

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE JOZINI
SWAZILAND BIG 6 DEVELOPMENT, SWAZILAND

For Siyazama Consultancy

Date: 5 November 2005

By Gavin and Louise Anderson

Umlando: Archaeological Tourism and Resource Management



PO Box 102532, Meerensee, 3901, South Africa

INTRODUCTION

Siyazama Consulting contracted Umlando to undertake the heritage survey of the area to be affected by the Jozini Big 6 project. The heritage survey was to focus on archaeological sites, as well as other sites of potential interest. Only those areas directly affected by the proposed golf course and lodges were surveyed; other sites were recorded but only if they were observed en route to the affected area.

The affected area is located between Jozini Dam, Zibe Dam and the Lebombo Mountains. The area is approx. 8 km long and 4 km wide, at its maximum. The development extends to the high water level of the Jozini Dam, and is restricted to the base of the Lebombo Mountains. The area is currently used as a cattle ranch and areas of it were previously used for agricultural activity. Most of the streams are surrounded by dense thorn bush vegetation, while other areas have grasslands. Both of these factors allowed for poor archaeological visibility and in some instances these areas could not be surveyed.

A total of fifteen sites were recorded. This excludes the many Stone Age artefacts that were observed throughout the general area. Most of these sites can be described as (recent) historical, and the youngest date to early 1960s. No sites of high significance were recorded during the survey. However, fourteen of the sites have at least one human grave. These graves would need some form of mitigation. We suggest that a monitoring and an awareness program are introduced to the various construction companies involved in the project and that certain areas are resurveyed after bush clearance has occurred.

Method

The archaeological survey consisted of a foot survey of the affected area(s) as well as a desktop study. The desktop survey involves consulting the database(s) for previously recorded sites. This allows for a general view of expected finds. The foot

survey involves the physical surveying of the entire affected area. We also had a 2 day site meeting with Mr Richard Patrics, who is the historian for the SNTC. The aim of this meeting was to discuss the Swaziland legislation regarding sites, as well as the history of the area.

The survey results will define the significance of each recorded site, as well as a management plan. Management plans may include further excavations and/or destruction permits from the relevant authority.

All sites are grouped according to low, medium and high significance for the purpose of this report. Sites of low significance have no diagnostic artefacts, especially pottery. Sites of medium significance have diagnostic artefacts and these are sampled. Sampling includes the collection of artefacts for future analysis. All diagnostic pottery, such as rims, lips and decorated sherds are sampled, while bone, stone and shell are mostly noted. Sampling usually occurs on most sites. Sites of high significance are excavated or extensively sampled. The sites that are extensively sampled have high research potential, yet poor preservation of features. I attempt to recover as many artefacts from these sites by means of systematic sampling, as opposed to sampling diagnostic artefacts only.

No formal archaeological body exists in Swaziland, and thus there is no standardisation or code of practice. Furthermore, the legislation pertaining to the treatment of archaeological sites is virtually non-existent. I have thus based my results from my experience in Kwa-Zulu Natal.

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

Defining significance

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

These criteria are:

1. State of preservation of:

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

2. Spatial arrangements:

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

3. Features of the site:

- 3.1. Are there any unusual, unique or rare artefacts or images at the site?
- 3.2. Is it a type site?
- 3.3. Does the site have a very good example of a specific time period, feature, or artefact?

4. Research:

- 4.1. Providing information on current research projects
- 4.2. Salvaging information for potential future research projects

5. Inter- and intra-site variability

- 5.1. Can this particular site yield information regarding intra-site variability, i.e. spatial relationships between various features and artefacts?
- 5.2. Can this particular site yield information about a community's social relationships within itself, or between other communities?

6. Archaeological Experience:

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

7. Educational:

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

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

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

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

THE SITES

All sites are prefixed with the letters JOZ. This refers to Jozini Dam. Table 1 summarises the abbreviations, terminology and dates of the various Ages. Family names are given to sites that have been positively identified by living relatives. These sites all post-date 1960.

