Unpublished report.
- 2005b Boschendal Heritage Assessment. Tree survey and evaluation. Unpublished report.

ANONYMOUS

- 1975 Pierre Simond and his English descendants. *Familia* Vol XII (2): 32-36.

BIEWENGA, A.

- 1999 *De Kaap de Goede Hoop. Een Nederlandse vestingskolonie, 1680 – 1730.* Amsterdam: Prometheus / Bert Bakker.
- 2007 *Indeks tot De Kaap de Goede Hoop. Een Nederlandse vestingskolonie, 1680 – 1730 (1999, Amsterdam).* Stellenbosch: Stellenbosse Heemkring.

BÖESEKEN, A.J.

- 1964 *Simon van der Stel en sy Kinders.* Kaapstad: Nasou Bpk.
- 1977 *Samuel Elsevier (1651-1724).* SABW III : 274-280.
- 1977 *Slaves and Free-blacks at the Cape 1658-1700.* Cape Town: Tafelberg.

BÖESEKEN, A.J., KRÜGER, D.W. & KIESER, A. (Eds)

- 1952 *Drie eeue. Die verhaal van ons vaderland (Deel I van V).* Kaapstad: Nas. Boekhandel.

BOOYENS, B.

- 1970 *Solomon Ceasar Malan: Akwarelle, U.S.* Kaapstad: Human & Rousseau.

BOUCHER, M.

- 1981 *French speakers at the Cape.* Pretoria: Unisa.
- 1981 *Le Grand, Gideon (1665 -1710).* SABD V: 442.
- 1987 *De Wet, Johannes Carolus (1709-1748). Olof de Wet (1699-1763).* SABD II: 195-196.

BRYER, L. & THERON, F.

- 1987 *The Huguenot Heritage. The story of the Huguenots at the Cape.* Cape Town: Chameleon Press.

CLAASEN, J.P.

- 1981 *Le Boucq, E.F. (1675 – 1748).* SABW IV: 319-320.

CLIFT, H.E.

- 1995 *The assimilation of the Khoikhoi into the rural labour force of Paarl, Drakenstein District.* Unpublished BA Honnours dissertation, Dept. of Archaeology, UCT.

COERTZEN, P.

- 1983 *Hulp aan die Hugenote verleen met hulle aankoms aan die Kaap van Goeie Hoop.* Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 21:20-27.
- 2003 *Les Veilles Afriquaines ou les Pseames de David mis en vers Francois.* Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 40:33-34.
- 2004 *Die Simond Psalmberyming.* Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 41:39-41.

COERTZEN, P. & FENSHAM, C.

1988 The Huguenots of SA. 1688 – 1988. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

DEACON, H., et al (project leader)

1994 Bien Donne Cultural Resource Management Reports 1990-1994.

Compiled by Dept. of Archaeology, US.

These reports include:

1. 1990 (5.10) Information visit – Bien Donne.
2. 1990 (Dec.) Bien Donne. An archaeological investigation of stoep and kitchen floors.
3. 1992 (Jan.) Bien Donne. Interpretation of the floors in the homestead.
4. 1992 (Dec.) Report on the Bien Donne Werf.
5. 1991 (17.10) A preliminary report on the Bien Donne Wine-cellar.
6. 1992 (Jan.) Bien Donne Wynkelder. 'n Argeologiese en kultuurhistoriese ondersoek.
7. 1993 (Sept.) Argeologiese ondersoek van rioolsloot voor "Waenhuis"/stalle.
8. 1994 (April) Bien Donne: the excavation of the Outbuilding complex.

DE BOSDARI, C.

1953 Cape Dutch houses and farms. Their architecture and history. Cape Town: A.A. Balkema.

DE VILLIERS, Anna

1947 Hercules des Prés (*'n historiese novelle*). Kaapstad: Nasionale Pers.

DE VILLIERS, C.G.S.

1976 Waar het Abraham de Villiers [o2] (1659-1720) gewoon? Bulletin 14:11.

DE VILLIERS, J.C.

1982 Huguenot surgeons. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 20:20-25.

DE VILLIERS, C.C. & PAMA, C.

