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NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1.1

1 For the paucity of work on the proto-Cape Dutch period, see literature review (Chapter 1.2).
   For a description of the primary characteristics of Cape Dutch architecture, see Chapter 3.
4 See Chapter 6.6.
5 See Chapter 7.6.2.
6 See Chapter 8.5.
7 See Chapter 9.5.
8 See Chapter 9.3.5.
9 See Chapter 7.5.2.
12 See Chapter 9.3.4.
15 See Chapters 7.3.4, 9.3.5 and 9.4.3.
17 See Chapter 9.2.3.
20 See Chapters 6.3.1 and 6.3.2.
22 See Chapter 6.6.2.
25 See Chapter 10.4.1.
26 Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg: South Africa's oldest existing inhabited
27 See Chapter 8.6.
28 Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch
29 See Chapters 9.3.3, 9.3.4 and 9.3.5.
30 Markell, A B. Building on the past: the architecture and archaeology of
31 See Chapter 9.5.
32 Hall, M. Brink, Y and Malan. A. Onrust 87/1: an early colonial farm complex in
33 Hall, M, Malan, A, Amman, S, Honeyman, L, Kiser, T and Ritchie, G. The
34 Although beyond the period encompassed by this thesis, and therefore not
addressed in the architectural evidence (Part 2), Paradijs is of interest in that it
began as an asymmetrically planned house, suggesting that the "symmetrical three-
roomed cell" had not yet been generally established as the first stage of the
incremental development of an individual house. This is of relevance to the
argument against an evolutionary development presented later.
35 See Chapter 8.3.1c.
36 Visser, D. The rebuilding of Newlands House after the fire of 1981: Restoration as
37 Brink. Y. The octagon: an icon of Willem Adriaan van der Stel's aspirations?
38 Brink. Y. The voorhuis as a central element in early Cape houses. Social
40 Authors subscribing to the evolutionary theory are Walton, De Bosdari, Fransen
and Cook, and Obholzer, as outlined in the literature review (Chapter 1.2).
43 The use of "Renaissance" rather than "Classicism" follows Benevolo's definition of
the term as covering the whole period extending from c1420 to 1750 (Benevolo, L.
44 See Chapters 7.2.1 and 7.2.2.
45 Lewcock, R B. Recent Research into Cape Architecture. Bulletin van de
Koninklijke Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond. Jaargang 64. Aflevering 5.
46 This edict was sent in a letter from Amsterdam dated the 30th October 1706
but was only received at the Cape in 1707 and presented to Wilhem Adriaen van
der Stel on the 14th June (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad:
Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1962, pp2-3; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal,

47 See Chapter 9.5.

48 The demolition of Vergelegen had been commenced by the 30th April 1709
(Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad. Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape
Town, 1962, pp98-99; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town,
1896, pp188-189).

49 See literature review (Chapter 1.2).

50 Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town. 1989. For the continued existence of
asymmetrical longhouses, see Chapters 1.2 and 9.2.4.


53 For further reference to the North American comparison, see Chapter 1.3.1, p14
and Chapter 5. p70.


55 Glassie notes that even after the Georgian exemplar had been introduced to
Virginia, craftsmen continued to use Medieval methods for setting out the houses
which emulated this type. (Glassie, H. Folk Housing in Middle Virginia. Knoxville,

56 Lewcock, R B. Recent Research into Cape Architecture. Bulletin van de
Koninklijke Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond. Jaargang 64. Aflevering 5,
1965, p171.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1.2


2 See Chapter 6.6.

3 See Chapter 7.6.2.

4 See Chapter 8.5.

5 See Chapter 9.5.

6 Pearse, G E. The Cape of Good Hope 1652-1833: an account of its buildings and

7 Biermann, B E. A contribution to the study of the origins of colonial architecture at

which spread his work to a wider readership.

9 Biermann, B E. Oor die bronke van ons volksbarok. Architecture SA, July/August
1989.


19 See Chapter 8.6. The "Posthuijs" appears in Fransen and Cook as "Stegmansrust", its name prior to restoration.
20 See Chapter 9.3.5.
24 See Chapter 7.5.2.
25 See Chapter 8.5.
27 Examples are Meerlust and Saxenburg.
28 See Chapter 9.2.4.
These include the Vergelegen drawings [Figs 227 & 230], and those of Stade produced in 1710 [Figs 53, 54, 137, 183, 188 & 225]. With regard to the latter, Roosegaarde-Bisschop suggested that Stade's triangular dwarf gables were more probably pedimented dormers, as shown in the later drawings of Heydt [Fig 138] and Rach [Fig 66].

Fransen also queries the accuracy of Stade's "triangles" in his doctoral thesis submitted 21 years after Roosegaarde-Bisschop's article (see Chapters 1.3.2, 8.5 and 9.3.2).


See Chapters 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7.


See Chapters 6.6.3a and 7.5.2.

His reconstruction of the Cape Town church is particularly unlikely, and does not correspond with the contemporary drawings of E V Stade (see Chapter 7.5.2). The suggestion that the plan and elevation of the second Drakenstein church (erected at Paarl in 1717) are contemporary with each other is equally improbable: the precision of the elevation suggests a drawing far later than 1717. Moreover, a plan involving roofing problems more complex than those in the Cape Town church is unlikely to have been implemented in a distant village at this early date.


See Chapter 9.3.

His plan of the village (drawn by the architect M C Stander), derived from Stade's drawing, is not consistent with the evidence although it is still regarded as authoritative. However, his "corrected" drawings of the 1710 and 1757 views of the village (drawn by the same Stander), have since been rightly discredited.


See Chapters 9.2 and 9.3.


See Chapter 6.3 and Fig 8.

50 See Chapter 6.6.2.
52 See Chapter 10.4.1.
53 Hall, M, Brink, Y and Malan, A. Onrust 87/1: an early colonial farm complex in the Western Cape. South African Archaeological Bulletin, Vol 43, 1988. This house, however, has not been firmly dated.
54 See Chapter 9.2.4.
56 Paradijs, however, dates from 1719/1720 at the earliest, according to Hall's clay pipe stem bore chronology, and will therefore not be analysed in the body of this thesis.
58 For an alternative identification of the "Posthujs" and a possible explanation for its symmetrical plan, see Chapter 8.6.
60 See Chapter 9.3.5.
62 See Chapter 9.5. These also correspond in type with the triple-aisled plan of Simon van der Stel's slightly earlier hospital (see Chapter 7.5.6).
64 Brink, Y. The voorhuis as a central element in early Cape houses. Social Dynamics, Vol 16, No 1, 1990.
66 For the Schreuder house, see Chapter 9.3.5. In the case of Paradijs, the inventory correlates far more convincingly with the two parallel ranges of rooms of its last stage of development than with the T-plan which has been proposed as its second stage.


71 An example is Shell's recent work on the social history of Cape slavery (Shell, R C-H. *Children of Bondage: A Social History of the Slave Society at the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1838*, Johannesburg, 1994).

This work is of interest as regards the documentary evidence of slave matters relating to architecture, but is misleading in the conclusions drawn from this evidence. Shell devotes a chapter to "Arson and Architecture" (Shell, Ch 9) in which he proposes that "Cape architecture" developed as a response to the "defensive, managerial, even hegemonic considerations" brought about by the institution of slavery (Shell, pp247-248).

This chapter, however, contains many serious inaccuracies, the most notable of which concerns the slave lodge itself. The "rooms" set aside for "lunatics" in 1710 (Shell, p250) were not in the slave lodge at all, but in the hospital on the other side of the Heerengracht, and comprised only a single "apartment" as clearly stated by Leibbrandt in the reference quoted by Shell (see Chapter 7.5.6).

These inaccuracies have arisen through a selective but uncritical acceptance of the architectural "evidence" contained in secondary sources in order to present an alternative slave-generated version of the evolutionary theory. Shell's "a priori" approach is thus open to criticisms similar to those levelled at Van der Meulen in the 1960s.

Shell's argument, based only on a partial knowledge of the field, is further example of the necessity for a systematic and empirical approach to research in a period which has not yet been seriously addressed in the secondary sources.

**NOTES TO CHAPTER 1.3**

**NOTES TO CHAPTER 1.3.1**


6 Upton points out that "the study of vernacular architecture is deeply and inextricably entwined with that of high architecture; they are part of the same
Upton states further: "If the progress-of-the-profession or -architect narrative that most historians of the high style adopt depends on a notion of universality, so, perversely, does the narrative of resistance to high culture that students of the vernacular inherited from social history. The latter sees high culture as a relatively monolithic, hegemonic entity that equally monolithic lower class or ethnic cultures struggle against for survival" (Upton, p197).
This, however, does not appear to have been the case with regard to the colonial society at the Cape in the 17th and early 18th centuries. High culture was seen as something to be aspired to and emulated, not to be resisted. This is exemplified by the palatial town house of Henning Hüsing, who arrived at the Cape as a humble shepherd but later became the sole leaseholder of the meat contract.

7 See Chapter 7.5.2.
8 See Chapter 7.6.2.
9 See Chapter 8.3.1c.
10 See Chapter 9.5.
Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Parts I & II. Cape Town, 1898 & 1899.
Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896.
Although incomplete, as detailed in Chapter 1.3.2, Leibbrandt's precis of the Journal and Letters did add significant material to that provided by the Resolutions. A complete study of the original volumes from 1667 to 1710 could thus reveal the presence of additional buildings as yet unknown.
14 The title-deeds and probate inventories were not consulted at this stage because they provide only circumstantial architectural evidence. Drawings of buildings were sometimes later added to original title-deeds, as appears to have been the case with Dubertijn's house in Cape Town (see Chapter 7.2, Note 47), and the inventories lend themselves to misinterpretation (see Chapters 8.3, 8.4 and 9.3). A thorough analysis of all title-deeds and inventories is essential for future research in the field.
however, in order to confirm or contradict the evidence derived from the sources consulted in this thesis.


17 See Chapter 12.1.

18 See Chapter 7.5.2.

19 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behoorende (English translation). Parts I & II. Cape Town, 1971 & 1973. Fransen, for example, dismisses Valentyn’s description of the dimensions of Simon van der Stel’s Constantia (See Chapter 8.5) as they do not correspond with those of the present house.

20 Kolbe, P. Naauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschrywing van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727. Kolbe’s accuracy was already being criticized as early as the 18th century by writers such as Mentzel (see Note 15, above).

21 Serton, the editor of Raven-Hart’s translation of Valentyn (see Note 18, above), makes frequent reference to Valentyn’s plagiarism from Kolbe. However, the unacknowledged use of published material was considered to be an acceptable practice in the 18th century. Kolbe himself made extensive use of second-hand accounts, without stating explicitly which of these he had personally experienced. As far as architectural descriptions are concerned, however, the distinction between hearsay and eyewitness accounts can be made on the basis of generality versus detailed description.

22 Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708.

23 See Chapter 9.5. While the discrepancies between Van der Stel’s and the freeburghers’ accounts of Vergelegen could be ascribed to exaggeration on the part of the latter, the valuation constituted an impartial record.

24 See Chapter 8.5.

25 See Chapter 9.5.

26 See Chapter 7.5.6.

27 See Chapter 7.5.2.

28 See Chapter 9.3.3.

29 See Chapter 9.3.5, pp509-512.

30 See Chapter 9.3.5, pp513-517.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 1.3.2

2 See Chapter 8.5.
3 See Chapter 9.5.
4 See Chapter 7.5.6.
5 See Chapter 8.3.1c.
7 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901.
   Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Parts I & II. Cape Town, 1898 & 1899.
   Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896.
11 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien", Amsterdam, 1726. (See Chapters 7.2.1 & 7.2.2).
12 As discussed further in Chapter 7.2.2.
13 Sewel, W. A Large Dictionary, English and Dutch. Amsterdam, 1727. The present author possesses an original edition of this dictionary, which has been a source of constant reference.
15 Kolbe, P. Naauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschrywing van die Kaap de Goede Hoop
(Dutch translation). Amsterdam. 1727.

16 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam. 1726.

17 See Chapter 7.6.2.

18 See Chapter 7.5.7.

19 See Chapter 7.5.2.

20 See Chapter 7.5.2.

21 See Chapter 7.5.6.

22 See Chapter 8.5.

23 See Chapter 7.5.6, Note 42.

24 See Chapter 9.5.


26 Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708.


28 Bogaert, A. Historische Reizen door d'oustersche Deelen van Asia. Amsterdam, 1711.

29 Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708.


32 Stavorinus, J S. Reize over de Kaap de Goede Hoop en Batavia. Leyden, 1797.

33 Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Parts One, Two and Three. Cape Town, 1921, 1925 & 1944.

34 Mentzel appears to have arrived at the Cape as a soldier in the Company's service, but later to have taken his discharge (Mentzel, Description (English translation), Part Two, p8).

35 See Chapter 7.5.7.


37 See Chapter 6.6.3b.

38 Stade's accuracy has been questioned by many authorities, including Roosegaarde-Bisschop and Fransen (See Chapters 7.2.2, 8.5 & 9.3.2).

39 See Chapter 7.2.1.

40 See Chapter 8.5.

41 See Chapter 9.3.2.


45 Although the buildings in Rach's view of Market Square [Fig 66] are drawn with apparent precision, he did distort the urban layout of the square itself. In order to locate the new Burgher watch-house as the central focus to his perspective, his drawing shows the road on the right-hand side as forming the edge of the square instead of bisecting it. In this respect Rach's artistic licence was even greater than that of Stade elsewhere, a point which has not been raised by the critics of the earlier artist.

46 In this respect the method adopted follows Schwarzer's advocation of a dialogic approach: "In dialogy, on the contrary" (as opposed to dialectics), "contradictions between voices (and language) in a narrative are not resolved. They are, rather, spread out in one plane. True dialogic discourse occurs when different utterances are allowed to participate with equal emphasis" (Schwarzer, M. Gathered this Unruly Folk: The Textural Colligation of Historical Knowledge on Architecture, *Journal of Architectural Education*, Vol 44, No 3, May 1991, p148).
NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1 The sequence of command has been derived from the Resolutions of the Council of Policy.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2.1

1 See Chapter 6.3.2.
2 See Chapter 7.2.1.
3 See Chapter 8.4.
4 See Chapters 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2.2

1 See Chapter 9.1.
2 See Chapters 6.6.2 and 6.6.3.
3 See Chapter 7.4.3.
4 See Chapter 7.5.3.
5 See Chapter 7.6.2.
6 See Chapter 7.5.2.
7 See Chapter 7.5.7.
8 See Chapter 7.1 and Fig 45.
9 See Chapters 7.2.1 and 7.2.2.
10 See Chapter 8.3.1b.
11 See Chapter 8.1.
12 See Chapter 9.2.1.
13 See Chapter 9.1.
14 See Chapter 9.1.
15 See Chapter 10.2.
16 See Chapter 10.3.
17 See Chapter 10.4.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2.3

1 See Chapters 6.6.2 and 6.6.3.
2 See Chapter 6.7.
3 See Chapter 7.1.
4 See Chapter 7.2.1.
5 See Chapter 7.5.6.
6 See Chapter 7.5.2.
7 See Chapter 7.3.3.
8 See Chapters 7.3.5 and 7.3.6.
9 See Chapter 8.5.
10 See Chapter 8.3.1c.
11 See Chapter 11.3.3.
12 See Chapter 8.2.
13 See Chapter 8.3.2e.
14 See Chapter 9.2.1.
15 See Chapter 9.1.
16 See Chapter 9.3.
17 See Chapter 9.4.
18 See Chapters 9.1 and 9.5.
19 See Chapter 9.5.
20 See Chapter 9.3.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 3


2 The earliest surviving gabled Cape Dutch farmhouses date from the 1750s, and it is agreed by authors such as Walton and Fransen and Cook that the predecessors of these buildings were mostly simpler vernacular structures without centre gables (Walton, J. Homesteads and Villages of South Africa. Pretoria, 1952, p12; and Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, pp5-6).


4 De Bosdari used the term for the title of his book (De Bosdari, C. Cape Dutch Houses and Farms. Cape Town, 1953).


6 Fransen and Cook, Old Buildings of the Cape. p137.


8 Fransen and Cook, Old Buildings of the Cape. p40.


11 In Stellenbosch the larger houses were based on a different model, being adaptations of the H-plan developed in the farmhouses of the surrounding districts. These were built as single- and double-storeyed buildings, an example of the latter being Grosvenor House, dating from the end of the 18th century (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, pp138-140).


13 Although present in the proto-Cape Dutch period in houses such as that of Henning Hüsing in Cape Town, the double-pile plan under a single pitched roof would not make its reappearance until the last decade of the 18th century, and only in the houses of the country villages and surrounding farms.

14 Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Houses of the Cape. Cape Town, 1965, p1. This dating was omitted from the revised edition (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980), although it appears to be correct if Schumacher’s and Gordon’s views of Cape Town in the late 1770s are compared with those of Rach dating from the early 1760s.


16 Fransen and Cook, Old Buildings of the Cape. p58.

18 Apart from a handful of late farmhouses which were double storeyed and flat-roofed, such as Vredenhof near Paarl (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. *The Old Buildings of the Cape*. Cape Town, 1980, p211-212).


24 See Chapter 9.5 and Fig 229.

25 See Chapters 7.2.1 and 7.2.2.

26 See Figs 227 & 230.

27 As outlined in the literature review (Chapter 1.2).


30 See Chapter 6.3.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1  See Chapters 1.1 and 1.2.
2  See Chapter 1.1, pp6-7.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4.1

2  For the recall of Van der Stel, the edict prohibiting Company's officials from
owning farmlands, and the demolition of Vergelegen, see Chapter 9.5, pp537-539.
3  While the farmhouses of the inland districts were probably also influenced by
buildings such as Vergelegen and the Company's buildings in Stellenbosch, there is
no evidence during the proto-Cape Dutch period that the buildings of Cape Town
were influenced by their rural counterparts.
4  The term "detailed resolution" is used here to describe the resolution of the building
through its system of detailing as applied to the proportioning of the volumetric
form. It does not mean a description of individual details.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4.2

1  For the siting of the Fort, see Chapter 6.1, pp74-76 and Chapter 6.3.1, pp81-82.
2  For an expansion of this argument, see Chapter 6.3, pp79-81.
3  For the beginnings of Cape Town and its incremental development, see Chapter
   7.1.
4  For positive identification of Van Harwaerden's inn, see Chapter 7.1, Note 32.
5  For discussions regarding the siting of the Castle, see Chapter 6.6.2, pp126-127.
6  For the early history of the church and slave lodge, see Chapters 7.1, 7.5.2 and
   7.5.7.
7  For discussion of the postponement of the church, see Chapter 7.5.2, pp277-279.
8  For the siting of the hospital, see Chapter 7.5.6.
9  For the recommencement of the church, see Chapter 7.5.2, pp279-280.
10 For identification of the sites of Hüsing's and Blesius' houses, see Chapter 7.2.1,
    pp211 & 215-217 (Hüsing) and Chapter 7.1, pp193-194 (Blesius).
11 For the siting of the stables, see Chapter 7.3.3.
12 For the siting of the guest house, see Chapter 7.6.2.
13 For the siting of Rustenburg, see Chapter 8.3.1b.
14 For the siting of Nieuwland, see Chapter 8.3.1c.
15 For the siting of the "Posthuijs", see Chapter 8.6.
16 For the present author's identification of the "Posthuijs", see Chapter 8.6.
17 Fitchett, R H. An investigation into the siting arrangements of Cape Dutch farms.
   South African Journal of Cultural and Art History, Vol 1, No 2, June 1987,
18 For the early planning of Stellenbosch, see Chapter 9.3.1.
19 For argument in favour of this reconstruction, which disagrees with other sources, see Chapter 9.3.2.
20 For further analysis of the siting of the Cape Town and the second Stellenbosch churches, see Chapter 7.5.2 and Chapter 9.3.1, pp463-463.
21 The siting described here is of the first and temporary church. See Chapter 9.3.4.
22 For Van Rheede's instructions regarding the planning of the village, see Chapter 9.3.1, pp461-463.
23 For Van Rheede's instructions regarding the Company's outposts, see Chapter 9.2.1, pp431-432.
24 For further discussion of the siting arrangement of Constantia, see Chapter 8.5.
25 For further discussion of the siting arrangement of Vergelegen, see Chapter 9.5.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4.3

1 For the planning of the buildings within the Fort, see Chapter 6.3.2.
2 For further discussion of this argument, see Chapter 6.3.2, pp108 & 121.
3 For the derivation of the term "cat" as used in the Castle, see Chapter 6.6.3b, p170.
4 For further discussion on the planning of the Castle, see Chapters 6.6.2 and 6.6.3b.
5 For the planning of the new official wing, see Chapter 6.6.3b, pp164-165 & 167-171.
6 For further discussion of the Dolphin Courtyard, see Chapter 6.6.3b, pp165-168.
7 For the planning of the slave lodge, see Chapter 7.5.7.
8 For the planning of the Company's stable, see Chapter 7.3.3.
10 For an analysis of the proportioning and a suggested reconstruction of the planning of the hospital, see Chapter 7.5.6; for an analysis of the proportioning of Vergelegen, see Chapter 9.5.
11 For the planning of the Vergelegen out-buildings, see Chapter 9.5, p569.
12 For an analysis and suggested reconstruction of the planning of the Cape Town church, see Chapter 7.5.2.
13 It has been suggested that the Drakenstein church built in 1717 had a plan in the form of an elongated octagon, but there is no evidence that it was built with this configuration. For further argument on the Drakenstein church, see Chapter 7.5.2, Note 55.
14 For further discussion on the De Keyser derivation, see Chapter 7.5.2, pp289-290.
15 For the proportioning systems employed in these buildings, see Chapter 7.6.2 (Company's guest house), Chapter 8.5 (Constantia), Chapter 7.5.6 (hospital) and Chapter 9.5 (Vergelegen). These proportioning systems could also have been derived from Vignola or Vitruvius, the authors of the other two treatises found at the Cape.
16 For the planning of Van Harwaerden's inn, see Chapter 7.2.1, pp206-207.
17 For the contemporary description of Van Harwaerden's inn, see Chapter 7.2.1,
p204.
18 For further discussion of early rearward extensions, see Chapter 7.2.2.
19 For further discussion of the absence of T-plans outside Cape Town, see Chapter 9.2.4.
20 For Valentyn's descriptions of the planning of these "dubbelhuisen", see Chapter 7.2.1, pp211-214.
21 For commentary on the "dubbelhuis", see Chapter 7.2.2, pp220-224.
22 For the planning of the Company's guest house, see Chapter 7.6.2.
23 For the planning of Rustenburg, see Chapter 8.3.1b.
24 For the planning of Nieuwland, see Chapter 8.3.1c.
25 For an analysis of the planning of Constantia, and a suggested reconstruction, see Chapter 8.5.
26 For an analysis of the planning of the first two drostdys at Stellenbosch, and their suggested reconstructions, see Chapter 9.3.3.
27 For the planning of this building, and further discussion on its "Posthuijs" attribution, see Chapter 8.6.
28 For the probable influence of the "dubbelhuisen", see Chapter 7.2.1, pp218-219 and Chapter 7.2.2, pp220-224.
29 For an analysis of the planning of Vergelegen, and a suggested reconstruction, see Chapter 9.5.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4.4

1 For descriptions of the timber-framed buildings in the Fort, see Chapter 6.3.2.
2 For descriptions of the brick buildings in the Fort, see Chapter 6.3.2.
3 For descriptions of the freeburghers' wattle-and-daub houses, see Chapter 8.4.
4 Mentzel, O F. Life at the Cape in Mid-Eighteenth Century, being The Biography of Rudolf Siegfried Alleman (1784). Cape Town, 1919, p112. See also Chapter 6.6.3b, Note 66.
5 For further discussion on interior spatial arrangements, see Chapter 7.6.2
(Company's guest house), Chapter 8.3.1b (Rustenburg) and Chapter 8.3.1c (Nieuwland).
6 For discussion of spatial continuity on the cross-axis in early examples, see Chapter 9.3.3 (second drostdy at Stellenbosch) and Chapter 8.6 ("Posthuijs" at Muizenberg).
7 For the interior spatial arrangements at Constantia, see Chapter 8.5.
8 For Valentyn's description of the "dubbelhuisen", see Chapter 7.2.1, pp211-214.
9 For Valentyn's description of Vergelegen, see Chapter 9.5, pp549-550.
10 For the internal spatial quality of the hospital, see Chapter 7.5.6.
11 For the internal spatial quality of the Vergelegen out-buildings, see Chapter 9.5, p569.
12 For evidence of the presence of a copy of Vitruvius at the Cape, see Chapter 12.1, pp644-645. Markell, on the other hand, argues a vernacular derivation for the Vergelegen out-buildings (see Chapter 9.5, Note 88).