Table 1: Terminology and dates of archaeological sites recorded in the area

Age	Abbreviation	Estimated age
Early Stone Age	ESA	1.6 million years ago to 120 000 years ago
Middle Stone Age	MSA	120 000 years ago to 30 000 years ago
Late Stone Age	LSA	30 000 years ago to 100 years ago
Historical Period	HP	180 years ago to 50 years ago
Recent	Rt	50 years ago to yesterday

Problems relating to the preservation of sites

The archaeological sites tend to be poorly preserved for the following reasons:

- The Stone Age Sites are open sites and the artefacts have been systematically scattered by erosion, water, animals and people. They

are now a continuous scatter from one end of the development to the other

- Organic remains are poorly preserved in these open sites and thus stone tools tend to be the only artefacts.
- The Historical and recent sites probably had “wattle-and-daub” structures and these would decay quickly. Houses would be preserved only if the base was lined with stones, or if stone-walled kraals were made.

We were expecting to find several sites dating to the Early Iron Age and Late Iron Age as many of these have been recorded in nearby areas. The development area has the correct landscape for these types of sites; however, we did not locate any of these sites.

The treatment of unclaimed human graves is discussed at the end of the report. All graves would require some form of mitigation. We tend towards a conservative approach if we are unsure if a site may be a grave, or if it is a natural phenomenon. The former tends to have other evidence of human activity. In these instances the developer would need to (dis-)prove that they are (not) graves. This would be in the form of excavating the demarcated area.

The sites and their locations are summarised in Table 2.

JOZ1

JOZ1 is a recent homestead occupied by the Ngcampalala family. The site consists of two small graves and stone terracing. The terracing is short and east of the graves. The terracing is probably the base of a “wattle and daub” structure. The site was abandoned in 1962.

Significance: The main site is of low significance, however the human remains are of high significance.

Table 2: Summary and location of sites mentioned in the text¹

Site Name	Period	Significance	Requires Mitigation	South	East
JOZ1	HP	High	Yes	27 13' 36.1"	31 57' 13.2"
JOZ2	HP	High	Yes	27 10' 42"	31 57' 16.7"
JOZ3	HP	Medium	Yes	27 12' 15.9"	31 57' 22.7"
JOZ4	HP	Medium	Yes	27 12' 19.3"	31 57' 22.4"
JOZ5	HP	High	Yes	27 18' 52.5"	31 57' 54.1"
JOZ6	HP	High	Yes	27 17' 01.4"	31 57' 33.9"
JOZ7	HP	Low	Yes	27 16' 58.7"	31 57' 53.1"
JOZ8	HP	High	Yes	27 16' 15.4"	31 57' 52.6"
JOZ9	HP	Low	No	27 16' 18.8"	31 58' 12.2"
JOZ10	HP	Medium-High	Yes	27 18' 57.1"	31 57' 40.7"
JOZ11	HP	Low	Yes	27 18' 55.0"	31 57' 38.6"
JOZ12	HP	Low	Yes	27 18' 45.1"	31 57' 09.1"
JOZ13	ESA/MSA/LSA	Low	Yes	27 15' 30.2"	31 56' 43.7"
JOZ14	HP	High	Yes	27 17' 44.9"	31 57' 12.7"
JOZ15	HP	High	Yes	27 17' 21.6"	31 57' 10.9"

Mitigation: The living relatives need to be consulted regarding the ancestral bones (hereafter referred to as *amathambo*).

JOZ2

JOZ2 is a recent homestead occupied by the Mbhamali family. At least four human graves have been observed. Two of these are juveniles, one relates to a young male, and the last to an elderly male. The elderly male is buried in the cattle kraal and in one of three areas.

The site has some stone terracing and a few upper grinding stones.

Significance: The main site is of low significance, however the human remains are of high significance.

Mitigation: The living relatives need to be consulted regarding the ancestral bones (hereafter referred to as *amathambo*).

¹ The datum used is WGS84

JOZ3

JOZ3 is located outside of the main development area, but within the lodges' area. It consists of a circular stone wall and one possible grave. Two fragments of lower grinding stones also occur.

Significance: The main site is of low significance, however the human remains are of high significance.

Mitigation: No-one has yet claimed the possible *amathambo*. The grave would need to be verified by excavation.