1981 Geslagsregisters van die ou Kaapse families. Kaapstad: A.A. Balkema.

DE VILLIERS, G.D.B., MARAIS, N. & WIESE, M.L. (eds)

1956 Het Sticht Simondium: 'n Skoolinstelling en Gedenksuil, 1852-1956 (Gedenkboek ter inwyding van *Skool Pierre Simond* 30.11.1956). Stellenbosch: Pro-Ecclesia Drukkery [Copy in Africana Library, US].

DE WET, G.C.

1968 Bergh, Olof (1643-1724). SABD I: 69-70.

1981 Die vryliede en vryswartes in die Kaapse nedersetting, 1657-1707. Kaapstad: Historiese Publikasie Vereniging.

1987 Nicolaas van den Heuvel (1690 – 1732). SABD V: 792.

DU TOIT, P.S.

1937 Onderwys aan die Kaap onder die Kompanjie 1652 – 1795. 'n Kultuurhistoriese studie. Kaapstad: Juta & Kie. Bpk.

FAIRBRIDGE, D.

1922 Historic houses of SA. Cape Town: Maskew Miller.

FAGAN, Gwen

1984 Die werf by Elsenburg. Restorica 16:34-38.

FENSHAM, F.C.

1968a Beck, Henricus (1669 -June 1755). SABD I: 60-61.

1968b Pierre Simond (1651->1713). SABD I: 724-5.

1983 Die Hugenote van Stellenbosch. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 21:28-29.

1986/7 Ligging van die eerste Huguenote-Kerkie. Huguenot Soc. of SA. Bulletin 24:28.

1987 Die Suid-Kaapse Meyers & Hugenote-afstammeling. Huguenot Society of SA: Bulletin 25. 1987/88: 23-24 (oudste grafsteen 1767).

1988/9 Grepe uit die vestiging van die Hugenote in SA. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 26:20-27.

FORBES, V.S.

1981 Wentzel, C.D. (1725 -1776). SABW IV: 811.

FORBES, V.S., RUDNER, J. & RUDNER, R.I. (eds)

1975 Andries Sparrman. A voyage to the Cape of Good Hope, 1772 – 1776. Cape Town: VRS I (2).

FOUCHÉ, L. & BÖESEKEN, A.J. (eds)

1970 The diary of Adam Tas 1705 – 1706. Second Series No.1. Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.

FRANKEN, J.L.M.

1934 Privaat skoolmeestersaan die Kaap in die 18de eeu. Annale van die Universiteit van Stellenbosch, Jg. XII (1). Kaapstad: Nasionale Pers.

1934 Huisonderwys aan die Kaap 1692-1732. Annale van die US, Jg XII (1). Kaapstad: Nas. Pers.

1978 Die Hugenote aan die Kaap. Pretoria: Staatsdrukker.

HARRIS, Stewart

2007 (April) Babylonstoren, the story of a Drakenstein farm. Unpublished report.

HEESE, H.

1981 Hugot (Hugo), Daniel (5.1664 - 4.1725). SABW IV: 259-260.

HEESE, J.A. & LOMBARD, J.J. (reds)

1992 S.A. Geslagsregister. Deel III. Pretoria.

HOGE, J.

1934 Privaat skoolmeesters aan die Kaap in die 18de eeu. Annale van die US, Jg XII (1). Kaapstad: Nas. Pers.

1946 Personalalia of the Germans at the Cape 1652-1806. Argiefjaarboek vir SA Geskiedenis. Kaapstad: Staalschmillen.

HUGO J.J.

1989/90 Daniel Hugo aan die Kaap [Plaas Zion]. Huguenot Soc. of SA. Bulletin 27:41-47.

HUGO, A.M.

1961 Paul Roux, c.1660 – 1723. SABW III: 743.

HUGO, A. & VAN DER BIJL, J.

1963 Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Kaapstad: Tafelberg.

HULSHOF, A. (ed.)

1941 H.A. van Reede tot Drakenstein: Journaal van zijn verblijf aan de Kaap. In: Bijdragen en Mededeelingen van het Historish Genootschap (gevestigd te Utrecht) Deel 62. Utrecht: Kermink & Zoon.