13 For an analysis of the internal spatial complexity of the church, see Chapter 7.5.2, pp280-290.

14 For the edict against extravagance, see Chapter 9.5, p538.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4.5

1 For descriptions of the exterior form of the buildings within the Fort, see Chapter 6.3.2.

2 For documentary evidence of pitched and tiled roofs, see Chapter 6.3.2, pp110 and Chapter 11.5.2.

3 For descriptions of the volumetric articulation of the Castle, see Chapter 6.6.3a, p152 and Chapter 6.6.3b, pp158-159.

4 For the erection of the subdividing wall of the Castle, see Chapter 6.6.2, pp144-145 and Chapter 6.6.3b, pp159 & 168.

5 For travellers' descriptions of the flat roofs of the Castle, see Chapter 6.6.3b.

6 For descriptions of the exterior of the slave lodge, see Chapter 7.5.7.

7 For descriptions of the exterior of the Company's stable, see Chapter 7.3.3.

8 For descriptions of the flat-roofed annexes to the hospital, see Chapter 7.5.6, pp302-303.

9 For an analysis of the roofing configuration of the church, see Chapter 7.5.2, pp285 & 288.

10 For the commissioning of the belltower on the Stellenbosch church, see Chapter 9.3.1, p466.

11 For Van Rheede's instructions regarding the Stellenbosch church, see Chapter 9.3.1, pp462-463 and Chapter 9.3.4.

12 For the reduction in height of the first Stellenbosch drostdy, see Chapter 9.3.3, pp484-485.

13 For further analysis of Van Harwaerden's inn, and a suggested three-dimensional reconstruction, see Chapter 7.2.1, pp206-207.

14 For an analysis of the facade treatment of Leeuwenhof, see Chapter 7.6.3, pp332-334.

15 For further analysis of the exterior form of Constantia, see Chapter 8.5.

16 For Valentyn's description of Hüsing's and Blesius' houses, see Chapter 7.2.1, pp211-214.

17 For Valentyn's description of the "opgaande trappen", see Chapter 7.2.1, p218 and Note 74.

18 For van der Stel's description of these houses, see Chapter 9.5, p541.

19 For an analysis of the relative accuracy of these two drawings, see Chapter 9.5, pp564-568.
20 The use of pilasters had already been reintroduced in the new Burgher watch-house begun in 1755. This, however, did not have the pitched roof and centre gable seen at Vergelegen and at the fourth Stellenbosch drostdy, but a flat roof without gables, as illustrated by Johannes Rach in 1662 (see Fig 66).
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   The necessity to impose order on such a rugged and disordered landscape could have been responsible for the adoption of the orthogonal system of garden and street layout, which had the added advantage that the building plots were easy to survey (see also Stilgoe, J R. Common Landscape of America 1580-1845. New Haven, 1982, p3).


4 Ras, Kasteel, pp2-3.

5 Ras, Kasteel, p3.
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.3

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.3.1

3 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, pp96-98.
4 Cape Archives. Map Collection: M1/36, M1/21, M1/23, and M2/20. The earliest of these, M1/36, is dated 1653.
5 The "walgang" allowed protected passage behind the breastwork or parapet (Mohr, A H. Vestingbouwkundige Termen. 's-Gravenhage, 1983, pp19 & 21).
6 The "berm", a narrow strip of ground at the foot of the curtain wall, was sometimes provided with a palisade to hinder the progress of anyone who had succeeded in crossing the moat (Mohr, A H. Vestingbouwkundige Termen. 's-Gravenhage, 1983, pp10 & 21).
7 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume 1, 1651-1655. Cape Town,
The dimensions of the Fort were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rods</th>
<th>Feet</th>
<th>Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The outside polygons or the outer points of the bastions were fixed at 21 rods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rhineland measure) from each other...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inner polygons at</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The length of the inside and outside polygon lines at</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gorge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main lines (through angles of bastions)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The flank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second flank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The face</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half the diameter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curtain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The angles of the polygons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The angles of the bastions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tenaille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The angled flank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150 deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The angle forming the flank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 deg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurements of the profile of the rampart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rods</th>
<th>Feet</th>
<th>Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The base of the rampart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The outside slope</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inside</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The height of the rampart</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its width at the top</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The base of the parapet of the rampart</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its outer and inner slopes together</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its outside height</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inside height</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its width at the top</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the rampart everywhere will then be 8½ feet wide.

The Salt River fortification was later to be named the Duijnhoop Redoubt.

The drawings showing the kraal to the rear of the Fort, as well as the hornwork in front, were only sent to Holland in 1656 (see Figure references).
49 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p328.
62 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II. Cape Town, 1899, p341.
63 Leibbrandt, Letters received, 1649-1662. Part II, p180.
67 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briefe, pp288-289.
70 For Lairesse’s instructions to Wagenaer, dated the 22nd September 1662, see Ras, A C. Die Kasteel en ander vroeë Kaapse vestingwerke, 1652-1713. Cape Town, 1959, p28.
74 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p97; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, pp73-74.
75 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p101; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p77.
76 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp103-104; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p79.
77 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p321.
78 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp321-322.
79 These intentions are outlined in Wagenaer’s report on the Castle, dated the 27th August 1665. Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp414-415.
81 See Chapter 8.3.2b, pp378.
86 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p172; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p129.
87 Boeseken A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel 1, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, p323.
89 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp350-351.
90 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p351.
93 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1662-1670*. Cape Town, 1901, p151.
96 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1662-1670*. Cape Town, 1901, p162.
100 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1662-1670*. Cape Town, 1901, pp221-222.
105 As mentioned on the 23rd June and the 4th July (Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1671-1676*, p61) and on the 22nd July 1672 (Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1671-1676*, p65).
107 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676*. Cape Town, 1902, p86.
109 Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1671-1676*, p120.
118 Cape Archives. *Map Collection, M2/21*. See Chapter 7.1, Note 48, for an analysis of the dating of this map.
119 The editor of the Valentyn translation believes that the writer was mistaken, and that the removal of the remains must have taken place later than 1685. This is based on an incorrect belief that the cable store was Van Riebeeck's first hospital, supposedly built outside the Fort. However, the hospital which doubled as a shipping store was in fact the third to be built, after the demolition of the second example in the hornwork. The cable store referred to by Valentyn was a later structure built on the site of the old hornwork, as confirmed by Stade's 1710 drawing and Mentzel's description of 1741, outlined in Chapter 7.3.5, pp252-253 (Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe

Kolbe also states that the ruins of the old Fort were still in existence when he arrived at the Cape in 1705, but it is unlikely that it would have taken twenty years for the last remains to be levelled (Kolbe, P. The present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis). London, 1731, Vol 1, p18).

Even Mentzel claims to have seen the ruins of Van Riebeeck's Fort (Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part One, p52), but this cannot be true as he arrived at the Cape only in 1732 or 1733 (Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1925, Part Two, p8). His "observations" in this regard can thus have been made only on the basis of hearsay or plagiarism.
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4. Walton, J. The South African Kapstylhuis and some European Counterparts. Restorica. No 10, December 1981. Walton mentions the Dassen Island shed in the above article without acknowledging that the drawing was found in the Map Collection of the Cape Archives by the present author, and brought to his notice by the author's previous supervisor, Prof D J C Radford.
6. Leibbrandt's translation (see Note 7) is misleading, as it suggests that the 36 foot long structure along the curtain was independent of the building in question.
10. Despite the earlier statement that he had moved into the first temporary shed.
18 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p128. However, this edit is dated the 14th October 1652 in Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaatboek, Deel I (1652-1707). Cape Town, 1944, pp7-8.
21 The military meaning of the Dutch "cat" is similar to that of the English "cavalier"; "A work generally raised... higher than the rest of the works... to command all the adjacent works and the country round" (Onions, C T (Ed). Shorter Oxford Dictionary. Oxford, 1973).
22 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape. 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, pp80-84.
23 Both drawings were received in Holland in 1653 (see Figure references).
24 M1/24 [Fig 9] is incorrectly dated 1653 by the Cape Archives. The correct date is 1656, as detailed by the Algemeen Rijksarchief (see Figure references). However, Georg Meister does depict the Fort with a central dome in his drawing published in 1688, which suggests that he had seen M1/21 [Fig 7] and drawn what he believed would have been the eventual reality [Fig 14].
39 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town,
1952. p315.
40 See Chapter 8.4, p385. Moreover, Walton has indicated that the "longhouse" or "einhaus" was more common as a dwelling type in the 18th century than had previously been supposed (see Chapter 8.4, Note 26).
47 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p263.
50 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, p232. It is not clear from this entry whether this structure was inside the Fort or outside on the shore, but permission to build an equipage magazine "in the fort" had been received from Holland on the 30th October 1655.
52 Thom, Journal. Vol II, pp71 & 81-82. The interpretation of a "square" as a "storey" is based on alternative contemporary usage. On the assumption that the word which Thom translated was "een vierkant", a possible English translation is "a Room" (Sewel, W. A Large Dictionary, English and Dutch. Amsterdam, 1727). Contemporary English usage, moreover, gives a possible English meaning as "Having a form more or less approximating to a cube; rectangular and of three dimensions. late ME" (Onions, C T (Ed). Shorter Oxford Dictionary. Oxford, 1973).
53 Recent archaeological excavations confirm that the 1656 plan [Fig 8], as well as the 1665 plan showing the relationship between the Fort and Castle [Fig 43], correspond more closely with the extant remains than the plan of 1653 [Fig 6] (Abrahams, G. The Grand Parade, Cape Town: Archaeological Excavations of the Seventeenth Century Fort de Goede Hoop. South African Archaeological Bulletin. Vol 48, 1993, p9). This is not surprising, as the 1653 drawing was merely illustrating intentions, whereas the 1656 plan appears to have depicted a built reality.
There is unfortunately some confusion in Abrahams' paper: the drawings referred to in the text do not correspond with their figure numbers, although the dates given in the captions to the illustrations are accurate.

54 The elaboration of the windows is confirmed in the cavalier perspective dating from 1660 [Fig 10].


57 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p258. According to Cuneus, Van Goens had given authorization for two granaries to be built "along the two inside curtains", one of which had already been commenced. It is not clear whether this was on the previously empty right-hand curtain, or was a replacement for the fire-proof magazine on the left-hand side.


60 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, pp76-77.


65 Further reference to the earlier flat roof of the "cat" had been made in Van Goens' report of the 16th April 1657, when it was mentioned that two cannon were placed on the "flat roof of the Commander's residence" (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p329); and on the 20th June 1659, when the "cat" was used as an observation point (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Vol III, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp68-72).

66 For further examples of double gables, see Fitchett, R H. The Double Gable at the Cape. Architecture SA. Jan/Feb 1987, pp19-22.

67 Given that the cavalier perspective of 1660 [Fig 10] was almost certainly drawn before the roof of the Fort had been altered, it must have been a representation of what was intended, whereas Van Harwaarden's inn was shown as a built reality. This building will be covered in the description of the town (see Chapter 7.2.1, pp206-207, and Figs 56 & 57).

68 The drawing is difficult to read here, but the same hatched convention is used as on all the other pitched-roofed buildings depicted. This is clearer in the original drawing in the Algemeen Rijksarchief than in the Cape Archives' reproduction.
This room could well have been a prison cell, as it was mentioned on the 18th September 1658 that cells had been built beneath and above the gate of the Fort (Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658*. Cape Town, 1954, pp339-341).

This cannot be seen in the Cape Archives copy, but is clear in the original in the *Algemeen Rijksarchief*. It should be noted that many of the details are difficult to read in photographic reproductions of this drawing. However, the original in the *Algemeen Rijksarchief* (Studiezaal VEL 824), is in excellent condition and can be read with clarity.

Many of the details of the 1660 cavalier perspective [Fig 10] disagree significantly with A A Telford’s well-known reconstruction of the Fort (reproduced in *Trefois, C V, Punt, W and Ploeger, J. Our Cape Gables*. Pretoria, 1968, p84) [Fig 15]. This appears to have been based on material compiled from a number of sources, regardless of their chronology. It omits the new gateway and the double-gabled “cat”. Moreover, all the buildings within the Fort and hornwork are shown with hipped roofs.

Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters and documents received*, 1649-1662. Part II. Cape Town, 1899. p341.


Evidently the resolution of the 7th January 1660 to replace all the Company’s thatched roofs with tiles had not been completely carried out.

The lofts were presumably reached directly from the “walgang”, the “wallwalk” along the inner edge of the rampart.


See Note 72, above.
89 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p68.
91 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, p98; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p75.
92 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp103-104; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p79.
93 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp319-320.
94 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp320-321.
95 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp322.
96 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp322-323.
97 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp334-335.
98 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, p335.
100 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp162-163; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p122.
103 This was the bazaar or market, which was also used as an abbatoir, and was therefore extremely inappropriate for the accommodation of soldiers (see also Chapter 7.3.6).
106 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, pp79-82. It is probable that Schouten’s view of the Fort and town [Fig 13] dates from his visit of 1665, rather than his first encounter of the Cape in 1658. Raven-Hart, however, locates the drawing (which he does not date) with the earlier rather than the later textual entry.
107 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Brieue van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, pp253-254; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, pp177-178. The Secunde, Abraham Gabbema, had departed for Batavia the previous day, having held this position for the last four years, and having served at the Cape for the last decade in various capacities, including the
supervision of the Company's building works (see Chapter 12.1).

109 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe. p384.
112 Lacus had been promoted to Secretary in 1660. Fiscal in 1663 and Secunde in 1666, after the departure of Gabbema. He acted as surveyor (see Chapter 12.2) and was also responsible for the administration of the warehouses, but was suspended for dishonest practices in 1667 and sent to Robben Island in 1668. Found guilty in 1670 of a shortfall of f6865, he was sent to India as a common soldier on a salary of 9 guilders a month, with which he was expected to repay his debt with interest.
113 Lacus' house was almost certainly in the Fort, and not a private residence in the town. Firstly, there is no mention in the Resolutions of any of the Company's officials living outside the Fort. Moreover, the Secunde's subordinate, the Fiscal, had been provided with official accommodation. Secondly, the Company would not have been able to prevent Lacus from using the largest room in the house if he had owned it himself. Lastly, instead of forbidding him to leave the Fort, as they did on the 1st October 1667, they would have given orders for him to be brought and detained there.

No significance, therefore, should be read into the use of the word "middelkamer" with regard to the planning of free-standing houses of this date.

124 The previous Governor, Joan Bax, had been instructed by his predecessor, Isbrand Goske, to demolish this structure as it could have been used as a vantage point by enemy forces (Ras, A C. Die Kasteel en ander vroë Kaapse vestingwerke, 1652-1713. Cape Town. 1959, p69). He continued to make use of it, however, even though he himself had instructed the freeburghers to demolish their houses in
the vicinity of the Castle.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.4


7 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, pp341-342.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.5


7 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp76 & 78.

8 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p130.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.6

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.6.1


NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.6.2

1 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel 1, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp332-333. The date of receipt was only mentioned on the 3rd August 1665, although the orders had been sent on the 13th and 20th November 1664, and had arrived in the "Amersfoort" on the 23rd April 1665.


4 The "old hospital" was presumably the old gardener's house, which was used to accommodate the patients while the new hospital in the hornwork was under construction.


6 "...te meer sijn E. (na wij hooren) met eenige gecommitteerde Heeren Bewinthebberen in Den Haegh alreede verscheijde malen hier over soude sijn in conferentie geweest" (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel 1, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp332-333).


8 Accompanied by lengthy written reports submitted by all the members of the Broad Council. They were the Commander Zacharias Wagenaer, the Secunde Abraham Gabbema, the Fiscal and surveyor Hendrick Lacus, the Junior Merchant on the ship "N. Middelburgh" Abraham Clement, the supervisor of works Abraham Schut, the commander of the garrison Johannes Coon, the ensign Dirk van Groeningen, and the Visiting Commissioner Isbrand Goske (Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, pp414-425).


13 Mentioned on the 10th and 17th October (Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p225; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p162), on the 2nd November (Boeseken, p228), and on the 12th December (Boeseken, p234; and Leibbrandt, p167).

14 An edict was published on the 5th November forbidding the workmen to visit the brandy taverns during working hours, on pain of being chained to their wheelbarrows (Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p229; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p164).

15 It was noted on the 12th December that between four and six men were reporting to the hospital daily, as a result of dysentery caused by the heavy work in the hot weather (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel 1, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp337-338).

16 The five months mentioned by Wagenaer do not correspond with the dates given in the records, which suggest a period of little more than three months.


19 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, pp376-377 & 394. It is surprising that Dombaer’s name was not attached to any of the written reports regarding the siting of the Castle (see Note 8, above), especially as he is credited with the preparation of M3/10, the 1665 drawing showing the relationship between the old Fort and the new Castle [Fig 21].

20 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p377.

21 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp381-382.

22 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p382.

23 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p384.

24 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp418-419. See also Note 8, above.

25 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp420-421. See also Note 8, above.

26 Dombaer’s plan (Cape Archives. Map Collection: M3/10) [Fig 21] was sent over to Holland with Wagenaer’s letter of the 22nd May 1666 (Boeseken, Dagregister en
Stone, lime and timber were to be collected, but work was not to be commenced until further orders had been received.

The men were set to work two days later, on the 29th February 1672 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, 1902, p46).

This was one of many instances of the lack of co-operativeness of the early settlers at the Cape (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, pp76-77).

These were evidently not the temporary enclosure commissioned by Goske, which had already been completed. They must therefore have been the permanent curtain walls, suggesting that they were built of earth and faced with stone, confirming the supposition with regard to the bastion referred to on the 20th September 1670.

This is not surprising, as the immediate threat was from the sea. unless invaders were to land elsewhere and attack the Castle from the rear (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp74-76).

1959, pp109-112.
58 The refacing of the bastion had, in fact, already been referred to on the 23rd February 1673 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, pp113-114).
59 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p120.
63 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p150.
64 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p153.
65 This was presumably the southern curtain, as the "flank" was merely the portion of the bastion which met the curtain at right angles.
69 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p164.
70 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp164-165.
72 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p174. Leibbrandt describes it as the "S. or S.W. bastion of the new Fort" in this reference, although it was in fact on the eastern side. This is clarified in later entries.
73 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p176.
74 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p177.
75 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p185.
76 As resolved in a meeting of the Council of Policy, presided over by the Governor Isbrand Goske and the Visiting Commissioner Sijbrand Abbema (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp117-118).
77 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p211. This was almost certainly the third bastion, whose earthen core had recently been completed and was now being faced with stone.
80 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p220.
81 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p225.
A ship was sent to bring lime from Mauritius on the 23rd June 1676 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p262).

The inventory reads as follows:

"90 cannons, viz.: 78 iron ones, i.e., 12 twenty-four pounders; divided as follows:-
2 for the main guard; 2 on the West Point; 2 on the North Point; 2 on the Sea Point; 2 on the 'getijpte' Point, or 12 in all of 24 lb. balls.
"29 eighteen pounders, viz.: 7 on the West Point; 4 on the North Point; 6 on the Sea Point; 6 on the East Point; 6 on the 'getijpte' Point.
"28 twelve pounders, viz.: 7 on the West Point; 6 on the North Point; 2 on the Sea Point; 6 on the East Point; 7 on the 'getijpte' Point.
"3 three pounders for the Horn Work, and 6 iron ten pounders on the Sea Point.
Grand Total, 78 pieces.
"12 metal guns, viz.; 2 bell metal pieces of 6 lbs. for the rice warehouse in the N. Fort; 2 do. of 4 lbs. for the said rice store; 2 do. of 2 lb. balls as above; 4 do. of 18 lbs. on the North Point; 2 do. of 8 lbs. on the East Point, or a total of 12 pieces. Grand total, 90 guns of various calibre"


This was clearly not the northern bastion on the sea-front, which is mentioned later in this resolution, and is another instance of the inconsistency which characterized descriptions of all the bastions until they had been formally named.

Their names, unfortunately, are not disclosed.

"Fausse-braye": a wall in front of the main rampart (Mohr, A H. Vestingbouwkundige Termen. 's-Gravenhage, 1983, pp 12 & 21). This term is given a variety of spellings in the primary sources. These spellings have been adhered to in the text, where they are placed in inverted commas.


103 The "afsluijten van d' bolwerken" presumably meant the completion of the curtain walls between them.
105 The gate had been completed by May 1678 (Ras, A C. *Die Kasteel en ander vroeë Kaapse vestingwerke*, 1652-1713. Cape Town, 1959, p75).
107 The "ingenieur off lantmeeter" is not mentioned in the resolution, but he must have been Johannes Wittebol. See Note 111, below.
108 In other words the corners between the flanks and faces of the bastions.
109 Thus corresponding more or less with the ravelin itself, but not including the linking palisade.
111 This plan (Cape Archives. Map Collection: M2/22) [Fig 23] is not dated, but it must have been drawn between the 15th September 1678, when it was decided to build the ravelin, and the 26th April 1679, when the bastions were first named. These are not described by name in Wittebol’s extremely detailed legend. In the unlikely event that he omitted them in error, the plan cannot have been drawn later than the 15th September 1681, when Wittebol’s death was recorded.
112 This was the first instance at the Cape of black people being used exclusively for heavy labour. Previously the slaves had worked together with the soldiers (Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II*, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp279-280).
117 The foundations were described as having been built "perpendiculair". This probably means that they were no wider than the bases of the inclined walls above, and therefore could not have withstood the overturning moment of the latter.
119 A detailed analysis of the dating of this drawing (Cape Archives. Map Collection:...
M2/21) [Fig 24] is given in Chapter 7.1, Note 48. This plan must also have been drawn by Wittebol, given its similarity to M2/22 [Fig 23] in draughting and lettering style.

120 In contrast with the wealth of evidence provided by his predecessor, the Acting Commander Hendrick Crudop.


123 These had already been mentioned on the 4th March 1677 (see Note 92, above).


127 Ras, A C. Die Kasteel en ander vroeë Kaapse vestingwerke, 1652-1713. Cape Town, 1959, pp83-84. Ras states that the new entrance had been completed by the 30th April 1684, but Boeseken gives a date of June 1682 (see below, Note 128). Ras must therefore have been referring to the completion of the belltower over the gateway, which Boeseken confirms was added in April 1684.