JOZ4

JOZ4 is located on top of a hill. It consists of a small bilobial stone-walled feature. There is an euphorbia growing in the middle of the one circle. These euphorbia tend to be associated with graves, However no surface features indicated that a grave occurred.

Significance: The main site is of low significance, however the human remains are of high significance.

Mitigation: The site is unlikely to be affected by the development. If JOZ4 is affected, then the feature needs to be mapped and the possible grave needs to be verified.

JOZ5

JOZ5 is a homestead belonging to the Matse family. The site consists of two graves and one stone terrace. It post-dates 1960.

Significance: The main site is of low significance, however the human remains are of high significance.

Mitigation: The living relatives need to be consulted regarding the ancestral bones (hereafter referred to as *amathambo*).

JOZ6

JOZ6 consists of a single possible grave. It consists of a stone circle that has been packed, or filled, with other stones. JOZ6 is not a collapsed kraal, as it is oblong and similar to other graves in the area. It probably pre-dates 1960 as it is more eroded than those graves that have been identified.

Significance: The main site is of low significance, however the human remains are of high significance.

Significance: The human remains are of high significance.

Mitigation: The site may be affected by the development. If it is not claimed by living relatives then it would need to be exhumed.

JOZ7

JOZ7 consists of two single stone circles just above the eastern track. The [sey stone circles](#) may be small goat kraals.

Significance: The site is of low significance.

Mitigation: The site should be mapped and photographed.

JOZ8

The site consists of five possible graves at the base of the Lebombo Mountain. The possible graves vary in size and are situated nearby each other.

Significance: The site is of high significance.

Mitigation: The site may be affected by the development. If it is not claimed by living relatives then it would need to be exhumed.

JOZ9

JOZ9 consists of a kraal that has sisal as a fence. The sisal is relatively large, suggesting that it has been used some time ago. The kraal post-dates 1960. No other features were observed near the kraal. However they probably did occur, but have now disappeared.

Significance: The site is of low significance.

Mitigation: No further mitigation is required.

JOZ10

JOZ10 is located below the base of the most southern hill. It consists of several stone features. One feature is a kraal approximately 7 m in diameter, while the other features are probably the bases of houses. There are between two to four possible graves at this site.

Significance: The site is of high significance because of the graves.

Mitigation: The site may be affected by the development. If it is not claimed by living relatives then it would need to be exhumed. The stone features should be mapped.

JOZ11

JOZ11 is located northwest, and downhill, from JOZ10: they may be part of the same site. The site is noticeable for the occurrence of a "sausage tree" near the kraal. JOZ11 has a large stone-walled kraal with secondary walling inside it. A smaller kraal is located south of the main kraal.

Significance: The site is of low significance.

Mitigation: The site should be mapped and photographed.

JOZ12

JOZ12 is located along the high water line of the Jozini Dam. The site initially appeared to be a pile of rocks, however we noted several small circular features and a larger rectangular feature. These appear to be the base of a structure. No other artefacts were observed and we cannot estimate the age of the site.

Significance: The site is of low significance

Mitigation: The site should be mapped and photographed.

JOZ13

JOZ13 is the only recorded scatter of stone tools as it consisted of good examples of stone tools, including finely worked MSA tools. A fragment of oyster shell (marine oyster) was also observed near these stone; however, it was on the surface and out of context. We could not locate other oyster fragments and this may be a chance occurrence.

Significance: The site is of low significance.

Mitigation: The stone tools from this site, and other scatters, should be sampled.

JOZ14

JOZ14 is located near the western road. It consists of stone walled features and at least two graves. The vegetation is very dense and we could not observe other features.

Significance: The site is significant because of the graves.

Mitigation: The site may be affected by the development. If it is not claimed by living relatives then it would need to be exhumed.

JOZ15

JOZ15 is located north of JOZ14 and is besides the western road. The site consists of a single human grave.

Significance: The site is significant because of the grave.

Mitigation: The site may be affected by the development. If it is not claimed by living relatives then it would need to be exhumed.