JOUBERT, G.

2005 Die Jouberts van Provence. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 42:57.

KOEMANN, Ir. C.

1955 Landgiften uit de eerste helft van de XVIIIe eeuw op een manuscriptkaart uit het archief der VOC. Argiefjaarboek vir SA Geskiedenis, Jg 18.

KOLBE, P.

1727 Naaukerige en uitvoerige beschryving van de Kaap de Goede Hoop. Vol. I & II. Amsterdam.

KRIGE, O.

1987 Nuusbrokkies vanuit Drakenstein 1715-1742. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 25 1987/88:38-40.

LEIBBRANDT, H.C.V.

1905 Precis of the Archives of the Cape of Good Hope. Requesten (Memorials) Vol I, 1715 – 1806. Cape Town: Government Printer.

LE ROUX, E.

1978 Kerkhowe op plase. Franschoek.
Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 16:12-14.

LE ROUX, J.G.

1985/6 Waar was hul plase? Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 23:32-45.

1989/90 Hugenote – voorname [ontleding]. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 27:37/38.

1995 Aan die wesoewer van die Bergrivier. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 32:44-49.

LE ROUX, J.G. & LE ROUX, W.G.

1999 Ons Drakenstein-erfgrond. Drakenstein Heemkring (Vos: eie saamgestelde kopie, individuele numering).

LE ROUX, J.G. & LOMBARD, R.T.J.

1988 Hugenotebloed in ons are. Pretoria: RGN.

LE ROUX, J.G., NIEMANDT, J.J. & OLIVIER, M.

2002 Inleiding. Grondbenutting en grondbesit sedert 1652. Bewaarders van ons Erfenis, Deel I: 1-12. Distributor GISA, Stellenbosch.

LOUW, J.P.

1983 Die Cronje-broers as vroeë pioniers. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 21:38-41.

LUCAS, G., DE VILLIERS, J, MILLER, D. & KLOSE, J.

2001 (March) Farm lives. Historical archaeology in the Lower Dwars [River] Valley, Western Cape, South Africa. A report on the second season (2000) of work (59 pp.). Unpublished report prepared for University of Cambridge, England.

MALAN, A.

2007 Identifying buildings and building lives at the Cape in the early VOC period: 23-52. In Worden, N. (ed.) Contingent lives. Social identity and material culture in the VOC world. Cape Town: Historical Studies Department.

MALHERBE, J.E.

1989/90 Opvoeding en geletterdheid van die Hugenote aan die Kaap. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 27:18-22.

1989/90 Die stryd om die voorste gestoeltes in die Kerk. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 27:48-49.

1999 Die pokke-epidemie van 1713. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 34:49-53.

2001 Die eerste drie geslagte Mesnards aan die Kaap. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 38: 15-18.

2004 Haupt familie register manuskrip. Franschoek.

MALHERBE, J.E. & MALAN, A.

1997 Geslagsregister van die familie De Villiers in S.A. Franschoek.

MALHERBE, J.E., et. al.

1996 Die Khoikhoi. 'n Inleiding tot die Khoi-khoi, hul kontak met die Europese koloniste, asook insidente tussen die Hugenote en die Khoikhoi. Hugenote Gedenkmuseum, Franschoek.

MARAIS, N. & DE VILLIERS, G.D.B.

1956 Pierre Simond: 28-38. In De Villiers, GDB et al (eds) Het Sticht Simondium, 'n Skoolinstelling en Gedenksuil 1852-1956. Gedenkboek opgestel by inwyding van skoolgebou, *Pierre Simond*, 30.11.1956. Stellenbosch: Pro-Ecclesia Drukkery.

MARKELL, A.

1993 Building on the past. The architecture and archaeology of Vergelegen. SA Archaeological Society, Goodwin Series 7: 70-83.

MENTZ, J.F. (ed.)

1941 Kwart millennium-gedenkboek van die NG Gemeente in Paarl 'n Oorsig van die geskiedenis van die gemeente:1691-1941. Paarl: Kerkraad.

NORTJE, P.H.

2008 Nortje / Nortier familie in SA. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 45: 80-86.

OBERHOLSTER, G.J.