134 Pearse, G E. Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. Cape Town, 1968, p36. Presumably, however, it appears in the Journal of Simon van der Stel. This source, available only as a manuscript copy in the Cape Archives, was not consulted in the preparation of this thesis as it was outside the research parameters outlined in Chapter 1.3.1.


136 Ras gives a date of May 1695 for the completion of the new "balcony", but does not quote her source (Ras, A C. Die Kasteel en ander vroeë Kaapse vestingwerke, 1652-1713. Cape Town, 1959, p86). This again is probably derived from the Journal of Simon van der Stel (see Note 134, above).
143 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp317-318.
144 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp223-224. The proposed battery is discussed in Chapter 6.7.
149 Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1696-1708, p238.
151 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel 111, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp415-417. This expedition was not successful, as noted on the 10th July 1676 (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol III, pp440-442), but slaves had been procured from Madagascar by the 21st April 1707, as mentioned in a letter to the Secret Committee (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p325).
159 Kolbe, Beschryving (Dutch translation). Vol II, p432. Although Kolbe is by no means an official source, his evidence in this matter is probably reliable, given that he was present at the time. The visit of Van Hoorn is confirmed by Valentyn, who did have access to official records, as demonstrated by his transcription of the Governor-General’s questions to the Council of Policy. The matter of the outworks, however, was not raised in this interview, and was not mentioned elsewhere (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in “Oud en


166 It is possible and indeed not unlikely that some of these accounts were exaggerated. However, see Hall et al. Note 169, below.


170 Georg Meister (1677) mentions that the Castle had "a good moat towards the Table Mountain on the landward side" (Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, pp198-199). Francois-Timoleon de Choisy (1685), however, stated that the Castle "has no outworks or moats" (Raven-Hart, Cape Good Hope 1652-1702, Vol 2, p269). On the other hand, the description of Christoffel Langhansz (1694) corresponds with that of Meister: "On the landwards side it has a fine and deep moat..." (Raven-Hart, Cape Good Hope 1652-1702, Vol 2, p402).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.6.3


6 The hall of the Fort was used for church services whenever the garrison was small enough to be accommodated in it, and when the new church was in need of repairs. This practice continued until the 17th July 1672 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p64).


8 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670. p266.


10 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p64.


15 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p220.


17 These documents may have been discovered since the turn of the century, but the research parameters of this thesis were confined to Leibbrandt's Precis for the Journal in the post-Wagenaer period (see Chapter 1.3.1).


20 Tachard, G. A Relation of the Voyage to Siam (English translation of French edition, 1686). London, 1688, pp48-49. For the new church under construction in the Company's gardens, see Chapter 7.5.2.


25 Raven-Hart (Valentyn’s translator) suggests that the services were given from the "balcony of the Governor’s house, otherwise called the Kat", thereby implying that they were held in the outer court of the Castle. This is a mistranslation, however, as the Dutch original reads "op de voorzaal van de Heer Gouverneurs huis, anders de Kat genaamt" (Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f.157; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol II, p257). This misconception is repeated in the translation of "op de Voor-zaal, of de Kat" as "from the terrace, or Kat" (Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol II, pp280-281). Valentyn’s own use of the words "groote Zaal" and "Voorzaal" within the same paragraph in the second entry evidently led the translator to believe that the latter was the landing of the staircase leading to the former. Both words, however, referred to the hall which gave access to the Governor’s residence. This hall was also used as the Council Chamber, and the derivation of the use of the word “cat” for its description will be discussed in Chapter 6.6.3b (p170).


NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.6.3b

4 Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676, pp117-118. The first shed had been the church and equipment store, described earlier (see Chapter 6.6.3a).
5 Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676. p156.
7 Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676. p166.
8 Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676. p166. A further reference to the "temporary corps de garde" was made on the 28th November 1673 (Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676, p170).
12 See Chapter 6.6.3a. p151.
15 Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676. p211.
17 These were on the 14th and 26th December 1674 (Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676, p227).
18 This would explain why Governor Bax continued to use the old residence in the Fort (see p155 & Chapter 6.3.2, Note 124)


25 See Chapter 6.6.3a, pp151-152.

26 This was almost certainly the old Governor's residence in the largely demolished Fort (see Chapter 6.3.2, pp120-121).

27 This was the first mention of the Company's garden house, predating both Simon and Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel’s periods of office.

28 This is an interesting entry, as it reveals that the original seaward gate was also to be provided with a belltower. Simon van der Stel’s tower over the present gateway was therefore not the first to be commissioned in the Castle.

29 This is more likely to have been the south-western curtain, between the Oranje and Leerdam bastions. Wittebol’s plan shows the Governor’s residence in this position, whereas the south-eastern curtain was reserved for barracks. On the other hand, the incorporation of store-rooms within the official wing does seem unlikely.


31 This was no longer a satisfactory location on account of the rotting of the timbers. They were now to be submerged in the Salt River, where they would be chained together and anchored down.


34 These accounts, which are referred to below, are consistent in referring to the early buildings as being "gewit". The trend in recent restorations of 18th century buildings of using colour on the external walls is therefore not representative of the early period described here.


37 For an analysis of the dating of this plan see Chapter 6.6.2, Note 111.

38 This must have been the projected Commander’s residence, as it was not ready for Simon van der Stel on his arrival (see Note 41, below).

39 Ras states on p81 that Wittebol had confused the old and the new gateways to the Castle, the one protected by the ravelin being described as the new entrance. It is more likely that the seaward entrance had only recently been completed, and that the old entrance was still being used for the delivery of building materials, for which it would have been more convenient.
The new entrance was only built during Simon van der Stel's period of office, thus postdating Wittebol's plan and perspective (see Chapter 6.6.2, Note 111). Van der Stel wrote to the Council of Seventeen in March 1681 (Ras, p84) for permission to relocate the entrance. This was only granted by the Visiting Commissioner Van Goens in 1682, after the death of Wittebol in September 1681. It is extremely unlikely that a plan illustrating the problems of the original entrance would have been sent to Holland with such an elementary error as that suggested by Ras (Ras, A C. Die Kasteel en ander vroeë Kaapse vestingwerke, 1652-1713. Cape Town, 1959, pp81 & 84).

40 As suggested by G Fagan, the architect responsible for the restoration of the Castle, in a public lecture in Cape Town, 1987.

41 Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy kinders. Cape Town, 1964, pp39-40. This entry (no date for which is provided) does not correspond with Wittebol's plan, which annotated the fifth curtain as being reserved for additional "wooningen". Nor does Boeseken explain why Van der Stel did not occupy the Commander's residence shown by Wittebol next to the hall used as a church.


44 This probably refers to the project which was postponed on the 9th March 1680.

45 This reference is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it could suggest that Wittebol's plan was drawn after the 23rd March 1680, when the decision was made to build dwellings along the fifth curtain. However, this could also have been a reversion to an earlier decision made prior to the 26th April 1679, when the bastions were first named. The absence of their names on Wittebol's plan has already been noted, and suggests that it was drawn prior to this date (see Chapter 6.6.2, Note 111).

Secondly, it suggests that the Commander's residence had already been completed, although Boeseken states below that Van der Stel had moved into the captain's dwelling by the 20th June 1680, as a temporary measure before commencing his own residence (see Note 47, below).


48 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel, p42.


51 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel, pp50-51.

52 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel, p51.


56 Boeseken, A J. *Simon van der Stel en sy kinders*. Cape Town, 1964, pp51 & 64-65. Boeseken states that the foundations of the new residence had been laid by the 13th May 1687, but contradicts herself by stating that work on the foundations of the subdividing wall (alongside which the final residence was located) was recommenced on the 27th August 1687. The foundations of the flanking buildings could hardly have predated those of the wall against which they were built.


60 This was probably the hall and Council Chamber, but it might have referred to the landing of the staircase from which it was reached.


65 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters Despatched, 1696-1708*. Cape Town, 1896, p100.

66 Raven-Hart, A. *Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers*. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, p446. Obholzer et al suggest that the "three-panel folding doors of deal" in the present Castle were "perhaps the original entrance to Simon van der Stel's Assembly Hall" (Obholzer, A, Baraitser, M and Malherbe, W A. *The Cape House and its interior*. Stellenbosch, 1985, Fig 145, p72).


71 This was probably the bakery erected in 1685.


74 Cape Archives. *Morrison Collection: M796 & 797*. These drawings were traced by Silip Schutte, the grandson of Herman.

75 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p115.


84 Mentzel, O F. *A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope* (English translation). Cape Town, 1925, Part II, p50. Mentzel, moreover, refers to the subdividing wall as the "blind line", and does not use the word "cat" in this context (Mentzel, *Description*. Part I, pp104-106).


**NOTES TO CHAPTER 6.7**


5 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676*. Cape Town, 1902, p71.


7 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676*. Cape Town, 1902, p73.


9 Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1671-1676*, p76.

11 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p78.
12 For the dating of this map, see Chapter 9.1, pp427-428.
19 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol IV, pp160-162; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, pp234-235. A detailed description was also given of experimental shots fired to establish the range of the cannon.
20 Kolbe later confuses the issue by referring to a complement of six cannon (Kolbe, P. Naauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, p181).
22 This appears to be a case of plagiarism, as Valentyn stated categorically that the proposed battery (Chavonnes) was to be located on the site of Simon van der Stel's structure, whereas the passage is ambiguous in Kolbe (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien" (Dutch original). Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, pp f.10 & 14; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope met de zaaken daar toe behoorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Vol I, pp71 & 83-85).
23 The "large Water-Redoubt" was the Chavonnes Battery.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 7

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.1

1 Todeschini and Le Grange both attribute the plan of Cape Town to a type developed from the "bastides" of the late Middle Ages, and the former also draws comparisons with the Spanish towns of Latin America built according to the "Laws of the Indies". (Todeschini, F. Cape Town: Physical planning traditions of a settlement in transition. Architecture SA. March/April 1994, p32; and Le Grange, L. Cape Town - reconstructing public space. Architecture SA, September/October 1994, pp23-24).

Neither states explicitly that the town was not designed as a colonial settlement from the outset, nor do they provide convincing evidence for their precedents. The Medieval bastidal arrangement had already been superseded by Renaissance planning types, and the Dutch would have been averse to Spanish plans owing to political and religious antipathy. Moreover, Cape Town displays none of the major characteristics of either of these two formulae, except that the streets are orthogonally related at right angles to each other.

The decision to follow an orthogonal grid in the incremental development of the town is far more likely to have been derived from a knowledge of the ideal towns designed by Albrecht Durer in 1527 [Fig 36] and Simon Stevin in 1660 [Fig 37]. Both were based on Italian models derived from interpretations of Vitruvius, and are therefore of Classical rather than Medieval origin.

As far as the "Laws of the Indies" are concerned, Crouch, Garr and Mundigo reveal that these were inspired by the intellectual principles of Vitruvius described in Renaissance treatises. Their practical implementation was influenced by the remains of the Roman colonial towns still extant in Iberia (Crouch, D P. Garr, D J and Mundigo, A I. Spanish city planning in North America. Cambridge (Mass), 1982. ppxvi, xvii, 2, 32 & 40). Their only reference to the bastidal towns was on p39, where they state that the Spanish predecessors of the colonial towns "may have been influenced" by these orthogonal Medieval plans.


11 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II. Cape Town, 1899, p328.


15 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, p49. This is a surprisingly early reference to masonry walls, suggesting that the freeburghers’ houses referred to were those in the incipient town and not those on the Peninsula.


17 This plan (M2/18) is misleadingly given the date of c1660 by the Cape Archives, but it almost certainly dates from late 1658 or early 1659, as outlined in Note 18, below.

18 The differences between the two plans are best described with reference to the legend of M2/19 [Fig 42], which is based on that of the earlier M2/18 [Fig 41]. The earlier plan (M2/18) differs from the later drawing (M2/19) as follows:

Caption D. The Company’s water-mill shown on M2/19 does not appear on M2/18, despite having been built in 1659. Caption D on the earlier plan (M2/18) refers to the Company’s horse-mill (completed in July 1657 and abandoned in 1659), which is shown below and adjoining the stable E. This appears on the later drawing (M2/19) with parallel hipped roofs, suggesting that the mill was incorporated into the stable after it had fallen into disuse.

Caption M. The two new Company’s gardens closest to the mountain, shown on M2/19, do not appear in M2/18.

Caption R. The freeburghers’ brick-kiln is described as empty in the later drawing (M2/19), rather than full as in the earlier one (M2/18).

Caption S. The houses of the freeburghers shown in the later drawing (M2/19) are omitted from the earlier one (M2/18). Apart from the gardener’s house shown on earlier drawings, the only residential building depicted on M2/18 is the lodging house and tavern of Jan van Harwaerden (described as the ensign’s house in the caption on M2/18). He was given permission to erect this building in October 1657, but had to relinquish it after his promotion to ensign in September 1658. However,
it was noted in April 1659 that his widow was completing it after his death in February 1659.

Caption W. The extensive new freeburghers' lands to the south of the Fort do not appear on M2/18 and are not mentioned in its legend.

Caption X. The freeburghers' new tile- and brick-kiln does not appear on M2/18 or in its legend.

Caption Y. The Company's lime-kiln does not appear on the earlier legend (M2/18), although it is also omitted on the later drawing (M2/19).

The differences between these two plans provide a limited dating span for M2/18. The earliest possible date is September 1658 (the date of the ensign's promotion), and the latest possible date is February 1659 (the date of his death). It is probable, therefore, that it dates from late 1658 or early 1659, thus correlating with the evidence provided by the mills. The two plans agree in all other respects.

19 For pig breeding, see Chapter 7.6.3, pp330-331.

20 See Chapter 7.3.1, p237.

21 These grants, together with two others made by 1662, will be discussed below in relation to the 1665 plan of the town (see Note 32).

22 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II. Cape Town, 1899, p178.


25 This land grant will also be detailed below in relation to the 1665 map of the town (see Note 32).


27 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp158-159.

28 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p352. See also Chapter 7.3.6, p254.


The land grants are as follows, from south to north, with page references from Leibbrandt:

a) Hendrick Hendricksz Boom, on the southern edge of Oliphants Straet: 58 by 140 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660 (p335).

b) Maerten Jacobsz of Amsterdam, on the northern edge of Oliphants Straet: 22 by 108 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660. This plot must later have been increased in depth, as it is shown on M3/10 [Fig 43] with the standard length of
140 feet (p337).

c) Elbert Dirx Diermer of Emmerich, on the southern edge of Reijger Straet: 37 by 140 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660 (p335).

d) Johanna Boddij, widow of the ensign Jan van Harwaerden, between Reijger Straet and Heere Straet: 56 by 140 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660 (pp335-336). She had already been granted a plot of 111 by 321 feet on the 15th October 1659 (p327). This was also along the as yet unnamed Heerengracht, and must have been reduced in size as more burghers applied for land in the town.

e) To the north of Heere Straet was a vacant plot that had not yet been granted, followed by:-

f) Hendrick Hendricksz. of Zeurwaerden: 20 by 140 feet, granted on the 1st November 1661 (pp339-340).

g) An earlier plot of the same Hendrick Hendricksz: 40 by 140 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660 (pp336-337).

h) Jan Maertens de Wacht: 22 by 140 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660 (p336).

i) Wouter Cornelisz. Mostert, at the end of the block and on the southern edge of the as yet unnamed Zeestraet: 22 feet by 140 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660 (p336).

j) Jurriaen (sic) Jansz. of Amsterdam, facing on to "Zeestraet" and alongside the backs of the properties of Mostaert, Maertens and Hendricksz: 22 by 72 feet, granted on the 20th September 1660 (p336). This was the first plot not to have a frontage on to the "Heerengracht".

k) Another plot of the same Juriaen Jansz., on the northern edge of "Zeestraet" and next to the Company's cable store: 16 by 24 feet, granted in loan on the 1st April 1661 (pp338-339). This plot already contained a house erected for the use of the free Saldanha traders, but its location cannot be determined on M3/10 [Fig 43]. Three freeburghers' plots are shown to the north of "Zeestraet", one of them on the site of the cable store itself.

l) A third plot was granted to Jansz. on the 2nd October 1662. This was between the properties of Diemer and Jochem Blanck of Lübeck (who had married Van Harwaerden's widow), and was 48 by 140 feet (p342). It was therefore in the position of the old Reijger Straet, although this is not shown on M3/10 [Fig 43]. It also provides a dimension for these first streets, namely a width of 48 feet.

33 The caption for the reservoir is identical to that on the 1660 drawing [Fig 42]: "Verse Revier daer men water haelt". The fact that the reservoir was not annotated clearly suggests that it had not yet been built when the plan was initially drawn.

34 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, p94. Raven-Hart, however, states that there were only sixteen freemen living in the town on the 24th September 1666 (Raven-Hart, Cape Good Hope 1652-1702, Vol 2, p525).


36 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p263.
43 Leibbrandt. Journal. 1671-1676, p166.
45 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal. 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, pp306-307. Its location is not given in this entry, but it was the structure shown to the east of the Heerengracht in the 1679 plan (M2/21), captioned "P: Siekenhuijs" (see Note 48, below).
48 M2/21 [Fig 45] is undated by the Cape Archives, but given a cautious dating of "17th C" by the Algemeen Rijksarchief. An almost identical copy (M2/17) is given the impossible date of 1656 by the Cape Archives, impossible because the projected Castle had not even been envisaged by that time. A redrawn version of the same plan (M1/377) is given the date of 1693. This date is also given to an enlarged portion of M2/17, numbered M1/3323, although a pencilled date of c1670 appears in the bottom-right corner. Pearse also illustrates a redrawn version, which he dates at c1700.

Given the crucial importance of this plan, the only one showing the development of Cape Town between 1660/65 and the middle of the 18th century, it is essential that its dating be accurately established:-

Firstly, the hospital (built between 1697 and 1699) is not shown, proving that the plan is earlier than c1700.

Secondly, the Castle is shown without its subdividing "cat" wall (erected in 1691), thereby disqualifying the 1693 attribution.

Thirdly, the original seaward entrance to the Castle is shown, although it was closed in 1682.

Fourthly, the slave lodge was completed in 1680, but the legend states that only its foundations had been laid at the time of the drawing.

Fifthly, the proposed demolition of the Governor's old residence in the Fort and the necessity for alternative accommodation for visiting dignitaries was mentioned on the 26th April 1679. These correspond with caption "F" in the legend to the plan, which states that the "dwellings" will be demolished and the salvaged materials used for a house for dignitaries or for an orphanage.

Sixthly, the 1670 attribution can be discounted because the decisions to erect a church and a slave lodge were only made in 1677 and 1679 respectively.
A date of 1679 therefore appears to be the most probable.

49 All present street equivalencies are derived from Picard, H W. Gentleman’s Walk. Cape Town. 1968. pp16-17.

50 See Chapter 7.5.2. p277.

51 This numerical analysis is based on M2/21 [Fig 48] (Wittebol’s plan sent to Holland), with reference to M2/17 (the copy retained at the Cape, which omitted most of the lines denoting the presence of lean-to roofs). The latter plan is clearer with regard to the overall outlines of the individual houses, although possibly over-simplified in some respects. The count of 36 houses has thus been established through a reconciliation of the information provided by these two drawings. Fransen counts only "some twenty-five houses" (Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an investigation into stylistic modes in the architecture and applied arts at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1820. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Pietermaritzburg. 1987. pp45-46), but this could be because he appears to have counted only one house on each plot. He probably assumed, perhaps correctly, that the plots with more than one building contained out-buildings in addition to a single house. However, it is not possible to make a firm distinction in this regard, and all buildings on plots annotated as "burghers' houses" have therefore been treated as dwellings in the present analysis.

In contrast, Johann Wilhelm Vogel stated in 1679 that there were seventy or eighty houses in the town, built "of brick in the Dutch style" (Raven-Hart. A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town. 1971. Vol 1. p212). This, however, was probably an exaggerated estimate.

52 The only T-shaped house is depicted as asymmetrical on M2/17, the copy retained at the Cape, and moreover is shown with a lean-to rear wing in the plan sent to Holland (M2/21). Similar lean-to roofs also comprise the rearward extensions of a number (but not all) of the L-shaped houses depicted in the same drawing.

53 See Chapter 7.3.4. p248 and Chapter 7.3.6. pp254-255.


The official census of 1709 reveals 500 burghers, living in 155 houses. It is unlikely that the population had not increased during the intervening twenty years (see Note 81, below).


75 Leibbrandt. Journal. 1699-1732, p75.

76 Bogaert, A. Historische Reizen door d'oustersche Deelen van Asia. Amsterdam, 1711, pp99-101. See also Chapter 7.2.1, p211. Chapter 7.5.7, p312. Chapter 7.5.2, p280 and Chapter 7.5.6, pp301-302.


78 Botha, C G. Collectanea: First Series. Cape Town, 1924, p34.

79 Botha, Collectanea, p53.


81 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p 144; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1973, Vol II, p239. The total number of freeburghers provided by Valentyn is incorrect, as the sum of men, women and children is 1823, not 1923 as
stated. The total number of persons at the Cape under VOC control, however, is correct at 3698.
84 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1699-1732, p175.
85 The Fiscal’s house was not on the Parade, but on the corner of Bergstraat (St George’s Street) and Thuijstraat (Shortmarket Street), as shown on M1/336, a plan of the town dating from 1749 [Fig 51]. Although this plan is inaccurate in many respects, the position of the Fiscal’s house does appear to correspond with written descriptions.
86 It was noted on the 7th May 1709 that Samuel Elsevier also had a house close to the churchyard wall. This was not the site on which the Burgher watch-house was built and suggests that Elsevier, like the Van der Stels, had a number of properties in the town (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, pp 189-191).
87 The "New Market Square" was first mentioned on the 23rd November 1709 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, pp 205-206).
90 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p230. For the unlikelihood that Hüsing lived in this particular house, see Chapter 7.2.1, p211 and Note 57.
97 Valentyn mentioned elsewhere, however (see Note 81), that in 1710 the Visiting Commissioner Joan van Hoorn, Admiral of the return fleet and Governor-General
of Netherlands India, had been informed that there were only 155 households who paid their watch-dues (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p f.144; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behoorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1973, Part II, p239).

98 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, pp f.12-13; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Part I, pp79-81. Raven-Hart translates Valentyn's paces ("treden") as "yards", but they were 1.8 feet rather than 3 feet long (see Chapter 7.5.6, Note 42).

99 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f.7; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Part I, pp57-59.

100 Whereas Bergstraat was cut off below Heerestraat by a block longer than the others in 1679, this has now been cut back to align with the others. However, the street is still cut off from the sea by the block below Zeestraat, which extends further than the others. This corresponds with the layout shown in the survey plan of 1753 [Fig 52].

101 There are two copies of this plan, M1/1029 and M1/1167, both of which are inaccurately dated c1790. This is incorrect, as the date 1749 is clearly written in the title of M1/336: "Grond-tekening van de Vesting en Stad der Kaap de Goede Hoop. 1749."


103 See Chapter 7.2.1, pp216-218.
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3 Walton, J. Homesteads and Villages of South Africa. Pretoria, 1952, p9. Walton describes how "the traditional Cape Dutch house developed in the eighteenth century from the simple three-roomed rectangular dwelling of the early settlers". Fransen, H & Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, p3. The authors state that "the Cape house in its original shape was almost always symmetrical".