GENERAL

The entire area consists of scatters of stone tools. These date to various ages and include the following:

- Early Stone Age: Hand-axes and cleavers
- Middle Stone Age: general flakes and cores, including those dating to the Howiesens Poort.
- Late Stone Age: Several sub-periods were visible and the tools consisted of large and small scrapers, adzes, cores, blades, utilised flakes, etc.

These scatters tend not to be significant as they are in a secondary context, however some should be sampled as a representative sample of the area.

CONCLUSION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

The archaeological survey recorded 15 sites of various ages. In addition to these sites, the entire development area can be considered as a Stone Age site. The stone tools date back to all three of the Stone Ages and should be sampled. They can also be used for display purposes.

We were surprised that no Early and Late Iron Age sites were observed. These have been previously recorded not more than 30km away. The topography of the development area is conducive to these types of sites. Our only suggestion would be that malaria, tsetse fly, etc. have affected the area

for a longer period than previously thought. This would result in sparse, if any, human occupation, and thus archaeological sites. Most of the sites probably date the Historical Period if not more recent.

Many of the sites have human graves and the development needs to consider its approach to the treatment of the human remains. I suggest that a single approach is used. This approach is that all graves will be mitigated and the amathambo will be removed from the development area. This would be more sensitive as the graves will not be affected (visually, spatially, or physically) by any part of the development. One cannot have a grave in the middle of a golf course, nor in the corner of someone's property. The local community is currently identifying those graves that have living ancestors and a tentative agreement has been reached. I suggest the following steps:

1. People who lived in the area in the 1960s are identified and approached. If they claim that they have ancestral graves in the area, then they need to identify these graves in some manner. They should also state who is buried, the age of death of the person, and when they were buried. It is especially important to identify when the person was buried as this may give a more precise date to the age of the site.
2. If the grave has been claimed and identified, then the living descendants should choose the manner of exhumation, and what customs would be followed. The exhumations should also be documented and possibly, the remains confirmed. That is, the remains should be confirmed as being of a young female if it has been claimed as a female. This latter process is important as other claims may arise if the remains are not properly identified pre- and post-exhumation.
3. If the graves are not claimed, and they are younger than 50 years then I would presume the local government would have appointed exhumers to exhume and relocate recent graves. All human of these recent remains should be stored and reburied in the same area, preferably as close to the affected area as possible.
4. If the unclaimed graves are older than 50 years then they should be excavated archaeologically. Their remains should be treated according to the customs of the people who lived in the area at that

time. This would need to be identified by the historian. I suggest that they are reburied with those from #3.

5. All exhumations need to be undertaken in a sensitive manner and with dignity. We would need to agree on the temporary storage methods and facilities, e.g. if the remains are placed in a coffin or box, if they are stored at SNTC headquarters or in a preselected storage room, etc.

The only site that may have had tourist potential is that of van Oordt's house. Van Oordt was the first white game ranger on the South African side of the border in 1893². He was also a magistrate for the then Transvaal government. According to sources (Mr Patrics pers. comm.), van Oordt's house doubled as the magisterial court and felons were imprisoned in the cellar. According to the historical sources, this land was annexed by the British in the 1890s. The sources are however unclear as to where the buildings are located. They are however probably located on the farm Inyawo's Heuwel. It would be worthwhile trying to locate this building as it has the potential for tourist attraction. If it cannot be located in South Africa, then it must exist in Swaziland, and can thus be utilised by the development. We did briefly search the most likely hill, however we did not locate the ruins. Aerial photographs may also assist in the location of the buildings.

The Swaziland National Trust Act of 1972 defines heritage sites. The developer will be required to apply for a permit for the destruction of the recorded sites. Any sampling or excavations would also require a permit.

Several areas could not be surveyed due to the dense vegetation. This would be the areas of thick thornbush and tall grasses. I suggest that these areas be surveyed after bush clearance has occurred. This should not take more than 2 days to survey.

² Paul Kruger appointed him for the potential reserve.

We also suggest that the bush clearances, and other construction activities, be sensitised to heritage sites. The people should be shown various sites and report any sites that they do observe, before and during construction. A formal procedure of site observations during the construction phase should be made.