1941 Die geskiedenis van die gemeente 1691 – 1795. *In* J.F. Mentz (Editorial Committee). Kwartmillennium Gedenkboek van die NG Gemeente, Paarl. 'n Oorsig van die geskiedenis van die Gemeente 1691-1941:1-70. Paarl: Kerkraad.

PHEIFFER, R.H.

1983 Iets oor die taalgebruik van die Hugenote aan die Kaap. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 21: 8-13

RABE, E.

2006 Donkerhoek homestead: Farm 956, Stellenbosch. VASSA 15 (Jan.) (Vernacular Architecture Society of SA).

RANDLE, T.

2005 Museum van de Caab: the story of Delta farm. Published catalogue of history in newspaper form [obtainable from the farm].

2007 Patterns of consumption at auctions: a case study of three Cape Estates [of Barbara Savoije], 1729: 53-74. *In* Worden, N. (ed.) *Contingent lives. Social identity and material culture in the VOC world.* Cape Town: Historical Studies Department.

2008 Solms-Delta: a story Van de Caab. *Capensis* (1) 2008:3-16 (reprint).

RAVEN-HART, R. (ed.)

1971 Cape Good Hope 1752 – 1702. The first fifty years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Vol. II. Cape Town: A.A. Balkema.

RAYMOND, L.

2005 A celebration of 200 years of the Paarl Strooidakkerk, 28.4.1805 - 28.4.2005. Drakenstein Bulletin Supplement:1-16. Drakenstein Heritage Foundation.

ROUX, Paulus

c.1716 Belydenis des Geloofs (Catechismus vir Drakensteinse jeug). Copied by H.C. von Wieding 18.5.1743. Copy at DR Church Archives, Theological Seminary (KL / 2 F-15, 23.2.1973).

SCHEFFLER, H.

1995 Fredericksburg, 'n vaste vesting. Die verhaal van die Hugenote plase Fredericks Berg en La Motte 1690 – 1995.

SCHOEMAN, K.

2001 *Armosyn van die Kaap, die wêreld van 'n slavin, 1652 – 1733.* Kaapstad: Human & Rosseau.

2006 *Kinders van die Kompanje.* Hatfield: Protea Boekhuis.

SMITH, A.B. & PHEIFFER, R.H.

1993 *The Khoikhoi at the Cape of Good Hope. Seventeenth century drawings in the SA Library.* Cape Town: SA Library.

SPOELSTRA, C.

- 1906 Bouwstoffen voor de Geschiedenis der Nederduitsch- Gereformeerde kerken in Zuid-Afrika. Deel I: Brieven van de Kaapsche Kerken, hoofdzaklijk aan de Classis Amsterdam (1655 – 1804). Amsterdam: HAUM.
- 1907 Bouwstoffen voor de Geschiedenis der Nederduitsch- Gereformeerde kerken in Zuid-Afrika. Deel I: Brieven van de Classis Amsterdam en ander kerklijke vergadeingen aan de Kaapsche Kerken (1651 – 1804). Amsterdam: HAUM.

SWART, J.E.

- 1986/7 Die eerste kerkie van die Drakenstien gemeente. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 24:29-32 (planne van 1717 kerk).

TERBLANCHE, D.J.M.

- 1987 Eerste Hugenote-kerkie by Drakensteingedenk. Hugueno Society of South Africa. Bulletin 25 1987/88:16-17.

TITLESTAD, Sally

- 2008 (July) Text explanation of accompanying historical spatial mapping for the scoping phase of the heritage Impact Assessment of the Drakenstein Valley. Appendix 8: Historical Spatial Chronology (Document 64 pp, Text, photographs, diagrammes).
- 2007 Boschendal Estates Catalogue of historical images. Catalogue compiled in association with Bauman and Winter.

VAN DER BIJL, J.

- 1968 Van der Bijl geslagsregister. Cape Town: A.A. Balkema.

VAN HUYSSTEEN, T.

- 1986/7 Beroepe en nerings van die Hugenote. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 24:46-49.

VAN HUYSSTEEN, T. & MEIRING, H.