5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II. Cape Town, 1900, p104.
This house was not built at once, though, as it was referred to on the 26th April 1659 as still being under construction (see text, p204). However, temporary accommodation had been prepared at the Company's expense for use as an inn. This was in a portion of the old sheep shed in the "hornwork" behind the Fort, as mentioned on the 10th October 1657, and would be rented by the innkeeper from the 1st November (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town, 1954, pp34-35; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad; Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp81-82). The entries in the Journal and Resolutions misleadingly describe the shed as being "on the northern side of the fort", whereas it was actually on the south-western side. However, a third reference, in an edict of the 15th October 1657 prohibiting the unlicensed selling of liquor, specifically mentioned that the stable was in the "hornwork" (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, pp67-77). This refers to the palisaded kraal behind the Fort, not to the hornwork facing the bay.

It was also mentioned on the 5th March 1659, in a letter to the Seventeen, that a brick house had been erected for the gardener (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, pp67-77).


See Chapter 6.3.2, p104.


Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p252.
Town, 1899, p506.


21 Given the care with which the facades have been presented, it is likely that the 1660 drawing [Fig 56] is an accurate record. It was probably made by the surveyor, Pieter Potter, although the engineer Jan Danckaert could also have been responsible.

22 This is unlikely, but if they were the main entrances this would indicate the use of the hall-house plan in the early period at the Cape, in contrast to the transverse plan entered through the long side.

23 Hipped roofs often continued to be used on the larger houses during the period covered by this thesis, as will be seen when the E V Stade drawings of 1710 are discussed.

24 This dislocation of roof and facade articulation was not uncommon in the early period at the Cape, and is also seen at Leeuwenhof, the garden house of the Fiscal Blesius (see Chapter 7.6.3, pp332-334).

25 The Cape Archives’ photographic copy (M2/19) loses some of the detail of the original drawing in the Algemeen Rijksarchief (VEL 824). The latter clearly shows a parapet gable facing the Heerengracht. Its position in the facade is ambiguous, however, owing to a geometrical error on the part of the draughtsman. It has been assumed in the suggested reconstruction that this gable is being shown in elevation, which would confirm its central position, and that the junction of its roof with the apex of the end hip on the Heerengracht side is incorrect.

26 See Chapter 7.1, Note 32, for details of the land grant.

27 See Chapter 12.1, pp645-646.


33 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp256-257.

34 These demolition orders, however, had not yet appeared in the Resolutions or in the Plakkaatboek.


37 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, pp201-203. These orders were repeated on the 16th October (Boeseken, pp203-207) and on the 23rd November 1677 (Boeseken.
pp210-212).
38 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, pp210-212.
39 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, pp285-288. This is the first mention of the
Company's guest house, which was thus already in existence in 1679, as confirmed
by Wittebol's map of the same date [Fig 45]. It thus predates the "summer house"
which Fransen and Cook state was built by Simon van Stel in 1682 (Fransen, H and
40 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch
colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, p234. The brief
descriptions of Schouten, Iversen, Abraham van Riebeeck and Masurier, quoted in
Chapter 7.1, have not been repeated here.
41 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape
Town, 1961, p89.
42 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost
Indien". Amsterdam, 1726. Vol 4, p c.103; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de
Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation).
's-Gravenhage, 1938, pp112-114.
45 Boeseken suggests that the plan depicted on the title-deed of Dubertijn's property is
that of "die huis van gouverneur Isbrand Goske, wat luitenant Jan Baptist du Bertin
in 1684 vir f900 gekoop het" (Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy kinders.
Cape Town, 1964, opp p49).
Here she is contradicting herself, as Dubertijn clearly built himself a new house.
Moreover, the plan does not correspond with that of the "brewery" shown on the
1679 plan, and was almost certainly added to the title-deed at a later date. Given the
precision with which it is depicted, and the graphic convention which is used, it is
likely that the plan was drawn at least a century after 1684, possibly by Louis-
Michel Thibault. It cannot therefore be considered to be representative of the period
of this thesis.
Vos is also incorrect in believing that the house shown on this title-deed was erected
by Governor Goske in 1684, and that it served as precedent for the U-planned
Stellenbosch drostdy (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of
46 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch
48 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape
Town, 1961, 136-137. The edict was issued on the following day, the 2nd July
1686 (Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaatboek, Deel 1 (1652-1707). Cape Town, 1944,
50 Raven-Hart, A. *Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers*. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, pp330-331. This is contradicted by Ovington's statement in 1689 that the houses were "strong and neatly built with Stone Walls and pretty Apartments" (Botha, C G. *Collectanea: First Series*. Cape Town, 1924, pp107-109). Raven-Hart, however, gives a date of 1693 for Ovington's visit to the Cape (Raven-Hart, Vol 2, p399).


57 By Picard and Fagan (see Note 79, below).


59 Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707*. Cape Town, 1961, p320; and Jeffreys, *Plakkaatboek*, Vol I, pp303-304. This edict was renewed on the 10th January 1704, except that a height of 15 feet was again stipulated, suggesting that Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel was not aware of the 1697 amendment (Jeffreys, *Plakkaatboek*, Vol 1, pp330-340).

60 Bogaert, A. *Historische Reizen door d'oostersche Deelen van Asia*. Amsterdam, 1711, pp99-100.


63 The house of the secretary of the orphan chamber, Albert Coopman, was mentioned on the 12th October 1705 in connection with the insulting behaviour towards the
Governor Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel displayed by the retired burgher councillor Jan Rotterdam. This house was described as having a masonry bridge leading to the front door across the water channel running in front of it (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp 424-427).


68 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1962, pp 142-145. Boeseken states that this house was on the Fiscal’s garden property, Leeuwenhof. However, it was actually on Market Square, facing Bergstraet as revealed in the resolution of the 10th March 1710, transcribed by Boeseken in the same volume (pp 146-153).

69 Kolbe, P. The present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis). London, 1731, Vol 1, pp 346-348; and Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van de Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, p 221. Mentzel, however, questioned the accuracy of Kolbe’s description. “One author says of the Cape: All the houses have big front and back gardens which give them an attractive appearance.” However, “in the town proper” there were only “three or four houses that have front courtyards and gardens” (Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part I, pp 135-136). Beeckman, on the other hand, who described the town in 1714 as having 200 or 300 houses built of stone, “about two or three stories high” (Botha, C G. Collectanea: First Series. Cape Town, 1924, p 113), was clearly exaggerating their height, unless he was counting cellars and attics as “storeys”.


71 See text, pp 211-213 and Note 62, above.

72 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f. 13; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol I, pp 79-81. For original Dutch quotation see text, p 217.

73 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f. 13; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol I, pp 79-81. For original Dutch quotation see text, p 218.

74 “…een zeer schoon en groot huis met een opgaande trap.” (Valentyn, Beschryvinge
These are presumably the “flat-roofed” buildings referred to by Frescura (Frescura, F. The South African flat-roofed dwelling: a study in geographical adaptation and cultural transmission. South African Journal of Cultural and Art History, Vol 3, No 4, October 1989, pp365-387). However, unlike the later flat-roofed houses in Cape Town, their roofs are clearly shown as projecting beyond the walls instead of being contained within parapets. The only firm evidence for flat roofs at this date is that of the buildings within the Castle (see Chapter 6.6.3b). The first guest house in the Company’s garden had also been partially flat-roofed, but had since been rebuilt, presumably with a pitched roof (see Chapter 7.6.2); and the slave lodge, depicted as flat-roofed by Stade and described as such by most contemporary visitors, actually had an internal monopitch, as revealed by Kolbe (see Chapter 7.5.7).

See Chapter 7.3.6.

See Chapter 7.5.5.

Van der Meulen, J. Die europäische Grundlage der Kolonialarchitektur am Kap der Guten Hoffnung. Marburg, 1962. Vol I, pp83-84. Van der Meulen’s error of suggesting Meerlust as the prototype for the H-plan has been commented on by many sources, but no one has yet questioned whether it really was Meerlust that Van der Stel was comparing with Vergelegen.


Picard states that Hüsing’s double-storeyed town house described by Valentyn was on Strand Street, where he owned the entire block between the present St George’s and Burg Streets (Picard, H W. Gentleman’s Walk. Cape Town, 1968, p96). These plots, however, were more likely to have been used for housing his workers at the abattoir down the road, of which he was the leaseholder. Hüsing, like Elsevier and the Van der Stels, evidently owned a number of properties in the town, and is unlikely to have lived on the insanlubrious water-front.


See Chapter 7.2.2. pp221-224.

See Chapter 7.6.3. pp332-334.

He certainly visited Leeuwenhof, as his drawing of the town from above is captioned "uijt de Thuijn van d’E fiscaal Blesius".
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42 None of the standard sources mention these early gables, which are clearly illustrated in M2/19 [Fig 56].
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4 Later references to the train-oil store, however, locate it on the shore close to the jetty.
5 Part of the vaulted sluice of Wagenaer's reservoir has been preserved in the Golden Acre shopping complex in Cape Town. The reservoir itself will be described in Chapter 7.4.3, pp266-268.
6 The powder-magazine at Stellenbosch, dating from 1777, is the best-known example, but vaulted magazines were used in all the fortification works from Van Riebeeck's time until into the 19th century.
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1 One of its walls needed replacement on the 23rd May 1670 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p318).
3 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p205.
21 Kolbe, Beschryving (Dutch translation), Vol II, pp248-249.
22 There had been an incident on the 16th May 1666 when sailors from the return fleet had set fire to one of Company's wagons (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p181).
24 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Vol I, pp107-109. Raven-Hart translates "regt tegen over" as "directly opposite", rather than "diagonally opposite" which seems to have been Valentyn's meaning. It is possible that Valentyn was relying on hearsay and had not seen the two buildings himself, but if he had seen them in person his description is significant: a similar diagonal relationship in Stellenbosch described as "regt over" was interpreted by Hugo as
"directly across" (see Chapter 9.3.1, p468).

A sitting for the stables "directly opposite" the guest house does appear on M1/336, the 1749 plan of the town and gardens [Fig 51]. However, this plan is inaccurate in its depiction of the church, the hospital, the slave lodge, the guest house and the stable itself, which is shown with a U-plan rather than the enclosed courtyard arrangement described by Kolbe.

Moreover, it cannot be argued that this depiction and Valentyn's verbal description refer to the site of the 1705 stable, and that the stable shown on the 1753 plan had been relocated. The resolution of the 15th September 1739 that the earlier stable was to be repaired and renewed ("gerepareert en vernieuwt") (De Wet, G C. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IX., 1735-1739. Pretoria, 1981, p292) was confirmed on the 12th September 1741, when it was resolved to rent the adjacent freeburgher's house and stable until the building works had been completed (De Wet, G C. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel X, 1740-1743. Pretoria, 1984, p136). It is clear, therefore, that the stable under construction on the 3rd December 1743, when timber was required for the completion of the loft (De Wet, Resolusies, Vol X, p278), was built on the site of the old one.

This could suggest that the early 18th century meaning of "regt tegen over" and "regt over", defined by Sewel as "over against" (Sewel, W. A Large Dictionary, English and Dutch. Amsterdam, 1727), was indeed that of "diagonally opposite". This meaning would explain the most notable so-called omission from E V Stade's perspective of Stellenbosch in 1710 (see Chapter 9.3.2, p480).

27 "De vierde en achterste zyde... is wel met een dak voorzien. zou dat men van buiten zoude menen, dat deze ook voltooit was..." (Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, p249).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.3.4
1 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, pp320-321. This suggestion was repeated in another letter to the Seventeen, dated the 15th April 1664 (Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p340).
4 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp333-335. This was the old water-mill, which is clearly shown in its
original position on the plan in question [Fig 43, Caption D].

5 There had been a reference to a cornmill under construction on the 22nd December 1676 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, pp306-307). This was probably the corn- and tannery-mill built within the old abbatior, as described in Chapter 7.3.6 (pp254-255). The tannery itself is not mentioned in the Journal or Resolutions, but an L-shaped "leertouwerij" is shown immediately to the south-west of the mill in Wittebol's 1679 plan of the town [Fig 45, Caption N].


18 Leibbrandt. Letters received, 1695-1708. p207.
21 The "waterhuijsje" was the upper reservoir, described in Chapter 7.4.3 (pp272-273).
NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.3.5


3 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p352. See also Chapter 7.3.6, p254.


12 See Chapter 7.5.5, p297.


18 Kolbe, P. Naauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, pp179 & 225-226. Kolbe is mistaken about the positions of the earlier hospitals (see Chapter 7.5.5, p298). The hospital which Simon van der Stel converted into an equipage warehouse adjoined the Heerengracht on its eastern side, as shown on Wittebol's plan of 1679 [Fig 45, caption P].


21 Mentzel, Description (English translation), Part I, pp107-108.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.3.6

5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p188. Another reference to the abbatior ("passer") being used for hospital patients was made on the 23rd September 1666 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, pp189-190).
10 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol III, pp138-139.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.3.7

2 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol 1, p371.
5 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape
This followed the debacle of the widow and son of his interim successor, Rutgert Mensingh, who had been unable to maintain the level of production established by their husband and father, respectively (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, pp109-110).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.3.8

5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p162. See also Chapter 11.3.3, p628.
6 Leibbrandt. Journal, 1662-1670. p168. See also Chapter 11.5.3, p638.
8 Boeseeken, Dagregister en Briewe. p389.
11 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p64.
17 Kolbe. P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, p85; and Kolbe, P. The present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis). London, 1731, Vol 2. p18. It should be noted that the English precis is particularly inaccurate with regard to this entry.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.4

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.4.1

1 Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655*. Cape Town, 1952, p47. Further mention of the unsuitability of the anchorage was made on the 22nd July and the 16th October 1652, on the 17th June 1659, and on the 24th January 1661 (see relevant dates in *Journal and Resolutions*, as outlined in Sources Consulted).


3 Thom, *Journal*, Vol I, p249. Further reports of ship careening and repairs were made in the *Journal and Resolutions* on the 4th, 17th, 24th and 31st July, and the 7th August 1655; on the 15th May and the 8th September 1657; on the 1st May 1659; on the 12th August and the 7th September 1660; on the 28th January 1661; on the 24th April 1663; on the 18th, 20th and 22nd August, and the 3rd and 19th November 1664; on the 28th May and the 15th July 1666; on the 26th May 1667; on the 16th November 1668; on the 15th March and the 1st August 1669; on the 17th June and the 30th December 1670; on the 27th September, the 21st and 25th October and the 18th November 1672; on the 19th to 25th June and on the 9th September 1676; on the 14th and 16th March 1677; on the 17th and 19th May and the 26th June 1679; on the 7th April 1681; on the 26th October 1682; on the 10th April, the 15th and 22nd June and the 26th November 1683; on the 18th April and 30th May 1684; on the 5th February 1685; on the 11th January and the 31st December 1686; on the 10th April 1690; on the 11th March 1704; and on the 20th March and the 5th October 1709 (see relevant dates in *Journal and Resolutions* as outlined in Sources Consulted).

4 Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658*. Cape Town, 1954, p8; and Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669*. Cape Town, 1957, p66. Further reports of the inadequacies of Table Bay for ship repairs were made in the *Journal and Resolutions* on the 18th October 1656, on the 4th December 1677, on the 23rd November 1694, on the 1st February 1700, and on the 4th May 1708 (see relevant dates in *Journal and Resolutions* as outlined in Sources Consulted).


6 Those mentioned in the *Journal, Resolutions* and Letters Despatched were the sloop "Robbejacht", launched on the 11th September 1655; the "Schapenjacht", completed by the 5th August 1658 when it was sold to the free Saldanha traders; the "Bruijdegom", launched on the 23rd November 1662; two boats requested by Van Riebeeck, which had arrived from Holland on the 5th February 1663 and had been assembled by the 12th; the "Bruyd", launched on the 9th October 1664; the "Voerman", launched on the 10th October 1667; a boat sent out in pieces from Holland and destined for Mauritius, largely completed by the 9th May 1672; the
"Oyster", also assembled from parts and launched by the 11th November 1672; the "Schulp", also assembled and launched on the 15th December 1672; and a vessel for the freeburgher holding the Saldanha Bay fishing rights, completed on the 2nd May 1707 (see relevant dates in Journal, Resolutions and Letters Despatched as outlined in Sources Consulted).


15 See Chapter 7.3.1, pp240-241 and Chapter 7.3.5.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.4.2

1 See Chapter 6.1, p74.

2 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc, Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p104.

3 Leibbrandt, Riebeeck's Journal, Part I, p109. The locks did not materialize and were not mentioned again, unless it was sluicegates that were being referred to.


5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, p248.


9 Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp63-64. Men were still being sent to the forest to drag beams for the jetty to the wagon road, as was mentioned on the 4th, 11th and 25th November 1656 (Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp71-73 & 75).


11 Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp81-82. The task of transporting beams for the jetty from the forest continued on the 6th and 20th January, on the 3rd and 10th February, and

12 The word "deal" could be referring to the size of timber, as well as to its type as in the present-day "Baltic Deal". A "deal" according to the "Shorter Oxford Dictionary" is: "A slice sawn from a log of timber, in Great Britain 9 inches wide, not more than 3 thick, and at least 6 feet long" (Onions, C T. Shorter Oxford Dictionary. Oxford, 1973).


14 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658, Cape Town, 1954, p103. After the fleet had left, the task of transporting the beams from the forest continued. 25 men were sent on the 20th April and 100 on the 23rd, 80 on the 3rd May and 100 on the 7th (Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp112-113 & 116-117).


17 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p337.


22 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p341.

23 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662, Cape Town, 1958, p482. This unfortunate occurrence was related to the Seventeen in a letter of the 9th April 1662 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, pp208-209).


25 Repairs to the jetty were noted in the Journal, Resolutions and Letters Despatched on the 16th December 1662, on the 21st November 1663, on the 31st May and the 5th September 1672, on the 2nd January 1673, on the 23rd August 1674, on the 1st March and the 13th December 1700, on the 25th July 1704, on the 31st March 1706, and on the 18th April 1708 (see relevant dates in Journal, Resolutions and Letters Despatched as outlined in Sources Consulted).

26 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676, Cape Town, 1902, p128. This suggests that Van Riebeeck's instructions to Wagenaer were only now being carried
out, under the Governorship of Isbrand Goske.

30 The convenience and length of the timber jetty was also mentioned by the ships' captains Jos. Haddock (1683), Georg Meister (1688), John Ovington (1693), Christoffel Langhansz (1694), John Dorrill (1696) and William Erle (1696) (Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, pp253, 343-346, 398, 410, 414-415 & 420).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.4.3

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I. Cape Town, 1898, pp190-192.
3 The first edict was promulgated on the 10th/12th April 1655 (Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaatheek, Deel I, (1652-1707). Cape Town, 1944, p18). It was followed by others on the 26th August 1656 (Jeffreys, p19; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957 pp79-80), on the 18th September 1656 (Jeffreys, p21), on the 25th/26th April 1657 (Jeffreys, p26), on the 6th February 1661 (Jeffreys, pp64-65) and on the 22nd December 1675 (Jeffreys, p133). Further regulations to prevent contamination of the water supply were discussed on the 28th December 1676 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town: 1959, pp159-165), and promulgated on the 5th January 1677 (Jeffreys, p133).
4 "Versse Revier daer men water haelt" (Caption to M2/18 [Fig 41] and M2/19 [Fig 42]).
5 "Versse Revier daer de slooten van Compagnies thuijnen uijtlopen" (Caption to M2/18 [Fig 41] and M2/19 [Fig 42]).
6 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p280.
8 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p502.
9 Leibbrandt, Letters received, 1649-1662. Part II, p341.
11 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p301.
14 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp83-84; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p63. These sailors returned to their ships on the 27th July 1663 (Boeseken, p85; and Leibbrandt, p64).
16 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p87; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p66.
17 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p87; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p66.
18 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p89; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p68.
19 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p89; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p68.
20 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p94; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p72.
21 Leibbrandt dates this entry as the 20th September 1663 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670, Cape Town, 1901, p73).
23 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p319.
24 Dated c1662 by the Cape Archives. This is incorrect, as the decision to build the reservoir was only made in the resolution of the 16th May 1663. Moreover, the drawing was received in Holland in 1663/64 (Algemeen Rijksarchief, Verzameling Kaarten: VEL 827), confirming that it was sent with the letter of the 21st November 1663.
25 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p293. Further instances of the cleaning of the reservoir, now using slave labour, were recorded on the 11th July 1672 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676, Cape Town, 1902, p63) and the 17th March 1674 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p187).
26 This might have been a fillet. The original resolution (see Note 27) reads: "...een voet hoog mede drie duijmen docerende...".
**34** Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676*. Cape Town, 1902, p6.


**37** Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1671-1676*, p63.

**38** Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1671-1676*, p135.


**42** Excavated and preserved in the "Golden Acre", a shopping complex in Cape Town.

**43** Further regulations concerning the water supply had been introduced on the 25th April 1686 (Boeseken, A J, *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707*. Cape Town, 1961, pp125-126) and on the 10th February 1687 (Boeseken, pp156-157). Again, however, the Resolutions are incomplete in this regard. The edict against the washing of clothes in the stream supplying the jetty was extended by a prohibition on the driving of cattle or wagons across it on the 25th/26th April 1686 (Jeffreys, M K. *Kaapse Plakkaatboek, Deel I (1652-1707)*. Cape Town, 1944, pp211-212). This was renewed on the 2nd January 1687 (Jeffreys, pp226-230), on the 10th/11th February 1687 (Jeffreys, pp231-232), on the 21st/22nd January 1692 (Jeffreys, pp265-271) and on the 10th January 1704 (Jeffreys, pp330-340).

**44** Botha, C G. *Collectanea: First Series*. Cape Town, 1924, p108; and Raven-Hart, A. *Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers*. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, p398. Other ships' captains who commented favourably on the water supply were Jos. Haddock (1683), Georg Meister (1688) and Christoffel Langhansz (1694) (Raven-Hart, Vol 2, pp253, 343-346 & 410). However, John Dorrill and William Erle both found in 1696 that the cistern was dry on account of the pipes having been broken (Raven-Hart, Vol 2, pp414-415 & 420).

**45** Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p12.


**47** Further repairs to the water pipes and pumps were made on the 6th March 1702 (Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1699-1732*, p47), on the 9th March 1702 (Leibbrandt, p47) and on the 22nd January 1703 (Leibbrandt, p59).

**48** Further damage to the water tanks was sustained on the 9th October 1700 (Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1699-1732*, pp31-32), but repairs were effected on the 13th December 1700 (Leibbrandt, p33), and again on the 31st March 1706 (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched, 1696-1708*. Cape Town, 1896, p281).

**49** Leibbrandt, *Letters despatched, 1696-1708*, p141.

**50** Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p231. See also Chapter 7.3.4, pp249-250.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5.1

2 Fransen and Cook also make no reference to a watch-house prior to 1716 (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, p40).
3 Fehr, W. The Old Town House. Cape Town, 1955, p11.
4 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp138-139. Fehr is therefore incorrect in stating that they assisted the military "to uphold law and order" (Fehr, Old Town House, pp11-13). It was only on the 11th September 1686 that the "ratelwagt", comprising three salaried burghers, took over the policing of the town at night (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol III, p145).

Fehr is also inaccurate in describing the hospital as "a building forming part of Van Riebeeck's old fort" (Fehr, Old Town House, p11). The hospital in question was at the lower end of the Heerengracht and had been built in 1676 after Wagenaer's hospital in the hornwork had been demolished (see Chapter 7.5.5, p297).

5 Six companies each containing thirty men would give a total of 180 members of the burgher watch. This seems excessively large, as the census for 1710 (fourteen years later) reveals only 155 houses in the town, and a total population of 500. It is more likely, therefore, that the thirty watchmen were divided into six companies, each of
which comprised only five men.


7 A "Watch House" was also mentioned on the 17th September 1699, in connection with the depredation of cattle by a lion, but this reference could have been to the freeburghers' redoubt at the Salt River (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p14).


11 Kolbe is mistaken here, as Commissioner van Hoorn arrived at the Cape only in 1710 (Boeseken, A J. Resolutions van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1962, p123).


NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5.2

1 See Chapters 6.3.2 and 6.6.3a.

2 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received. 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p344.


8 Bax, D. Die buitenkant van Kaapstad se twee Kerke aan die ou Heerengracht. Simon van der Stel Foundation. Bulletin 5. September 1962, pp5-6. (Bax's information was taken from Hulshof, A. H A Van Reede tot Drakenstein. journaal van zijn verblijf aan de Kaap. Bijdragen en mededelingen van het Historisch
11 Kolbe only arrived at the Cape in 1705, when the church had already been completed by Simon van der Stel’s successor, Wilhem Adriaen.
12 See Chapter 9.3.1, pp464-466.
13 See Chapter 6.6.3a, p152.
15 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol III, pp347-348. Evidently the Resolution of the 30th December 1677, stating that a six-foot wall would be built around the cemetery, had not yet been implemented.
17 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p175.
18 Bax, D. Die buitenkant van Kaapstad se twee Kerke aan die ou Heerengracht. Simon van der Stel Foundation, Bulletin 5, September 1962, p9. (Bax’s information was derived here from the minutes of the church council, 1665-1791. Cape Town: N G Kerkargief, p74).
25 "...men ziet derhalven boven op ’t dak, dat aan de 4 kruishoeken in malkander loopt, dat op de plaats, daar ’t anders opgehaald had moeten worden, een breed vierkant plat dak gelegt is" (Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, pp233-235).
27 Kolbe, Beschryving (Dutch translation). Vol II, p237. There was also another inscription above the Church Square entrance, but Kolbe had lost his transcription of it. This could explain his confusion about the “flat roof” in the centre of the church, if his notes on this aspect of the church had likewise been lost.
28 These "vakken" would have been the triangular spaces between the arms of the Greek cross.
29 Valentyn described these windows as also being between twenty and thirty feet high, but this must have been a slip of the pen or a printer’s error. Judging by Comfield’s 1824 drawing of the enlarged Church [Fig 81], which probably re-used the old windows, they were closer to twelve feet in height.
The present author has interpreted Valentyn's "spinnekop" as a fanlight above the doorway, although his translator, Raven-Hart, describes it as a "many-paned window". It was not a separate window between the door and the upper window, as is shown in the redrawing of "Howard's 1781 drawing" (Pearse, G E. The Cape of Good Hope 1652-1833. Pretoria. 1956. Plate 49). This is a misinterpretation of the plaster surround to the inscription above the door, as confirmed by Comfield's 1824 drawing [Fig 81] and De Meillon's perspective of 1832 [Fig 82].

These "portaalen" were probably internal lobbies rather than external porches, as will be discussed later in connection with the reconstruction of the plan. The 1727 Dutch-English dictionary (Sewel, W. A Large Dictionary. English and Dutch. Amsterdam. 1727) gives three meanings for "portaal" (porch, lobby, and portal), the second of which supports this interpretation. Moreover, a contemporary meaning of portal was "A space within the door of a room, partitioned off, and containing an inner door" (The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford, 1971).

The veined or marbled paint-work, moreover, is unlikely to have been applied to external surfaces, given the severity of the climate. Kuyper, incidentally, mentions that Hendrick de Keyser took out a patent in 1612 for the invention of artificial marble (Kuyper, W. Dutch Classicist Architecture. Delft. 1980, p28).

The canopy was probably similar to the one shown on the left of the crossing in Heydt's view of the interior of the Jaffna church [Fig 77].


These were probably pyramidal mouldings above a cornice supported by pilasters on either side of the door, as seen in depictions of the church at Stellenbosch as enlarged in 1814.


Mentzel, Description. Part I, p122. This passage was evidently taken from Valentyn, but as mentioned previously the "porches" appear rather to have been internal lobbies (see Note 31, above).

The "wooden platform" supported by the four columns could have been a ceiling over the crossing. This would explain Kolbe's misconception that the centre was flat-roofed.

Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part One. pp122-123. Mentzel also describes the seating arrangements, which correspond largely with those in the
accounts of Kolbe and Valentyn. The differences are accounted for by the changes that were almost certainly made in the eighteen years which separated Valentyn’s departure from the Cape and Mentzel’s arrival, and have therefore not been detailed here.

40 Mentzel, Description, Part I. p125. Apart from the inordinate respect accorded to the Governor, this entry is extremely important with regard to the planning of the Church. These "vestibules" were almost certainly Valentyn’s "portaalen", and correspond with the projections from the octagonal interior shown on Wentzel’s 1753 survey plan described below [Fig 78].

41 If the square projection had faced the shore instead of the hospital, this plan could have been suggesting a tower attached to a 5/8ths octagonal building. This is unlikely, however, as the written evidence gives no indication that the tower intruded on the octagonal interior of the Church.

42 It also corresponds with the gable facing Table Mountain in "Howard’s 1781 drawing" (Pearse, G E. The Cape of Good Hope 1652-1833. Pretoria, 1956, Plate 49). This drawing shows the church in its later form, when additional flat-roofed annexes had converted the Greek cross into a quincunx (Greek cross inscribed in a square). The Church Square facade had been rebuilt in the Neoclassical manner, but the gable facing the mountain had evidently been unaltered. It should be noted, however, that this drawing is suspect, and gables similar to that over the main entrance are shown in Comfield’s 1824 drawing [Fig 81] and in De Meillon’s perspective of 1832 [Fig 82].

43 There is also a hint of similar valleys in the view from the water-front [Fig 79], suggested by the interruption of the hatching of the roof.

44 See Chapter 7.5.6, Note 42.

45 Bax’s improbable exterior view of the church attempted to incorporate Kolbe’s flat roof, but is geometrically impossible at the crossing as drawn (Bax, D. Die buitenkant van Kaapstad se twee Kerke aan die ou Heerengracht, Simon van der Stel Foundation, Bulletin 5, September 1962, p8).

Fransen followed Bax in his (correct) assumption that Wentzel’s survey was accurate, although he derives his plan from the tracing in Pearse of the "1767" plan of the town (Pearse, G E. Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. Cape Town, 1968, p3).

However, although superficially similar in general outline to the present author’s reconstruction, Fransen’s plan does not correspond with the documentary evidence as regards his suggestion of the “lean-to’s” (contradicted by Stade’s perspective), the "vestry" (contradicted by Mentzel’s description of the entrances) and the absence of arches over the pulpit and the skippers’ seats (described by Kolbe).

While Fransen’s reconstruction gives an approximation of the plan, its proportional relationships are incorrect and it does not reveal the spatial complexities of the interior. It must be stressed that the reconstructed drawings presented here were made without reference to Fransen’s. His thesis and article were consulted only after the reconciliation of the original verbal and visual sources had been completed.
(Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an
investigation into stylistic modes in the architecture and applied arts at the Cape of
Good Hope 1652-1820. Pietermaritzburg, 1987, p327a; and Fransen, H. Die
Kaapse "preekkerk" en sy oorsprong. South African Journal of Cultural and Art

46 Bax, D. Die buitenkant van Kaapstad se twee Kerke aan die ou Heerengracht.
47 Bax, Kerke aan die ou Heerengracht, p12. It was opened in 1667 and received a
pitched roof only in 1735. Bax states that a description and illustration of its
appearance in c1770 are given in De Haan's "Oud Batavia" (De Haan, F. Oud
could not be traced through a computer search of South African libraries.
48 Bax, Kerke aan die ou Heerengracht, p12. This was completed in 1642 or 1643,
and demolished shortly after 1732, and is described and illustrated in "Oud Batavia"
49 Bax, D. Nederlandse invloed op de oudste Kaapse kerkgebouwen. Bulletin van de
50 Ozinga, M D. De Protestantsche Kerkgebouw in Nederland van Hervorming tot
Franschen tijd. Amsterdam, 1929, p48.
51 This was almost certainly "Architectura Moderna", published in 1631. See Chapter
12.1, pp644-645.
52 Bax, D. Nederlandse invloed op de oudste Kaapse kerkgebouwen. Bulletin van de
53 See Chapter 7.5.3, p291.
54 Brink, Y. The octagon: an icon of Willem Adriaan van der Stel's aspirations? South
55 A possible exception might be the Drakenstein church of 1717 (predating the
present Paarl church). Bax shows a "contemporary" plan in the form of an
elongated octagon (Bax, D. Nederlandse invloed op de oudste Kaapse
kerkgebouwen. Bulletin van de Koninklijke Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond,
Vol 71, No 1, 1972, Afb 1), and Fransen suggests that the church was built
according to this configuration (Fransen, H. Die Kaapse "preekkerk" en sy
oorsprong. South African Journal of Cultural and Art History, Vol 3, No 4,
October 1989, pp314-324). However, it is questionable whether this plan dates
from as early as 1717, as the graphic convention indicates a date much later in the
18th century. It is possible, therefore, that the drawing represents an alternative but
rejected design for the present Paarl church, which followed the conventional Greek
cross plan type. Further analysis of this building is inappropriate here, as it falls
outside the period of this thesis.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5.3

1 It was resolved on the 16th January 1666 that the sister of the deceased minister,
who had died four days previously, would be permitted to continue to live in this
house until the arrival of his successor (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, p339).


6 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p344.


9 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f.157; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation). Vol II, p257. This house had been built with the Company's materials, over which "Dubertino" was in charge. He was almost hanged for this offence, but was banished to Mauritius instead (see also Chapter 7.2.1, pp208-209).

10 Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, pp238-239. Kolbe's words regarding the siring of the earlier parsonage were "tegen de Kerk over staat". As will be seen below, however, it was not directly "across from the church", but diagonally opposite. This corresponds with Valentyn's description of a similar diagonal relationship between the Company's stable and guest house as "rekt tegen over" (see Chapter 7.3.3, Note 24).


13 There could be two reasons for Wittebol's incorrect annotation of a building which he himself had designed. The first is that he omitted "V" (which is not to be found on the drawing) from the Company's garden pavilion shown on plan, and omitted "W. Pastorie" from the legend (as he did with "H", which he added beneath the caption frame). The second is that the parsonage might well have been referred to as the "thuijnhuis" in the 1670s, as the first official Company's residence to have been built in the gardens. The Company's garden pavilion, significantly, was referred to as the "speelhuijsje" in an entry also dating from 1679 (see Chapter 7.6.2, p321).

14 The gardener's house shown on the 1660 cavalier perspective [Fig 56] did have a symmetrical facade, if the adjoining annexe is ignored. However, there is no evidence that its internal planning correlated with the symmetry of the facade, and it is more likely that it was a two-roomed than a three-roomed house.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5.4

2 Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp258-259. The establishment of the first school at the Cape was probably the result of Rijckloff van Goens’ instruction of 1657 that all slaves should be brought up to speak the Dutch language (Boeseken, A J. Nederlandsche Commissarissen aan de Kaap, 1657-1700. ’s-Gravenhage, 1938, pp131-133).
5 In the Resolution of 17th June 1669 (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol I, pp390-391).
8 The location of the slave schools will be discussed together with the slave lodge in Chapter 7.5.7.
9 See also Chapter 7.2.1, pp208-209 and Chapter 7.5.3, p292.
10 Boeseken, A J. Nederlandsche Commissarissen aan de Kaap, 1657-1700. ’s-Gravenhage, 1938, pp131-133. The “voorlezer” was to be appointed as schoolmaster, with a salary of 20 guilders a month, the same amount that Wittebol had received.
12 See Chapter 7.5.3, pp292-293. While Woodward has noted the relative lack of concern for privacy during this period (Woodward, C S. The interior of the Cape house, 1670-1714. Pretoria, 1982), it is unlikely that this would have been tolerated by the Fiscal and his family.
13 See also Chapter 7.5.3, pp292-293. The inn of Jan van Harwaerden cannot be cited as precedent here, as although it did have a double-pitched roof over both sides of its L-plan, it did not have a lean-to adjoining one side of its major facade (see Chapter 7.2.1, pp204 & 206-207).
18 See also Chapter 7.5.3, p292. This diagonal relationship described by Kolbe as "tegen over" is similar to Valentyn’s description of that between the Company's guest house and stables as "regt tegen over" (see Chapter 7.3.3, p246), and that
between "Colonieshuisen 1 and 3" in Stellenbosch described in the records of the Landdrost and Heemraden as "regt over" (see Chapter 9.3.1, p468). In all three cases the visual evidence suggests that the contemporary meaning of these descriptions was "diagonally opposite" rather than the literal translation of "directly opposite".


NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5.5

1 See Chapter 6.3.2.

2 There are a number of misconceptions regarding the siting of this fourth hospital, caused largely by a lack of knowledge of the location of its three predecessors. Boeseken is incorrect in describing the first hospital as being next to the smithy. (Boeseken, A J. Nederlandse Commissarissen aan de Kaap, 1657-1700. 's-Gravenhage, 1938, pp110-111). This was the second hospital, in the hornwork in front of the Fort, the first hospital having been adjoined by the stable in the kraal behind the Fort (see Chapter 6.3.2, p105).

Fehr describes the fourth hospital as located within the remains of the old Fort (Fehr, W. The Old Town House. Cape Town, 1955, p11).

Burrows attempts to clarify the issue by stating that the first hospital was erected by Van Riebeeck in the hornwork of the Fort in 1656 (but this was actually the second hospital), and was used until c1697 when it was replaced by Simon van der Stel's hospital. (Burrows, E H. The Early History of the Cape Hospitals. Quarterly Bulletin of the South African Library, Vol 11, No 3. March 1957, pp98-101).

However, even Wagenaer's hospital, which replaced Van Riebeeck's (second) hospital in the hornwork, had been demolished by 1679 as revealed in Wittebol's plan. This was replaced by a fourth hospital, on the water-front close to the Heerengracht, which was used until the opening of the new hospital beneath the Company's garden (see Chapter 7.5.6).

Raven-Hart adds to the confusion by claiming that there were only three hospitals at the Cape prior to 1710: "First, built by Van Riebeeck on shore. Second, in outworks of old Fort. Third, cruciform, opposite Church" (Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, p505).

There are two possible reasons for these misconceptions. The first concerns a resolution of the 19th March 1676, when it was decided that the patients should be moved into "the old rice warehouse", as the hospital "was in an almost irreparable condition" (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp139-140). This, however, was only a temporary measure. The second is that Kolbe and Mentzel both described the equipage warehouse as having originally been built by Van Riebeeck as a hospital. Valentyn also confused the location of this structure with its successor, which was indeed on the site of the old hornwork (see Chapter 7.3.5, pp251-253).
's-Gravenhage, 1938, pp110-111. This entry could suggest that the fourth hospital was a conversion of an existing building. However, it appears from the 1677 letter that the rice warehouse was used only as a temporary expedient while the new hospital was under construction. Moreover, this warehouse was located within the Castle (see Chapter 6.6.3b, p159), not outside on the shore as implied by Commissioner Verburgh.
6 "...soo meede onder off beneeden de vloer tot aen de beddingen te beleggen met de hier in v<o>orraet zijnde cust vioersteenen..." (see Note 7, below).
's-Gravenhage, 1938, p111. Boeseken seems to believe that this was still in the old rice warehouse, on account of the letter of the 4th April 1695, which mentions the unacceptable stench from the train-oil warehouse annexed to the hospital. However, the rice warehouse was inside the Castle (see Note 4, above), whereas the train-oil warehouse was located outside (see Chapter 7.3.2, p243).
12 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p36. (See also Chapter 6.7, p173).
15 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1699-1732, pp26-27. The "Fort" referred to here is of course the Castle, the old Fort having been long since demolished.
16 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp423-424. (See also Chapter 7.3.5, p252).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5.6

1 They were reminded of this in a letter to Middelburg dated the 30th June 1697 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp43-44).
3 Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1696-1708, pp43-44. The "Council" decision of the
3rd May 1697, however, is not to be found in the Resolutions of the Council of Policy, nor is there any record of a meeting on this date.

4 Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1696-1708. p52.

5 This plan is undated by the Cape Archives, but is described in the Algemeen Rijksarchief as having been received in Holland in 1697 (see Figure References).


Pearse, however, gives an unreferenced date of December 1694 for the commencement of the foundations, but states that “the building was not properly undertaken until July 1697” (Pearse, G E. The Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1833. Pretoria, 1956. p53).


10 Botha, C G. Collectanea: First Series. Cape Town, 1924. p34.


14 There is always the possibility that the relevant resolutions might have been lost. However, in the case of the hospital, a project of such magnitude, it is extending coincidence too far to suggest that all Council of Policy Resolutions discussing it were mislaid.

15 Since the dimensions on the scale of Rhineland roods do not correspond precisely with those on plan, the annotated dimensions have been used here.


17 In fact the length of the whole building at 288 feet is twice the relationship between 144 and 30 illustrated in Wittkower’s diagram of harmonic proportions, and the relationship between the lengths of the two arms of the cross. 288 feet and 120 feet, is a diatonic major tone (Wittkower, Architectural Principles, p133).

18 Bogaert, A. Historische Reizen door d’oostersche Deelen van Asia. Amsterdam, 1711, p101. Kolbe, Valentyn and Mentzel also transcribed this Latin inscription.

19 "...uitgang vindende na haar begeeren... tot veele en groote onheilen en transgressien." (see Note 20, below).


22 Boeseken. Resolusies. Vol IV, pp125-128. The Commissioners were the Secunde and chief administrator d'Ableing, the Fiscal Blesius, the Senior Merchant Brouwer, and the chief surgeon.

23 "...alle Europese menschen." (see Note 24, below). This suggests that the policy of not discriminating between slaves and Hollanders within the walls of the hospital had been abandoned.


25 This inspection was undertaken by d'Ableing and Blesius, assisted by the supervisor of public works Gerrit Brouwer.

26 "...kikvorschen en modderkrabben". (see Note 27, below).


28 This is not surprising, as orders to commence with the wall were only given on the 17th February 1710. Stade's view of the town from above was done on the 25th January 1710 and, although he did not give a precise date for his water-front view, it is likely that this was also drawn in the same month. The wall would therefore not yet have existed.

29 According to Kolbe, therefore, the maximum number of patients was only somewhat over 260, unless he was referring to just one of the longer wings, in which case the total would have been about 460. This would correspond more closely with the Commissioners' report of the 4th February 1710, which stated that the number of patients "sometimes increased to as many as 400 or 500" (see p302 and Note 23, above).

30 This post was abolished on the 10th February 1710, "as her office was entirely incompatible with that of a woman". Her place would be taken by an assistant cook, who was presumably given lodgings in her old dwelling (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p214). Kolbe also mentioned that as all the patients were male, her duties involved only the supervision of the provisions (see Note 31, below).

31 Kolbe. P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch Translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, pp226-229. Kolbe appears to have had a fascination about human suffering as he also gave a detailed description of a particularly ghoulish execution which he had attended.

32 Kolbe, Beschryving (Dutch Translation). Vol II, pp226-229. Kolbe's location of the prison is ambiguous, but it must have been situated next to the house of the "Oppermeester".


Although the amputation attended by Kolbe was in 1708, before the instruction of 1710 to surround the hospital with a wall, this had evidently not yet been commenced by the time of his departure in 1713.

"...dat byna zulken gevel, als de Kerk hoven zyne deuren, heeft." (See Note 37, below).


"...aan wederzyden 11 lage steene bogen heeft". Raven-Hart translates these as "low brick pillars". (See Note 39, below).


Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921. Part One, pp108-110. Mentzel’s inaccurately proportioned plan disagrees in many respects with the descriptions of Kolbe and Valentyn, most notably in the location of the houses of the chief and assistant surgeons outside the hospital. If such changes were made, they must have dated from long after Mentzel’s departure from the Cape in 1741, given that they are not shown on Wentzel’s survey plan of 1753.

Valentyn’s wall is 200 paces long by 115 wide, in comparison with Wentzel’s 30 roods by 16, i.e. 1:1.74 versus 1:1.88. Valentyn described the facade as being between 160 and 170 paces, whereas Wentzel’s measurement was 25 roods. The proportional relationship between the facade and the longer boundary wall is therefore 1:1.25 or 1:1.18 in the case of Valentyn and 1:1.2 in the case of Wentzel. In terms of proportions, therefore, the discrepancy is no more than eight percent at its greatest.

This is based on a comparison between Valentyn’s paces and the length of the boundary wall in Wentzel’s plan, which reveals that his paces were 1.8 feet long. This is the most reliable comparison, as Wentzel’s survey plan is likely to have been accurate with regard to block sizes, although he exaggerated the width of the hospital wings at 36 feet rather than the 30 annotated on the 1697 plan, as he did those of the church (see Chapter 7.5.2, p286).

Valentyn’s 160 paces (i.e. 288 feet) have been used to establish the internal dimensions of the length of the hospital in the author’s reconstruction [Fig 101]. This gives a centre-line dimension of 290 feet.

A similar application of the 1.8:1 ratio for paces to feet to the perimeter of the church reveals an equally close correspondence (see Chapter 7.5.2, p286). While a distance of 1.8 feet might appear too short for a “pace” in modern usage, where it is usually equated with a “yard” or a “metre”, the Rhineland measure had
no equivalent for a dimension of three feet. Moreover, it is not improbable that
Valentyn’s paces were identical to those he used in the solemn processions which he
performed on a weekly basis as a minister of the church. The pacing out of a
distance requires consistency of stride, and the slow and short measured pace
employed in church services would probably have been that chosen by Valentyn, in
whom it had been ingrained for many years.

43 These comprise ten in each of the long wings and one on either side of the entrance
to the shorter wing, with another on both sides of the first bay of this wing. These
would have provided the only illumination and ventilation to the cross-wing. There
must have been windows on this end, as otherwise the concerns about the location
of the boundary wall mentioned on the 17th February 1710 would have been
unfounded (see p.303).

44 However, the proportions of the lit and unlit parts of the main ward are 3:5 to the
south (but 3:10 to the north), and are repeated in the ratio of width to length in the
dysentery ward.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.5.7

1 See Chapters 6.3.2, 7.2.1, and 6.6.3b.
2 The second is still in existence, although added to in the 1750s, converted into a
Supreme Court in the early 19th century, and now serving as the Cultural History
Museum.
3 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Brieue van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666.
4 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, p350.
6 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p311. According to Geyser, “it was stated in the
Council of Policy” on the 22nd June 1670 “that the slave lodge had been in such a
decrepit state that further improvements had been done to it” (Geyser, O. The
History of the Old Supreme Court Building. Johannesburg, 1982, p21). However,
no Council meeting is recorded on this date, and the repairs referred to on the next
day, the 23rd, involved only “het equippagie als traenpackhuijs en andersinds”
(Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape
Town, 1959, p43).
7 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town,
1959, pp218-220.
8 Geyser, O. The History of the Old Supreme Court Building. Johannesburg, 1982,
pp21 & 24.
9 Geyser, Old Supreme Court, p24. It is also possible that the first lodge was
surrounded by the second, which was planned around a large courtyard, but if this
were the case, the new building would also have been damaged in the conflagration.
The gardener’s house, moreover, had certainly been on the site, necessitating its
rebuilding (see Chapter 7.1, p184).
10 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town,
1959, pp277-279.