- 1985 Hugenoteland. Deel II van Hart van de Boland: Die Franse verbintenis. Kaapstad: Tafelberg.

VARLEY, D.H.

- 1949 Adventures in Africana. Cape Town: Trustees of the SA Library and UCT.

VIGNE, R.

- 1997 Pierre Simond's "*Les Veilles Afriquaines*" – South Africa's first published work of literature. Huguenot Society of SA. Bulletin 34:8-10.

VOS, H.N. & BOSHOFF, J.

- 1988 Schreuderhuis revisited: archaeological and archaeotectural investigations 1988. Unpublished site report. RCHA, Stellenbosch Museum.

VOS, H.N.

- 1993 An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680 – 1860. Unpublished Masters dissertation, Dept. of Archaeology, US.
- 2001 De Kleine Bosch, Dal Josaphat. An historical journey of a farm, its people, places and buildings. Unpublished report ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch
- 2004a De Goede Hoop farm, Dwars Rivier Valley, Drakenstein. Report 1, Structural investigations of the Outbuilding (stables) of the early 18th century. Unpublished report. ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch.
- 2004b (Sept.) De Goede Hoop Farm, Dwars River Valley, Drakenstein. Report 2. Historical survey of the owners. Unpublished report for Boschendal Estate. ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch.
- 2004c Rhone farm structural investigations of an 18th century outbuilding. Unpublished report for Boschendal Estate, ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch.
- 2004d Zilvermyn at Simonberg, Groot Drakenstein, First phase: General visual assessment of the *Silver Mine Industrial Complex*. Unpublished report (21 pp.). ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch.
- 2008a Waterford Estate, off Massinger Rd, Diep River (Erf 14834): Two pioneer buildings c.1700. Historical and structural investigations. Unpublished report for Coessa Holdings. ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch.
- 2008b Tuynhuys, Cape Town. Monitoring of basement excavations and historical explication of development. Unpublished report for Munnik Visser Architects, Cape Town. ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch.
- 2009 The French congregation in Drakenstein. A survey of the history of the Farmyard Church (1688 – 1694), the Barn-church (Oude Kerk) (1694 – 1716) and the Nieuwe Kerk, Paarl (1716 – 1725). Report in preparation. ARCApe Consultancy, Stellenbosch.

WIJSENBEEK, Thera

- 2007 Identity lost. Huhuenot refugees in the Republic and its former colonies in north America and South Africa, 1650 – 1750: a comparison: 91 -109. In Worden, N. (ed.) *Contingent lives. Social identity and material culture in the VOC world*. Cape Town: Historical Studies Department.

WINTER, S.

- 1999 Heritage conservation component of a structural plan for the Dwars River Valley. Unpublished report.
- 2000 Heritage conservation study for the Groot Drakenstein. Spatial evelopment Framework. Unpublished report.

WORDEN, N. (ed.)

- 2007 *Contingent lives. Social identity and material culture in the VOC world*. Cape Town: Historical Studies Department.

NOTE: REFERENCES ABOVE INCLUDE DOCUMENTATION THAT ALSO APPEARS IN THE REPORT *THE FRENCH CONGREGATION IN DRAKENSTEIN. A SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF THE FARMYARD CHURCH (1688 – 1694), THE BARN-CHURCH (OUDE KERK) (1694 – 1716) AND THE NIEUWE KERK, PAARL (1716 – 1725). REPORT IN PREPARATION. ARCAPE CONSULTANCY, STELLENBOSCH. H.N. VOS 2009.*

NOTE: THE REFERENCES ABOVE INCLUDE RESEARCH DOCUMENTATION THAT ALSO APPEARS IN THE REPORT
BETHLEHEM FARM 153, DWARS RIVER VALLEY, DRAKENSTEIN. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF ITS OWNERS & THE EARLY FRENCH CONGREGATION. 2009.

RBethlehem.doc

In the historic novel by Anna de Villiers, “Hercule des Près” (1947: 32), she contended the seats of the post-1695 church were built of shaped anthill clays.

ADD.14 Description of Bethlehem (Heywood 1964:67) on Cloete as manager (1919-50)