16 Boeseken, Commissarissen, pp70-71. A single school is unlikely, not only because of the appointment of two teachers, one for the boys and the other for the girls, but also because of Kolbe’s specific description twenty years later that there were two schools in the slave lodge, one for boys and the other for girls.

17 Boeseken, A J. Memoriën en instructiën, 1657-1699. Cape Town, 1966, p198. Van Rheede was also concerned about the proximity of the church to the Castle (see Chapter 7.5.2, pp277-278).

18 For identification of the parsonage, annotated on M2/21 as "thuijnhijs", see Chapter 7.5.3, p292.


21 Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708, p33; and Leibbrandt, H C V. The Defence of Willem Adriaan van der Stel (English translation). Cape Town, 1897, p38.


24 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in “Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien”. Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p f.18; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Part I, p101. This figure could have been based on hearsay, however, as he mentions later that the census of the 31st August (year not given) recorded a total of 440 Company’s slaves (Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol II, pp242-243). Mentzel records an identical figure in his transcription of a census which he states was taken after the smallpox epidemic of 1713 (Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1925, Part Two, pp126-127). However, as his figures for the freeburghers correspond exactly with those of the 1709 census cited by Valentyn (see Chapter 7.1, p192), this may have been a case of plagiarism.

25 The slave lodge is unfortunately completely obscured by the church in Stade’s view.
of the town from the anchorage [Fig 79].

26 This would correspond with the outline shown on M2/21 [Fig 75] and with Wildt’s plan of the slave lodge prior to alteration [Fig 104]. The latter plan, however, is of Rijk Tulbagh’s slave lodge dating from the mid-18th century, but it was on the same site as the original building.


31 (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971. Vol I, pp100-101). His translator Raven-Hart, however, is mistaken in suggesting that Valentyn plagiarized Kolbe by stating that the lodge was built across the entire width of the gardens. Valentyn’s description of the siting of the lodge in relation to the garden as “langs zyne breedte” referred to the fact that the lodge was located parallel to the lower end of the gardens, not that it was “across its breadth”. Moreover, Valentyn’s 77 paces for the length of the lodge are considerably less than his 293 paces for the total width of the garden.


34 Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1925. Part Two, p125.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.6

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.6.1

1 See Chapter 7.1, pp176-180.


3 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe. p320.

4 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe. p340. See also Chapter 6.3.2, p117.

5 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe. p415.


7 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p304.


10 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch
12 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol II, pp288-290. This was evidently the wall referred to by Meister in 1677.
19 Botha, Collectanea, pp123-124.
27 Kolbe, Beschryving (Dutch translation), Vol II, pp243-245.
28 Kolbe, Beschryving (Dutch translation). Vol II, p244. His English translator stated that the garden contained "a Bowling Green, and a commodious Ground for the Game of Nine Pins" (Kolbe, P. The Present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis). London, 1731, Vol 2, p87). Although he was certainly guilty of omission in his abridgement of Kolbe's original German text, he appears here to be guilty of embellishment, as no reference to these facilities exists in the Dutch translation.
31 Valentyn states that the gateway was on the eastern side, although the entrance was actually from the north-west, at the upper end of the Heerengracht. In this respect
he concurs with Kolbe, and was possibly working off the latter's inaccurate plan.


33 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Part I, pp100-101.

34 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Part I, pp100-103. Valentyn’s "paces" correspond closely with Kolbe’s "feet" with regard to the width of the avenues in the garden.

35 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Part I, pp102-105.


37 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f.139; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Part II, p221.

38 Bax states that the menagerie was built by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel, but this is contradicted by the accounts of Kolbe and Mentzel. In Kolbe’s time (1713) the upper end of the garden was used only for pasturing the Governor’s dairy cattle, while in Mentzel’s time (1741) it was used as an enclosure for the draught oxen of the inland farmers visiting the town. Bax was possibly confused by the room of stuffed animals in the Company’s guest house (Bax, D and Koeman, C. Argitektoniese Skoonkeid in Kaapstad se Kompanjiestuin 1777-1805. Cape Town, 1963, p59).


NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.6.2


2 This plan does show a building annotated "thuijnhsij" immediately to the east of the projected slave lodge. This building, however, did not communicate directly with the garden and was almost certainly the first parsonage. It is possible that this was referred to as "thuijnhsij" at the time, as it was the first official’s residence to have been erected in a subdivision of the gardens. Moreover, the guest house was described as a "speelhuijsje" in the same year, 1679. (See also Chapter 7.5.3, p292).

3 Boese'ken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp285-288. The fact that it was already in existence by 1679 contradicts Fransen and Cook’s statement that it was erected by Simon van der Stel only in 1682 (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, p44).

6 Tachard, G. A Relation of the Voyage to Siam (English translation). London, 1688, pp49-50. The quotations throughout are taken from the English translation, but significant words from the French original are included in brackets (Tachard, G. Voyage de Siam. Paris, 1686).
7 Tachard, Voyage to Siam, pp52-53.
8 See Chapter 7.2.1, pp 211-214 & 217-218 and Chapter 7.2.2, pp221-224.
10 See Chapter 9.3.7, p529, and Fig 224.
11 Pearse suggests that its form might have inspired the "Dak kamer" houses found in the town (Pearse, G E. Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. Cape Town, 1968, p38). These, however, were only built much later in the 18th century, long after the first garden house had been demolished.
13 Raven-Hart states that this was Constantia, but it is more likely to have been Rustenburg, which is referred to elsewhere as being used for accommodating distinguished guests (see Chapter 8.3.1b) (Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: the first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, pp323-324).
14 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: the first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, pp323-324. Raven-Hart also draws attention to the fact that Tachard had written that the earlier guest house had been demolished in 1686.
17 Commissioner van Rheede was at the Cape from the 19th April until the 16th July 1685. Apart from the fact that the "speelhuijsje" had already been specifically mentioned in 1679, Tachard was given accommodation there on his arrival in June 1685, during the period of Van Rheede's visit. Valentyn arrived only on the 24th September 1685, after the departure of the Commissioner, when the original building was still in existence.
19 Fransen and Cook state that the earlier garden house "built in 1682 by Simon van der Stel", stood on a site "now covered by the House of Assembly" (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, p44). This is
contradicted by Tachard's evidence and by that of the maps of the time. The "thuijnhuijs" annotated on M2/21 [Fig 75], moreover, is not on the site described by Fransen and Cook (see Note 2, above).


23 Fransen and Cook are therefore mistaken in their statement that "Willem Adriaan van der Stel in 1700 built a new lodge for housing visitors, higher up the garden" (Fransen. H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, p44).

25 Leibbrandt. H C V. Letters despatched. 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896. p290. The garden house and its adjoining kitchen were also used for grain storage in 1707, as mentioned on the 15th April (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched. 1696-1708, p321) and 12th July (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched. 1696-1708, p335).


27 Kolbe also transposes the conventional use in English of "depth" and "width" in his description of the gardens themselves (see Chapter 7.6.1, p318).

28 This is the usual translation, which does correspond with later descriptions of these animals. However, Kolbe's Dutch translator actually wrote: "...allerhande wilde dieren, met hooi of stroo door den Opper-Tuinman, Johannes Hertzog op-opgezet (sic)" (see Note 29, below). Given that the contemporary meaning of "opgezet" was "designed" as well as "set up" (Sewel, W. A Large Dictionary. English and Dutch. Amsterdam, 1727), these could have been straw "sculptures" of wild animals, smaller than life-size. If they really were full-size stuffed animals, the room would have been too cluttered to have been of any use other than as a natural history museum.

29 This is the usual translation, which does correspond with later descriptions of these animals. However, Kolbe's Dutch translator actually wrote: "...allerhande wilde dieren, met hooi of stroo door den Opper-Tuinman, Johannes Hertzog op-opgezet (sic)" (see Note 29, below). Given that the contemporary meaning of "opgezet" was "designed" as well as "set up" (Sewel, W. A Large Dictionary. English and Dutch. Amsterdam, 1727), these could have been straw "sculptures" of wild animals, smaller than life-size. If they really were full-size stuffed animals, the room would have been too cluttered to have been of any use other than as a natural history museum.

Valentyn claims to have seen the following "rare beasts" during his visit of 1714: two "roebucks" (kudus), one eland, one small rhinoceros, one "Rossen bok" (unidentified), one young "sea-calf" (hippopotamus), one "dappled wild ass" (zebra), a lion and a lioness, a "seacow" (hippopotamus) and "many other rare skeletons of beasts which I did not know" (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, pp108-109).

It is improbable that these large animals could all have been stored in a room of 18 by 11 feet, even if it was not subdivided. Moreover, Valentyn's description of the guest house itself is too inaccurate (in comparison with Kolbe's) to suggest that it was made on the basis of personal observation, as will be discussed further in the text. It is likely, therefore, that his account of the stuffed animals was also based on hearsay, and that Kolbe could well have been referring to miniatures.

30 Kolbe, *Beschryving* (Dutch). Vol II. pp246-247 & 408. Pearse describes this as a "Schneckenstige" (spiral staircase), a detail omitted from the Dutch translation (Pearse, G E. *Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa*. Cape Town, 1968, p39). A staircase of this type has already been noted in the "cat" of the original Fort (see Chapter 6.3.2, p107 & Fig 8).


34 Valentyn's translator describes these as "two fine rooms on both sides of this passage", and the original is ambiguous in stating: "Dit huisje heeft aan weerszijden van dien trant twee fraaje kamers" (Valentyn, *Beschryvinge* (English translation), Vol I, pp107-109; and Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien"*. Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p 1.20). Valentyn, however, was probably referring to two rooms in total, as stated explicitly by Kolbe. These would have been too small for entertainment purposes if they had been subdivided. It is interesting, though, that Valentyn is more explicit than Kolbe in stating that there were also "twee zulke kamers" above.

35 Valentyn does not give dimensions for the garden house, but Mentzel (1741) concurs with Kolbe in stating that there was "a commodious summer-house for the Governor, 40 feet by 18" (Mentzel, O F. *A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope* (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part One, pp118-119). Mentzel, however, could well have derived these figures from Kolbe, as he had nothing further to write about the building.


37 Pearse believed that Kolbe had also described the house as flat-roofed, but missed the reference to the loft (Pearse, G E. *Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa*. Cape Town, 1968, p39).

38 The probable inaccuracy of Valentyn with regard to the second guest house indicates the necessity for evaluating the evidence prior to the process of architectural analysis. When Valentyn writes from personal observation he is invaluable, but when he derives his material from other sources he is often obfuscatory. The same applies to Kolbe, who in this case appears to be the more reliable of these two sources.


40 The precise dimensions are 21 feet deep and 20.5 wide for the central hall, 23.75
wide for the room to the north and 24 wide for the one to the south, both of which had a depth of 20.5 feet. These are internal dimensions. However, dimensions derived from existing structures should not be taken too seriously with regard to buildings dating from the period of this thesis. The rebuilding of the guest house in the 1750s could well have ignored the original foundations, which were probably already suspect. Pearse was the first to set the dangerous precedent of subtracting from the present in order to establish the past, a practice which has continued to give a distorted representation of the early architecture at the Cape.

41 See Chapter 8.5 (p391), Chapter 8.3.1c (p370), and Chapter 8.3.1b (p368).
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1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, pp100-102.
3 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, p228.
5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, pp224-226.
11 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p118.
12 Van Riebeeck had been granted a farm behind the Lion Mountain, but later exchanged it for the more fertile lands at Boscheuvel. Although this exchange did receive official approval, it was not in Table Valley but was the furthest farm from the Fort (see Chapter 8.1, pp338-339). Other officials to have held lands in Table Valley prior to the Governorship of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel were Commander Wagenaer and Acting Commander Crudop, but these were within the spirit of this

13 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p176.
14 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p211.
23 Raven-Hart (Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation). Vol I, p198) states that this building was erected in 1701 on land bought from the widow of Hendrik Bernhard Oldenland, as mentioned in Note 63 of the transcription of the Resolutions, concerning the Fiscal's accommodation allowance (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad; Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1962, p144). Boeseken is incorrect, however, in assuming that this entry referred to Leeuwenhof. It was almost certainly referring to Blesius' house in the town, as he would not have been given an accommodation allowance for a private garden.
Fransen and Cook state that the house was built in 1697, but do not reveal their source (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, p76).
Fagan (Gwen) states that Blesius' title to Leeuwenhof was renewed on the 28th March 1698, in full ownership rather than as the loan-farm which he had previously been granted. She concurs with Fransen and Cook in suggesting that the house had already been built in 1697. However, it is unlikely that such a large building would have been erected on land that was only loaned to the Fiscal. It is more probable that he built it only after he had full title to the land.
Fagan also concurs with Raven-Hart and Boeseken in suggesting that this was the house referred to in Blesius' application of 1710 for an accommodation allowance.
(see Chapter 7.2.1, pp212-213), but this could not have been built prior to 1701, given the Fiscal’s statement that he had lived there for nine years.

Fagan suggests, moreover, that this was the double-storeyed house described by Valentyn in 1705 (see Chapter 7.2.1, pp212-214), and the house which was compared with Vergelegen in Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel’s "Korte Deductie" (see Chapter 9.5, p541). Fagan, G. Leeuwenhot: Restorasi van die slawehuis, bo-tuin en die werf. Part 1. Restorica 12. Simon van der Stel Foundation, p37.

However, the Fiscal’s house described by Valentyn was his town house, as revealed in the resolutions of 1710 concerning the Burgher watch-house (see Chapter 7.1, pp193-194 and Chapter 7.5.1, pp274-275). Moreover, it was almost certainly this house, which according to Valentyn was similar to Hüsing’s town house and thus a refined version of the earlier garden house at Leeuwenhof, that Van der Stel cited in his defence.

24 See Chapter 7.2.1, pp211-214.
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1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal. 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p120.
4 Bogaert, A. Historische Reizen door d'oostersche Deelen van Asia. Amsterdam, 1711, p98.
5 Valentyn agreed with Bogaert’s suggestion that the guard-house was on the summit of Lion’s Head, but acknowledged that men were also posted in the Kloof (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p f.10; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behoorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Part I, p69).
7 Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part One, pp95-98.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7.6.5

2 Valentyn confuses the date of this event, however, giving 1681 as the date of Van
Goens' departure in his account of 1695, and 1682 as the date of the ascent in his account of 1714 (Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f.10; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol I, p69). Kolbe states in contrast that the monument was dated 1680, as outlined below (see Note 3).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.1

5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck’s Journal, etc. Part I, Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p141.
7 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, pp144-146.
11 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, p222.
14 These two plots also appear on M1/15, another map of 1656.
20 Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp103-104. The surveyor was sent out again on the 29th March to beacon off the shortest line across the Cape Flats (Thom, Journal, Vol II, p105), and further surveys of the Peninsula were undertaken on the 7th and 26th April 1657 (Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp109 & 114-115).
21 The Cape Archives’ dating of 1734 is obviously far too late, but the Algemeen Rijksarchief’s statement that this map arrived from the Cape in 1656 is also suspect. Since it shows “drie burgers huijsjes van de uitgegeven landerijen” it must date
from 1657 at the earliest, unless this was referring to their intended location.


23 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p250. Van Riebeeck did write to the Seventeen for approval of his land grant on the 17th May 1657, unlike Simon and Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel, later in the period of this thesis (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p320).


25 Thom, Journal. Vol II, p119. Van Riebeeck had suggested, however, in a letter to the Seventeen dated the 25th March 1656, that the freeburghers should be entrusted with all the farming activities (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p236).


33 This point was also made in Boeseken, A J. Nederlandsche Commissarissen aan de Kaap, 1657-1700. 's-Gravenhage, 1938, pp25-26.
34 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, pp256-269.
42 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p88.
43 Leibbrandt, Letters received, 1649-1662. Part II, p102.
44 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III. Cape Town, 1900, pp122-123. Van Riebeeck also informed the Seventeen, on the 19th March 1660, that he had no intention of expanding the settlement beyond the Bosbergen (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1652-1662. Vol III, pp139-140).
It was recorded on the 7th May 1660, however, that the lands on the Peninsula comprised only 152 morgen. The Company owned 50 morgen. Van Riebeeck 35 morgen, and the remaining 67 morgen were held by the seven freeburghers. They were Jacob Cloeten (10 morgen), Jacob Rosendael (15 morgen), Steven Janssen (16 morgen), Harman Remajenne (9 morgen), Jan Martenssen (3 morgen), Caspar Brinckman (10 morgen) and Pieter Vasagie (4 morgen). Significantly, only one of the freeburghers mentioned on the 9th August 1659 appears here, perhaps explaining the smaller area of cultivation recorded (Thom, Journal. Vol 111, pp215-216).

The Cape Archives dating is not confirmed by the Algemeen Rijksarchief, but the map was received in Holland in 1661 (see Figure References).

This information has been transcribed in M1/381 [Fig 120], which also appears in Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town, 1954, opp p318.

The 1657 map, M3/9 [Fig 112], depicts more farms along the eastern banks of the Liesbeeck River than the 1660 map, M1/16 [Fig 113]. Perhaps some of these had been consolidated, but the visual evidence is nevertheless contradictory.

Boeseken also suggests that Van Riebeeck had three farms at the time of his departure from the Cape (Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenae, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, p232; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p166. But here she is incorrect. He had already handed over the first
one at Sea Point to the Company for grazing lands, and "Uijtwijck" and "Boscheuvel" appear to have been different names for the same farm, as revealed in the Journal and Resolutions.

65 Bommelshoek was not on the Peninsula, but close to the Blaauwberg (see Chapter 9.2.1. pp431 & 434).
66 Rietvallei was also not on the Peninsula, but on the present Diep River (see Chapter 9.2.1. pp431 & 435).
73 See Chapter 7.2.1. pp211-214.
75 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol III. pp232-233. (The Cape District extended beyond the Cape Peninsula to the Blaauwberg and Koebberg areas).
80 See also Stellenbosch (Chapter 9.2.3, p443) and Drakenstein (Chapter 9.4.3, p535).
81 Kolbe arrived at the Cape only in 1706 and left in 1713.
82 The battery shown to the north-west of the Castle had only been discussed in 1710, and was not commenced until 1715 (see Chapter 6.7, pp173-174), and there is no evidence in the written sources of the windmill shown at the mouth of the Salt River.
"Rust en werk" could have been another farm, as it is indicated beyond Rustenburg on M/1/1177 [Fig 118], but its outline as depicted here corresponds with that of the "Rustenburg" shown on M/1/1162 and M/1/1164 [Figs 115 & 116], although not annotated on the latter map. The first accurate plans of Rustenburg [Fig 126] and Nieuwland [Fig 127] both date only from 1791 (see Chapters 8.3.1b and 8.3.1c).

This map must date from between 1700 and 1710, given that both Nieuwland and Vergelegen are depicted. Moreover, it is probably no later than 1707, the date of Willem Adriaen van der Stel's recall, as the extent of his father's lands at Constantia is withheld from the Directors, the farm being inaccurately located above the town and the Company's gardens.
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2 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, p274.
3 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, pp144-146.
4 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p90. Rijckloff van Goens also mentioned the dangers of the Hout Bay anchorage in his report of the 16th April 1657 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p321).
8 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, p230.
15 This was probably M1/15 |Fig 121|, as the watch-houses are indicated.
17 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters and documents received, 1649-1662*. Part I. Cape Town, 1898, p296.
29 Leibbrandt, *Letters received, 1649-1662*. Part II, p220. The Rondebosch redoubt was begun first, however, and that at Harman's lands was postponed, together with the one at Boscheuvel.
31 Although the moat was outside the rampart in military works, it must be stressed that the primary purpose of this fortification was to confine the local Khoi within the Peninsula. A moat on the inner side would therefore be more appropriate.
32 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol II. Cape Town, 1900, pp310-312.
The Cape Archives' dating of 1734 is too late, as the Castle is not shown, while the Algemeen Rijksarchief's statement that M2/19 (Verzameling Kaarten: VEL 805) was received in Holland in 1656 cannot be correct, as the survey of the shortest line across the Cape Flats was undertaken only in 1657 (see Figure References).


61 This was the first recorded instance of prefabrication at the Cape.


66 This was followed on the 20th/21st September 1659 by an edict prohibiting the freeburghers from damaging the "pega-pega" (Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaatboek, Deel I (1652-1707). Cape Town, 1944. pp51-52).


69 This reconstructed map appears to have been compiled from material found in a number of different primary sources.


71 Thom, Journal. Vol III, pp185-186. Van Riebeeck described the hedge as similar to those found in Germany in the district of Cologne. These also had watch-towers and heavily barred entrances.

72 Thom, Journal. Vol III, pp204-205. An edict of the 13th March 1660, however, states that the barrier was at the "Keert-de-Koe" watch-house, and not between the two (Leibbrandt. H C V. Letters and documents received. 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, pp486-488). This is confirmed by a reference of the 27th May 1660, outlining the duties of the mounted guards (see Note 74, below).


74 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town,
The Council had resolved on the 24th May to attempt to enlist some of the survivors from a French ship, wrecked at Salt River, to assist with the ploughing. However, there is no mention of whether they were successful in their attempt (Thom, Journal, Vol III, pp224-227; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, p242).

Neither the cause of the damage nor Van Riebeeck’s remedial specification are mentioned in the Journal or Resolutions.

The source of this information is unknown, as it does not appear on any of the maps in the Cape Archives or in the Algemeen Rijksarchief.

98 Ras, Kasteel, p48.

99 Ras, Kasteel, p50. The idea that a redoubt at the Boscheuvel could afford protection to the anchorage in False Bay does stretch the imagination, however, as it does the effective range of the cannon in question.


101 Raven-Hart, Cape Good Hope, 1652-1702. Vol 1, p157. Raven-Hart comments on the fact that the inland expedition noted on the plan of the Peninsula illustrated in the account of Nieuhof [Fig 122] (who visited the Cape at the same time as Padbrugge) is not mentioned in the Journal. This is probably because the plan, and its indication of the proposed canal, dates from his earlier visits of 1658 and 1659. These would correspond more closely with the small number of houses depicted in the town.


103 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676. p258.


106 Although undated, this map is similar in almost all respects to a number of surveys of the Peninsula and False Bay dated 1687. They are M1/982, M1/974-977 and M1/978-981, the second of which has imaginative but unlikely drawings of the buildings.

107 Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg: South Africa's oldest existing inhabited building. Lantern, April 1983, pp3-12. On the other hand, it could have been Simon van der Stel's fishing post, as suggested later (see Chapter 8.6).
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.1

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.1a

3 These "uyltatingen", which were unfortunately not described, were incorrectly translated by Leibbrandt as "exits" (see Note 4, below).
5 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, p76.
7 See Chapter 8.6.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.1b

1 See Figures 115, 116 and 117 for the location of Rustenburg.
2 Woodward mentions that Bax suggested that Rustenburg "was probably built in 1663, because on August 31st of that year the Dagregister refers to 'het nieuwe huijs'" (Woodward, C S. The interior of the Cape house, 1670-1714. Pretoria, 1982, pp22-23). This, however, was the replacement for the gardener's original house of reeds. It is thus more likely that Rustenburg was the house built in 1666, described in the letter to the Seventeen dated the 22nd May. The earlier house, significantly, was not double-storeyed, but merely had a loft above (see Chapter 8.3.1a).
3 Fransen mentions a plan of 1666 which "already shows the axis of the house (Rustenburg) extended as an avenue, as far as the Liesbeeck River in front and up the lower slope of Devil's Peak behind" (Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an investigation into stylistic modes in the architecture and applied arts at the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1820. Pietermaritzburg, 1987, p313). However, he gives no reference for the plan in question.
6 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961. pp54-55. The exiled King of Tambora was also detained at Rustenburg, as mentioned on 10th March 1708 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters Despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town. 1896, p343).
10 Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town. 1971, Vol 2, p253. Raven-Hart suggests that Captain Haddock was describing the Constantia property, but this is incorrect, as the land grant was made only in 1685.
12 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 4, pp c.130-131; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol II, p279. It is possible, though, that Valentyn was deliberately misinformed, and that Simon van der Stel was actually living in his own house at Constantia.
13 Boeseken, A J. Memoriën en instructien, 1657-1699. Cape Town. 1966. p218. The pressing-house was almost certainly at Rustenburg, as there is no other reference to a similar Company's building elsewhere in Rondebosch.
15 This again raises uncertainty as to whether this was the gardener's house erected in 1663 or the later house of 1666. The earlier house, however, could have been used for another purpose after the erection of the later, as suggested in Note 16, below.
16 This was probably the gardener's house erected in 1663. Its description as "low" suggests the single-storeyed building outlined above, in comparison with the double-storeyed Rustenburg.
19 "...een zeer proper huis... met verscheide gemakkelijke vertrekken boven en onder..." (Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p f.29; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol I, p131).
21 For the possible mention of an outside kitchen at Rustenburg, see Chapter 8.3.2b, p379.
22 For the outside kitchen at the guest house in the Company's garden, see Chapter 7.6.2, p327.
23 For Mentzel's unfavourable comments on Rustenburg, see Chapter 8.3.1c, p370.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.1c

3 The farm is shown along the banks of the Salt River, rather than the Liesbeeck River, and is described as "Nieu warmoes land groot 40 morgen". This was almost certainly a depiction of the intended "Nieuwland", and it corresponds in size with Valentyn's description of the extent of the property (see Chapter 8.1, p346).
4 Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part One, pp120-121.
7 Visser dates Barrow's watercolour as c1790, but John Barrow arrived at the Cape only in 1797, as Private Secretary to the Governor, Lord Macartney.
9 Visser, Newlands House, p26.
11 Brink, The octagon, p93.
12 See Mentzel's disparaging comments on the original Constantia (Chapter 8.5, pp391-392).
13 See Chapter 7.5.2, pp289-290.
14 Wilhem Adriaen was in Holland from 1684/1685 until 1698, and had access to upper-class circles (see Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy kinders. Cape Town, 1964, pp46, 156-157 & 225).
15 See Chapter 7.6.2, pp321-323.
16 The possibility of the original Nieuwland being double-storeyed is speculative, and largely dependent on whether Mentzel actually saw the original building or relied on secondary sources for his account of its successor. Nevertheless, Nieuwland appears to have been similar in plan to Rustenburg and the Company's guest house in the garden above Cape Town, both of which are clearly indicated in the primary sources as having been double-storeyed.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.2

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.2a

8 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p344. The palisades mentioned here were evidently referring to the kraal, and the planks to the sheds, as a palisaded structure in either case would not have required a cladding of planks. The structure of the sheds, therefore, would have comprised a number of poles spaced at intervals, rather than adjoining each other, as suggested by Vos (see Chapter 7.2.2, Note 62).
12 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp265-266. Although the cattle kraal at Rietvallei was mentioned in the same context, it was not on the Peninsula.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.2b

2 See Chapter 12.2 (p648) and Chapter 12.1 (pp644-646).

The first concerns Commissioner Pieter van Hoorn's account of his visit to the Cape in 1663. He describes the granary as being under construction, although the Journal entry of the 31st August merely states that he had seen it and the "nieuwe huijs" at the orchard. There is no mention of work in progress, and it is possible that Raven-Hart mistranslated this entry (Raven-Hart, Vol 1, p76).

Abraham van Riebeeck also made a cryptic entry in his journal of his visit in 1676. This stated that the granary had "now been somewhat enlarged and built up around with hewn stone" (Raven-Hart, Vol 1, pp191-192). However, the stone probably referred to the kraal walls, given the entry of the 18th April 1708 referred to above in the text.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.2c


NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.2d

2 Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp383-384; and Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol I, pp179-180. The wording of this entry suggests that the bridge had been recently erected for the purpose outlined above, but there is no description of its construction.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.3.2e

1 Hout Bay was first inspected on the 1st October 1652 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck; Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, pp65-66).
2 False Bay was first inspected on the 6th August 1653 (Thom. Journal, Vol I, p167).
3 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp212-213. The text reads "ter gewoonlijke plaatse", which suggests that False Bay was already a regular venue for the careening of ships.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.4

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p92.
7 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck; Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town, 1954, p155. They were from the ship Rotterdam, but unfortunately their names and towns of origin were not provided.
14 Thom, Journal, Vol II, pp390-402. For alternative interpretations of early timber houses as log-cabins (Woodward) or as having palisaded walls (Vos), see Chapter 7.2.2, pp231-232 and Note 62.
20 None of the standard works on Cape Dutch architecture deals with this evidence, and one is thereby given the impression that the first use of fortified farmhouses was by the British settlers on the Eastern Frontier, as outlined by Lewcock
21 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp160-167. This was also translated in the Attestations (24th December 1659) as a "crevice or a peep-hole" (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662, Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p434).
25 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenaar, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, p305. This workshop was probably the "house" rented by the free smith and the free wagon-maker, erected three years later in 1666 (see Chapter 8.3.1a, p366).
26 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp158-159; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, pp119-120. The fact that this type was not uncommon in the early architecture of the Cape has been discussed by Walton, although he does not mention this first known example (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989). An even earlier example of people and animals sharing the same roof was that of the hospital-stable in the Fort, dating from 1653 (see Chapter 6.3.2, p105).


33 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters and documents received, 1649-1662*. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p472.

34 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p51.


**NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.5**


6 Van der Stel, W A. *Korte Deductie*. Amsterdam, 1708, p91.


9 It is not widely acknowledged that Simon van der Stel was dismissed from his post as Governor at the Cape, as outlined in a letter from the Seventeen to the Council of India dated the 27th December 1697. (Boeseken, *Simon van der Stel en sy kinders*. Cape Town, 1964, pp154-155). Since he was allowed to retire to his estate at Constantia, the impression is given in most secondary sources that he relinquished his post voluntarily. This was not the case, however, and it is interesting that one of the reasons for his dismissal was the brevity of his letters to the Seventeen regarding architectural developments at the Cape.

10 "From the upper Front- Windows you have a charming Visto..." (see Note 11, below).


12 For the probable location of Simon van der Stel's "Fish-House" at Muizenberg, see Chapter 8.6.

13 Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost


16 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel, p157.
17 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel, pp207-208.
18 Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, pp5-6.


20 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 4, p c.160; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol II, p287.

21 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 4, p c.160.
22 Fransen translates this as "2 or 3 flights of steps" in an attempt to explain the presence of an entrance staircase in his reconstruction (Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, p15). Had it been so elaborate, however, Valentyn would surely have given it at least as much attention as he did to the simpler staircase in the courtyard, which he describes in detail.


24 Raven-Hart, A. Scenes from the Cape of Good Hope in 1741 as drawn by Johann Wolfgang Hevdt. Cape Town, 1967, ppl0-12.


27 See the descriptions of Kolbe and Valentyn, quoted above.

28 It has been argued by Roosegaarde-Bisschop and Fransen that Stade's dwarf-gables
were actually pedimented dormers, as shown in Heydt's engraving of Constantia in 1741 (see also Chapter 7.2.2, pp232-235).

It is argued here, however, that Stade's "triangles" were accurate depictions of simplified versions of these features, brought about by technical problems. The only other examples of pedimented dormers at the Cape were those depicted on the original Fort [Figs 9 & 10], if they were built at all, at Rosensburg, where they could well have been later (as discussed in Chapter 7.2.2, pp233-234), and in Rach's drawing of Market Square dating from as late as 1762 [Fig 66]. Stade was therefore probably showing a Cape innovation, not to be found in Holland.

29 This arrangement of a hipped roof with a full-height centre gable flanked by dormers or smaller gables was not uncommon in Holland. A particularly elaborate example is the Kloveniersdoelen in Middelburg, built from 1607 to 1611 and sold to the VOC for a recruiting centre in 1788 (Overvoorde, J C and De Roo de la Faille, P. De Gebouwen van de Oost-Indische Compagnie en van de West-Indische Compagnie in Nederland, 's-Gravenhage, no date, pp78-79. Fig 30).

30 Kendall states that Heydt's engraving shows wings of equal length, but the left-hand wing is one-third longer than the other, as scaled with dividers. Kendall probably made this error on the basis of his findings on site, which suggested that the original building had equally long rearward wings (Kendall, F K. The Restoration of Groot Constantia. Cape Town, 1927, p23).


32 Kendall, F K. The Restoration of Groot Constantia. Cape Town, 1927, Fig XIII. Fransen's reconstruction is based on Kendall's, but attempts to incorporate the material in Stade's drawing and Valentyn's description (which were unavailable to Kendall) without reconciling their discrepancies with Kendall's findings (Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, pp14 & 19).

33 Kendall, Restoration of Groot Constantia, pp15-16.

34 Kendall, Restoration of Groot Constantia, p23.


40 Kendall, Restoration of Groot Constantia, pp16-17.

41 Kendall, Restoration of Groot Constantia, pp26-27.

42 The cellars on either side of the present courtyard staircase have no such openings, but continue uninterrupted through their full depth, as shown on Fransen's cellar plan (Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, p14).

44 Kendall, Restoration of Groot Constantia, pp24-25 & Fig XIV.
47 Fransen, Groot Constantia, p19.
50 Fransen, Groot Constantia, p17.
52 Fransen, Groot Constantia, p18.
53 See Note 22, above.
54 Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, p17.
55 Fransen, Groot Constantia, p29.
56 Fransen, Groot Constantia, p17.
57 Fransen, Groot Constantia, p22. The raising of the ground level by 3.5m would have required an inordinate volume of fill, given that the present ground level does not rise towards the facade.
59 Burrows' argument that the "red" referred to the red wine of Groot Constantia as opposed to the white wine of Klein Constantia is therefore more likely (Burrows, E H. The age of the manor-house of Groot Constantia. Africana Notes and News. Vol 6. 1948, p8).
60 This is the most likely explanation for such an extensive use of clinkers in the second Constantia. Van der Stel probably used them because he was concerned about the load-bearing capacity of local stock-bricks, having probably read in the Cape records about the collapse of the double-storeyed Secretariat in the old Fort in 1663 (see Chapter 6.3.2, pp115-116).
His concern would later be justified by the failure of the upper storey of the first Stellenbosch drostdy, also built with local bricks (see Chapter 9.3.3, pp484-485).
61 Despite Fransen's contention that "no Cape home owner in his right mind would ever consider" such a course of action (Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, p26).
62 Kendall's elevation shows clinkers to the full height for the first 40 feet, but only at cellar height for the remaining 30 feet. This could suggest that Cloete's first building was even more asymmetrical, and that the back room was omitted, but this is contradicted by Kendall's plan which shows clinkers extending as far as the back wall, which was built of the later blue bricks. It could be that the depiction of these
in elevation on the superstructure was due to the replacement of single casements with double casements when Cloete enlarged the house.

63 The reconstructed plan suggests, therefore, that the omission of the wall between the two rooms to the right, and the reduction of the one to the left of the “voorhuis” to give passage access to the room at the end, were alterations to the original design. These would probably have been contemporary with the enlargements of c1792, and would have been in keeping with the pretension of the new building.

64 All dimensions are based on centre-lines, which appears to have been the convention of the time, judging by the contemporary plans of the hospital [Fig 98] and Vergelegen [Fig 229].

65 As seen in the correspondence between Valentyn’s measurements in the hospital and the church, his paces were about 1.8 feet long. Fransen was therefore partially correct in stating that Valentyn’s dimensions were exaggerated, but only in terms of his paces. Significantly there was no Dutch measure for a length of three feet, and Valentyn’s paces appear to have been considerably shorter than this (see Chapter 7.5.6, Note 42).

66 Woodward also suggested that galleries at this time might have been arcaded, but not with specific reference to Constantia (Woodward, C S. The interior of the Cape house, 1670-1714. Pretoria, 1982, pp27-31).

67 Precedent for the lateral stair halls at Constantia is seen at Heerengracht 495, Amsterdam, built in c1670 and modernized in c1700 (Kok, A A. Amsterdamsche Woonhuizen. Amsterdam, 1946, p198, and plan, p199).

68 This room could also have been Simon van der Stel’s private apartment, on the analogy of the centrally located bedroom of Louis XIV in the palace of Versailles. This is improbable, however, particularly since the main room on the upper floor of the Mauritshuis was also used for entertaining.

69 Simon van der Stel would not have wanted slaves mingling with his guests in the courtyard, whereas for Cloete as a farmer, the courtyard was a working area. When he rebuilt the lateral cellars, he thus had no qualms about re-orientating them to provide more convenient access from the court.

70 It is highly unlikely that this little cellar was built by Cloete, as it is almost certain that he would have built a stoep across the front of his earlier house. This would have been in line with contemporary practice, and would have blocked off the entrance to the tunnel which communicated with this room.

71 The presence in this room of a window, which would have been blocked off by Van der Stel’s lateral gallery vaults, might have been due to alterations introduced by Cloete. It is more likely, however, that it was the work of Kendall, who states: “Some extra light has also been admitted at two or three convenient points, and
most of the eerie gloom of the place has now been expelled" (Kendall, F K. The Restoration of Groot Constantia, Cape Town, 1927, p35). Given that his description suggests that this was the gloomiest room of all, this assumption is not unreasonable.

This is also conclusive proof that Cloete did not fill up the old cellars in order to raise the ground level. A diagonal tunnel angling upwards through cellars in this corner is inconceivable. Moreover, Kendall makes no mention of old cellar walls when describing his excavation of the tunnel.

Kendall describes this brick chamber as "evidently of later construction", but does not explain why. It could be that it was built of the "soft bricks" he describes as vaulting the cellars, in contrast to the clinkers used for the walls. Alternatively, it could simply have been a justification for his alteration of the natural ground level (Kendall, F K. The Restoration of Groot Constantia, Cape Town, 1927, p27).

Van Riebeeck's Boscheuvel and the Company's house at Rustenburg could conceivably have influenced Constantia, but there is no visual evidence to support this possibility. The former, moreover, was probably no more than an overseer's house, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter.

The first drostdy at Stellenbosch, erected in 1687, had a similar plan, although only the front wing appears to have been double-storeyed (see Chapter 9.3.3, pp484-485, 489-490 and Fig 206). This official building, commissioned by Simon van der Stel, might have influenced the design of Constantia, if the latter was commenced only in 1692. If, however, Constantia was indeed commenced in 1685, it could have influenced the drostdy instead.

De Bosdari suggests that the court between the rearward-facing wings afforded protection from the strong winds on the Peninsula (De Bosdari, C. Cape Dutch Houses and Farms, Cape Town, 1971, p19), and Fransen and Cook state that "the space between the back wings was kept as a sheltered back court" (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape, Cape Town, 1980, pp1-2). If this were the reason for choosing a U-plan, an H-plan would have been even more suitable. It would have offered two courtyards which could have sheltered the inhabitants from the north-west as well as the south-east winds.

Fransen and Cook state: "From Cape Town, this type of plan (the U-plan) spread to the neighbouring countryside" (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape, Cape Town, 1980, pp1-2). However, since there is no evidence of U-shaped houses in Cape Town prior to 1685 (or 1692, for that matter), this argument is also without foundation.


This farm (originally called Klein Constantia) together with Bergvliet, was
subdivided from the original Constantia after the death of Simon van der Stel in 1712 (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, pp115-117).

80 Fransen mentions that these buildings are not shown by Heydt, which they could not have been as they are obscured by trees, but ignores the evidence provided by Stade (Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, p19).

81 These two buildings could conceivably have belonged to Matthijs Michielsz, who owned the land to the south of Constantia when Van der Stel was granted his property in 1685. However, this was probably the farm Zeekoeienvalleij, "towards False Bay" (and therefore more likely to have been on lower and flatter land), which Van der Stel acquired in 1699 for grazing purposes (Fransen, H. Groot Constantia: its history and a description of its architecture and collection. Cape Town, 1972, pp5-6).

This suggests, moreover, that the land had originally been used by Michielsz for the same purpose, and that he had not erected any substantial buildings on it. Three farms, in fact, are shown to the south of Constantia in M1/17, a map of the Peninsula dating from c1691 [Fig 114], but it appears that by 1710 (the date of Stade’s drawing) all the land south of the original Constantia was owned by Van der Stel.

82 Although Stade’s drawing is from a less oblique angle than Heydt’s engraving, this building would have appeared taller and further to the left if correctly sited, thereby obscuring part of the right-hand facade of the main house.


84 This is Raven-Hart’s translation of the German caption "Logis vor die aufseher des guths" (Raven-Hart, A. Scenes from the Cape of Good Hope in 1741 as drawn by Johann Wolfgang Heydt. Cape Town, 1967, p10).

85 They would not have been large enough to house the farm slaves, who would probably have been accommodated near or within the pressing-house.

86 Fransen suggests that the reason for the forecourt not being lined by buildings on both sides was to leave a clear view towards False Bay, hence the erection of Cloete’s wine-cellar of 1791 behind the house (Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an investigation into stylistic modes at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1820. Pietermaritzburg, 1987, pp313-314). However, he underestimates the fall in the terrain, which would have required any out-building on the False Bay side of the house to have been provided with double-storeyed substructures. This misunderstanding of topography is also seen in his suggestion that the lower storey of the original Constantia was surrounded by fill at a later stage.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8.6

3 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel, p263.
4 Including the two illustrated by Robertson. Other maps, not illustrated here, which reveal the sequence "Zand Vallij" - "Steenbergshoek" - "Kalk Baaij" - "Post Huijs" - "Esselsteijn's Baaij" are M1/982 (c1687), M1/1169 (undated), M1/3317 (undated) and M2/11 (1730).

The nomenclature of the bays is not always consistent, and Kolbe confuses the issue by omitting the "Posthuijs" altogether in his maps of the whole colony (M1/1162) and of the Peninsula (M1/1163) and by locating the lime-kiln at "Esselstein's Baay" (Simons Bay), to which he gives the alternate name of "Kalk Baay" in the latter map.

Inaccuracies aside, the sequence of bays and promontories shown in these early maps corresponds with those on the current 1:50 000 map of the Peninsula.

Muizenberg, as yet unnamed, was referred to as "Zand Baaij" or "Zand Vallij" on the 17th century maps, corresponding with the outlet of the present "Sandvlei", revealing that the "bay" had silted up in the intervening years (South Africa, 1:50 000 Sheet, 3418AB & AD, CAPE PENINSULA. Pretoria: Government Printer, 1981).

6 Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg; South Africa's oldest existing inhabited building. Lantern. April 1983, pp3-12.
8 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676. p35.
9 This entry suggests that "IJsselstein Bay" was referring to the present Fish Hoek, and that the large bay beyond was Simon's Bay, with Roman Rock as the blind rock described. However, later entries are explicit about "IJsselstein Bay" referring to Simon's Bay. It is possible, therefore, that the lieutenant and the surveyor misnamed the former bay in their report, and that Robertson was correct in her assumption that the anchorage referred to was at Fish Hoek.
12 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676. p72. This Journal entry states that the "matter will be considered in our Saturday’s meeting", but there is no mention of it in the Resolution of the 3rd September 1672 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp97-98).
13 Robertson suggests that the absence of records of the erection of this building is because they appeared only in the Secret Records, "subsequently lost" (Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg; South Africa's oldest existing inhabited building. Lantern, April 1983, pp5-6). This suggestion, however, is invalidated by the extensive descriptions in the Journal and Resolutions of the contemporary VOC.
post across the bay at Hottentots-Holland (see Chapter 9.2.1, pp429-433).


15 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p110. This entry is slightly ambiguous with regard to the "higher mountains towards the east", and could imply that these were the Hottentots-Holland mountains and that it was the eastern side of False Bay that was being inspected, particularly since the letter was received "via Hottentots-Holland". However, the intention was to keep a look-out "towards the east", suggesting that it was the western side of False Bay that was being inspected. It is more likely, therefore, that the mountains to the east were the successive promontories towards Cape Point which prevented a view of the entrance to False Bay. If the spot selected for the flagstaff was at Fish Hoek, the party would have had to cross the present Elsepiek to reach Simon's Bay, and the present Swartkopberge to reach Smitswinkelbaai. This would explain the need to cross "several mountains".

16 The "Posthuijs" at Fish Hoek, moreover, is first shown on maps dating from as late as c1687.


18 Robertson, Post Huys, pp9-10.

19 Robertson, Post Huys, pp10-11.

20 Robertson, Post Huys, pp10-11. It is conceivable that his son Wilhem Adriaen allowed him the use of the building during his Governorship, although unlikely, as father and son appeared to be hardly on speaking terms (Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy kinders. Cape Town, 1964, pp156 & 225-227). It is inconceivable, however, that the Company did not repossess this supposedly strategic military structure immediately upon the recall of Wilhem Adriaen or at least upon the death of his father Simon in 1712.

21 Robertson, Post Huys, p12.

22 De Wet, G C. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel X. 1740-1743. Pretoria, 1984, p225. De Wet is explicit about this being at Fish Hoek, referring to M3/2 (Cape Archives: Map Collection). This map, together with M1/1174-1175, clearly shows Gustaaf Willems Baaij in the position of the present Fish Hoek.


24 See Chapter 10.4.1, p604. According to Schrire, this building was erected in 1669, and is thus almost contemporary with Robertson's date for the "Posthuijs". However, Schrire's date has been challenged by Yates and Smith (see Chapter 10.4.1, Note 55) who propose a date of c1700, thus corresponding with the present author's dating for Simon van der Stel's fishing station.

25 Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg: South Africa's oldest existing inhabited building. Lantern. April 1983, pp8-9. The archaeological plan of the "Posthuijs" has not been published and the present author has been unable to procure a copy.
26 Robertson, Post Huys, p8. Her authority for the "wide stoeps" on 17th century
watch-houses is "Mr Ton Koot, late of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam", who
visited the building in question.


29 Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg: South Africa's oldest existing inhabited

30 These are the earliest known examples of the wall-anchors described by Walton
pp6-11).

31 These were first referred to on the 11th October 1656, confirming Visser's
statement that these trees would have been eighteen years old if they were felled in
1673 (see Chapter 11.1.2e, p620).

32 Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg: South Africa's oldest existing inhabited

33 Robertson also points out that the floors were of clay, although the thresholds were
of stone. She cites the absence of stone floors as evidence that the masons were
taken off the job in order to contribute to the Castle works, thereby confirming the
early date of the "Posthuijs". This suggestion, however, is implausible. The extra
contribution that a couple of masons could have made to the Castle was minimal in
comparison with the completion of an equally strategic building, if it did indeed
exist at this date.

34 Robertson suggests: "It is doubtful if any guns were ever placed on the platform.
The Dutch East India Company never wasted anything" (Robertson, M. De Post
Huys, Muizenberg: South Africa's oldest existing inhabited building. Lantern, April
1983, p12). If this was the case, the question is raised of why the effort should have
been expended on erecting a strategic outpost of military importance which was
incapable of defending itself.

35 Robertson, M. De Post Huys, Muizenberg: South Africa's oldest existing inhabited
building. Lantern, April 1983, p12. Presumably she is referring to the building
commissioned by Van Imhoff in 1743, which was to be erected at Fish Hoek, but
was probably built at Muizenberg instead.
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1 They were unwilling to bring their cattle to Table Bay, owing to the danger of wild animals and the lack of pasturage (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p27).

2 This is the first example of the use of indigenous precedent in the design of colonial buildings at the Cape. Van Riebeeck showed a particular interest in the structure and configuration of the settlements of the Khoi, both from the architectural and anthropological points of view. The method of fortification referred to here was described on the 6th June 1657, when Hottentots-Holland was discovered by a party of freeburgher explorers. On their arrival "the natives (sic) at once fetched a large quantity of branches with which, according to their custom, they formed a breastwork round our men for protecting them against wild animals" (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town, 1954, pp122-123).


6 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p255.


14 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p82. For further information on the Company's post at Hottentots-Holland, see Chapter 9.2.1, pp429-433.


16 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, pp222-228. This resolution was confirmed on the 25th February 1678 (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, pp228-230), and was in response to instructions received from the Seventeen in a letter dated the 18th October 1677 (Boeseken, A J. Nederlandsche Commissarissen aan de Kaap, 1657-1700. 's-Gravenhage, 1938, p44). However, Simon van der Stel repossessed the lands for the Company in April 1684 (Boeseken, Commissarissen, p144).

17 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, p301.

19 Boeseken, Commissarissen, p57.
21 Smuts, Stellenbosch, pp55 & 177.
25 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol III, pp181-182. The first 23 farms at Drakenstein, named after Hendrick van Rheede tot Drakesteijn, were measured out along the river on the 16th October 1687, and the land-surveyor was given the necessary instructions to peg them out (Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy kinders. Cape Town, 1964, p63).
28 For the dating of M1/17, see Chapter 8.1, p344.
29 The "Babilons toorn" is also annotated on this map as "alias Drakesteijn", which probably gave rise to the proposition that the Drakenstein church was in the vicinity of Babylontoren (see Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, p198).
30 As mentioned in a letter to Amsterdam dated the 18th March 1699 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp100-101).
31 The findings of this inspection, commenced on the 23rd November 1699, were sent to Holland on the 1st March 1700 (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1696-1708, pp136-137).
35 This map is incorrectly dated c1695 by the Cape Archives. It cannot be earlier than 1701, as Vergelegen is shown. Moreover, it was also illustrated by Kolbe, and could be as late as 1713, the date of his departure from the Cape.
36 The "France quartier" is now described only as "Draakenstein", while the "Babiloonsche Tooren" has no alias, nor indeed is there any indication of a church in its vicinity (see Note 29, above). However, it must be noted that this map is inaccurate in its location of the Fiscal Blesius' farm at Simonsvlei (see p530).
37 See Chapter 8.1, p345.
38 See Chapter 9.2.3, pp443-444.
39 Although the redoubt at Sea Point had not yet been built by this date.
41 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost
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2. Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676. pp88-89. The Dutch had no measure for a distance of three feet. Leibbrandt must therefore have converted these dimensions from feet or roods.
9. Unfortunately the configuration of the amended redoubt was not disclosed.
22. Leibbrandt, Journal. 1671-1676. p283. Given that the first kitchen was already being roofed in 1673, it is likely that this was a more permanent replacement.
27. Boeseken, Commissarissen, p144.


31 Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, p6. Hugo's information was presumably derived from the original Journal, which falls outside the terms of reference for this period of the thesis (see Chapter 1.3.1, pp14-16).


35 As mentioned on the 14th and 18th September and the 16th October 1676 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp282-283 & 287).


38 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel, pp42-43.


41 For the dating of M1/3308, see Chapter 8.2, Note 106.


47 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp74-75. The reference to the Steenberg is confusing, as it suggests that Bommelshoek was on the Peninsula, south of Constantia. It was, however, to the north of the Tygerberg on the present Diep River.


49 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp305-306. The post on the "inner" or eastern side of the Steenbergen, mentioned in the same inventory, could well have been Bommelshoek.
Again it is possible that this entry is referring to the Peninsula Steenbergen, but the "Comps, dienaars en slaven" were more likely to have been recalled from a cattle post than from the fishing post at Fish Hoek, which appears to have been the only Company's establishment on the southern Peninsula at this date (see Chapter 8.6, p417 and Note 16).


60 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol III, p204.

61 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p245; and Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol III, pp380-381. The Company’s post at Riebeeck’s Casteel was also mentioned in the "Korte Deductie" (Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708, p145), in the “Contra-Deductie” (Van der Heiden, J and Tas, A. Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van de valsheit der uitgegeevene Deductie. Amsterdam, 1712, p197), and in Valentyn’s description of 1714 (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken


74 Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708, pp145-146.


78 Apart from the bridge at De Cuijlen, mentioned by Kolbe (Note 44) and Valentyn (Note 45).


80 Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1696-1708. p178.
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1 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p150.
5 Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708, p32; and Leibbrandt, H C V. The Defence of Willem Adriaan van der Stel. Cape Town, 1897, p37.
6 Van der Stel, Korte Deductie. p33; and Leibbrandt, Defence, p38.
10 Fouche, L. The Diary of Adam Tas (1705-1706), with an enquiry into the complaints of the colonists against the Governor Willem Adriaan van der Stel. London, 1914, p315.
13 Kolbe, P. The present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis). London,
1731, Vol 2, p43.


15 Fagan, Gwen. Die Werf by Elsenburg. Restorica 16, October 1984, pp34-39. Fagan suggests that the U-shaped house at Elsenburg was a new structure built by Martin Melck, but an intermediate inventory of 1747 which she quotes is also difficult to reconcile with a T-shaped plan. The accommodation now comprised a "voorhuis", a "camer ter regterhand", a "binncamor" (which she believes is the room to the left described in the previous inventory of 1722), an "agterkamer" and a new kitchen and pantry. If Fagan is correct about the "binncamor", the "agterkamer" could have been behind it, thus converting Elsevier's L-plan into a U-plan by mirroring the kitchen in the other wing. According to Fagan's reconstruction, the kitchen in the tail of her T-plan would have had to be gutted to make room for the "agterkamer", and then rebuilt behind this room.

16 Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727. Vol 1, pp118-119; and Kolbe, P. The present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis). London, 1731, Vol 2, p52. This figure was confirmed by Valentyn and Mentzel (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726. Vol 5, p f.36; Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behoorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, p161; and Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1944, Part Three, p65). According to Raven-Hart, however, Valentyn's account was taken from Kolbe, as might have been Mentzel's as well, in which case they cannot serve as supporting evidence.


18 This is not to be confused with the "Onrust" ten kilometres north of Stellenbosch excavated in 1987 (Hall, M, Brink, Y and Malan A. Onrust 87/1; An early colonial farm complex in the Western Cape. South African Archaeological Bulletin. Vol 43, 1988, pp91-99).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.2.3


3 See Chapter 9.2.1, pp433-434.


The first plan of the Warm Baths is M1/912, dating from 1788 [Fig 168]. This shows two rectangular bath buildings, one being for the use of slaves, an early instance of social and racial segregation. Some distance away, between the baths and the "Swarte Bergh" was a T-shaped dwelling house, with a rectangular stable and kraal nearby, both situated along the road to the Cape. It is unlikely, however, that these were the original buildings of 1710.


9 Kolbe, P. Naauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol 1, pp105-106.


11 Kolbe, P. Present state (English precis), Vol 2, pp55-56 & 59. Valentyn also
mentioned that the inhabitants lived in "very poor huts" (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge
van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726,
Vol 5, p f.37; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de
Mentzel also concurred with this description (Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and
Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape
Town, 1944, Part Three, p67).
12 Van der Heiden, J and Tas, A. Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van
de valsheit der uitgegevene Deductie. Amsterdam, 1712, p249. The cattle post in
question had been granted in 1705.
13 Leguat, F. A New Voyage to the East. London, 1708, p228. According to Walton,
Francois Leguat's "Tallifer" (sic) was "probably Jean Taillefer of Laborie or Isaac
14 See Chapter 9.2.2, pp441-442.
15 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979; Walton J. Old Cape
Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989; and Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological
16 Smuts, Stellenbosch, p22.
18 According to Walton it was granted only in 1692, although Arnoud Jansz had been
20 According to Walton, the grant was made only in 1691, "although the plan is dated
23 Smuts, Stellenbosch, p69.
24 Walton states that the accuracy of Mulder’s drawing is "confirmed by E V Stade’s
drawing of Stellenbosch in 1710, on which Oude Molen farmhouse is shown as a
rectangular thatched building with an entrance in one end and a tall chimney at the
opposite end, as in Mulder’s sketch" (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape
Town, 1989, p12).
However, Walton is incorrect here, as the sketch he illustrates shows a gabled roof
with a large central doorway in one of the ends, whereas Stade shows a hipped roof
and an off-centre end entry. The difference in roofing is significant, suggesting
either that there were early problems associated with gabled ends, or that a
conversion from wattle-and-daub to masonry construction could have facilitated the
use of hips as in the buildings of the Company’s officials. The size and position of
the door also suggest that Stade’s house might have been a replacement for the one
depicted twenty one years earlier.
It is also possible that this drawing was not executed by Mulder himself, but was
added to the title-deed at a later date. It is cruder than his other sketches, and does
not use the same graphic convention.
There is also a later depiction of Oude Molen, dating from 1701, again drawn by someone other than Mulder. This sketch [Fig 179] does correlate with Stade’s drawing, as will be discussed on pp447-448 in the text, below.

25 Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989, p12. Walton states that "Its most striking feature was a curvilinear end gable with three lobes, such as were to be seen in Cape Town at the time". Here again, however, he is probably incorrect: the gable is clearly straight sided, any suggestion of curvilinearity being the result of the imprecision of Mulder’s drawing style. Moreover, there is no evidence of triple-lobed curvilinear gables in contemporary drawings of Cape Town.

26 Walton, Old Cape Farmsteads, p13.

27 Vos believes that these end-entry houses were erected as barns which were used temporarily for living accommodation until proper houses had been erected (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp99-101). This, however, does not explain the presence of chimneys, which suggest permanent dwellings. By contrast the Schreuder house, built as late as 1709, was not provided with a chimney although it was erected as a purely residential building within the village of Stellenbosch.


29 According to Walton, the grant was made in 1693, but Dirk Coetsee had been living there since 1682 (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989, p14).

30 Walton does not mention the central chimney, necessitating the off-centre placement of the entrance door. This, he states, was "in the middle of one long side", and he later describes the long side as having "a central doorway with a window on each side" (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989, p14).


32 Walton states that the land was granted jointly to the Fiscal Johannes Blesius and his brother-in-law Abraham Diemer in 1691 (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989, p14). If Walton’s dating is correct, Stellengift would have predated Coetsenburg by two years, but doubts have also been raised as to whether this sketch really was a representation of Stellengift (see Note 33, below).

33 Vos states that Stellengift was incorrectly identified by Fransen in “Stellenbosch Three Centuries”, and that the title-deed was actually of Zorgvliet (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp99-101). However, he provides no evidence with which to substantiate this statement, nor does he provide any information on its date or owner.

34 Walton states that this house also “had an entrance in the centre (sic) of one side and a window on each side” (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989, p14).


37 Smuts, F. *Stellenbosch Three Centuries*. Stellenbosch, 1979, p105. Interestingly, Walton does not mention this building, the only hip-roofed and non-rectangular example illustrated in Smuts.

38 Smuts, *Stellenbosch*, p186. According to Walton, it was granted in 1680, but only registered in 1690 (Walton, J. *Old Cape Farmsteads*. Cape Town, 1989, pp19-20).

39 Walton dismisses this complex as being "an irregular group of four buildings" (Walton, J. *Old Cape Farmsteads*. Cape Town, 1989, pp19-20).

40 Biermann, B E. *A contribution to the study of the origins of colonial architecture at the Cape*. Cape Town, 1952, caption to Plate II (no page number).


42 Fitchett, *Siting Arrangements*, pp99-109. No instance occurs in surviving farms of an end gabled building being symmetrically flanked by the long facades of two other buildings.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.2.4

1 See Chapter 7.2.1, pp211-214 & 218-219, and Chapter 7.2.2, pp221-224.
2 See Chapter 9.2.3, p444.
5 While Valentyn described the "hofstede" at "Meirlust" as "byzonder fraaje", it is possible that he did not actually see the farm in question. His information might therefore have been based on hearsay, possibly received from Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel himself, who would have exaggerated its appearance.

Moreover, the contemporary meaning of "hofstede" was "a Farm, or Stately country-house" (Sewel, W. *A Large Dictionary, English and Dutch*. Amsterdam, 1727). Given the large number of "hofsteden" in the district referred to by Valentyn and Kolbe, it is unlikely that they were all "stately country-houses", and more probable that the former meaning was intended, as acknowledged by Raven-Hart in the use of "farmstead" in his translation of Valentyn (See Chapter 9.2.3, Note 8).

7 See Chapter 8.6.
8 See Chapter 8.5 (Constantia) and Chapter 7.6.2 (guest house).
13 The dating of 1701 is derived from the recollections of Dr Anna de Villiers in 1979, who was a very young girl when Arthur Elliott photographed the farmhouse...
in 1913. The farm had actually been granted eight years earlier, in 1693 (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p342).

While it is unlikely that the family were unsheltered for the first eight years, it is quite possible that the first permanent dwelling was erected only in 1701. This could explain the family tradition that the house demolished earlier in this century was the earliest on the property, but it is more likely that the T-shaped configuration dated from later in the 18th century.


15 See Chapter 8.5, pp400-401.

16 Pearse’s plan shows the Saxenburg (spelled Saxenberg in his caption) "voorhuis" as square (Pearse, G E. Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. Cape Town, 1968, p15). Obholzer’s more recent but unsealed plan reveals an internal width to depth ratio of 1.7:1.8 and a ratio of 2:2.1 for the overall external dimensions of the front and rear wings respectively (Obholzer, A. Baraitser, M and Malherbe, W A. The Cape House and its interior. Stellenbosch, 1985, p157). These discrepancies, which are hardly significant and were probably due to inaccurate setting out, could easily have been accommodated with slight alterations in roof pitch had the T-plan been built from the outset.

17 Woodward, C S. The interior of the Cape house. 1670-1714. Pretoria, 1982. pp24-25. Woodward also draws attention to the three lean-to’s described in the 1712 inventory, and their prevalence at the time as revealed by the inventories of other houses. Half of those which she consulted had at least one lean-to attached (Woodward, pp25-26).

18 Brink believes that the plan was L-shaped rather than T-shaped, but does not offer any other possible arrangements (Brink, Y. The voorhuis as a central element in early Cape houses. Social Dynamics. Vol 16, No 1, 1990, pp47-48).


20 For discussion of the Schreuder house and "Colonieshuis 1", see Chapter 9.3.5, pp514-517 & 506-508.

21 For discussion of Oude Molen, see Chapter 9.3.7, p528.

22 Not to be confused with the Onrust of the Landdrost Johannes Starrenburgh, which was at the "Tijgerbergen" (see Chapter 9.2.2, p441).


24 As was the Company's "lodge" at Saldanha Bay (see Chapter 10.4.1, p604).


27 See Chapter 6.3.2, p105.

28 See Chapter 8.4, p385.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3.1

3 It is surprising that neither Hugo nor Smuts mentions this reference to the "kerckje" and to Overnij's presence in the Stellenbosch district prior to the "first service" held in a freeburgher's house on Sunday the 13th October 1686 (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, p9; and Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p245).
4 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p292. Hugo mentions that Commissioner Van Rheede enquired of Van der Stel, during their visit of inspection in 1685, who the owner was of an isolated house across the river from the Stellenbosch island. The answer was that it belonged to the schoolmaster and sick-comforter Mancadan. This description led Hugo to claim that this was "ongetwyfeld die eerste huis van die latere dorp" (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, p3).
However, the "isolated" nature of this house suggests that it was outside the "new village" described by Van Rheede, where he lodged in one of the freeburghers' houses (see Note 10, below).
Moreover, given that this was two years prior to Mancadan's purchase of the property shown on Stade's drawing, as mentioned later by Hugo, it is more likely that the Company's school-house was on the other side of the river from that of the site of the village itself. Hugo's explanation that he could have bought the property adjacent to the school is contradicted by the evidence of the title-deed, as he himself acknowledges. It is also contradicted by Hugo's suggestion that the house and school were separate buildings, whereas the Resolution of 1683 was explicit about classes and sermons being held in the house itself (Hugo, Die Kerk van
In addition, Adam Tas describes the erection of another schoolmaster's and sick-comforter's house in the village in 1705 (see below), suggesting that the original school-house was in fact inconveniently located outside Stellenbosch, and that no specific building for the purpose had been erected within the village in the interim (Fouche, L. The Diary of Adam Tas, 1705-1706. London, 1914, p89).


6 Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp145-147. Vos is incorrect in his assumption that the sick-comforter's house was built of timber, as the Council of Policy agreed to supply masons as well as carpenters for its erection, as resolved on the 28th December 1683 (see Note 1, above).

7 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch. pp145-147.


9 Smuts, Stellenbosch. pp58-63.


11 Boeseken, Simon van der Stel. p61.


13 Further commentary on the church and its siting will be given in Chapter 9.3.4, but Van Rheede's terminology here is worthy of note. His "opgeslage loots" suggests a temporary structure yet to be built, not a freeburgher's shed or a permanent church. If his instructions were followed, the church depicted by Stade would only have been an interim solution, explaining its unimposing siting as well as the simplicity of its architectural form.


15 Boeseken, A J. Memoriën en instructiën, 1657-1699. Cape Town, 1966, p212. Van Rheede's exact words were: "...sorge draghende dat van de grond daer de kercke staen sal tot aen de riviere toe geen landen werden weghgegeven, aangesien daer ter plaatse sullen moeten woonen alle degenen op geen hoffsteden levende, gelijk predicant, schoolmeester, koster, smith, raede-maker, kramer en wat van diergelijken meer tot gerieff van de ingesetenen met der tijd sullen van nooden wesen, om door deselve huijs een huijs met de front nae de riviere een frayie en geschichte stra[et] te maaken, hebbende tot dien eijnde achter-erven en land genoegh voor cleijne thuijknens tot haar verdoen". See also Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p63.

16 Hugo, however, who did not acknowledge the temporary nature of the first church, believed that it was on the permanent site, and that the site of the present church was chosen only after the fire of 1710 (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, pp4-5). This will be discussed further in Chapter 9.3.4.

18 Hugo ascribes this delay to the five-month expedition to Namaqualand and to the problems associated with the wreck of the "Nostra Senora de los Milagros" (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, pp5-6). However, the latter should not have occupied him for a full seven months. He could, moreover, have entrusted the setting out of the village to the surveyor, either before or after their return from the Namaqualand expedition.


20 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p7. Hugo ascribes this to the necessity of raising funds for the building of the church. However, the Resolution of the 5th August 1686 requiring the burghers to pay a yearly levy of six guilders stated that this was for the maintenance of the church and cemetery (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Peel 1 1 1 , 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp140-142).


22 Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, p7. Bax suggests that the chief carpenter Adriaan van Brakel was the designer of both buildings (Bax, D. Nederlandse invloed op de oudste Kaapse kerkgebouwen. Bulletin van de Koninklijke Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond, Vol 71, No 1, 1972, p11). This, as in others of his attributions, is unlikely and anachronistic. Craftsmen-architects were a Medieval, not a Renaissance phenomenon, and by this time the chief carpenter would not have designed any but the simplest of buildings. While he might have been responsible for the "opgeslagen lofts" that constituted the church, he would merely have supervised the construction of a pre-established design in the case of the drostdy. The actual designers were more likely to have been the surveyors or even the Commanders, as has been seen in Van Riebeeck's plan for the granary at Rondebosch (see Chapter 8.3.2b, p378).

23 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, pp7-8.

24 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p8. This passage does not read as if he was making excuses about his absence from the site, as implied by Boeseken, but rather as if he had been informed of Van der Stel's visit and wanted to give him prior warning of the lack of progress (Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy kinders. Cape Town, 1964, p88).


26 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p9. It is unlikely that this was really the "eerste predicatie", as described by the secretary Grevenbroek (see Note 3, above). It is also intriguing that this service was held in a freeburgher's house and not in the school-house of the sick-comforter Mancadan. Hugo gives three possible attributions to the owner of the house in question, but none of them was Mancadan. This supports the premise that the original school was outside the village (see Note 4, above), and that the church service in question was the first to be held in
the village itself.
Vos suggests that the service was held at Welgevallen, the farm of S J Botma across
the river from the Stellenbosch island (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological
27 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p9; and Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries.
Stellenbosch, 1979, pp63 & 245.
29 Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape
30 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, pp10-11.
31 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p11.
32 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p12; and Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en
34 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p15.
35 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p17.
36 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p17.
37 Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy kinders. Cape Town, 1964, p89; and
38 Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape
39 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p20.
40 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p21.
41 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p63.
42 Walton, J. Water-mills, windmills and horse-mills of South Africa. Cape Town,
1974, p38. According to Smuts, however, the name was first mentioned only in
1701 (Smuts, Stellenbosch p165).
43 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape
Town, 1961, pp169-170; and Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaatboek, Deel I (1652-
1707). Cape Town, 1944, pp238-239.
44 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, pp165-166; and Hugo,
A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963,
p20. Hugo incorrectly states that the new mill was on the Oude Molen site.
Moreover, Vos disagrees that this obliquely sited building was the second mill,
locating it further upstream (see Chapter 9.3.5, pp504-505).
45 Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape
Town, 1963, pp31-33.
46 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p248; and Hugo, Die
Kerk van Stellenbosch, pp33 & 143.
47 Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape
Town, 1963, p33. It has been suggested that Van Loon vacated the house within
a year, and moved to one of his two farms, Warburg and Hercules Pilaar, both
in the vicinity of Klapmuts (as described in Smuts, Stellenbosch, p248). The
evidence is that Van Loon requested permission from the Council of Policy on the 29th March 1701 for the sick-comforter Jan Mahieu to be given lodgings in the "vacant Colonies-house" at Stellenbosch (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp245-246). This, however, was not the house in which Van Loon was living, but the one diagonally across the street intersection. Moreover, Van Loon was still living in "Colonieshuis 3" in 1704, as noted by Hugo: "Resol. L.& H. 19 Mei 1704. Heemrakte verkoop aan Jan Mahieu 't Colonies huys en erve tegenwoordig bij hem bewoond… regt over 't Colonies huys bewoond bij den predicant Hercules van Loon." (Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch. Note 2, p33).

48 See Chapter 9.3.3, p484.
50 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, pp31-33; and Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p248. Smuts states that Beck lived here only from 1705, on the basis of the diary of Adam Tas.
There is also a confusing entry in Leibbrandt, where it is stated in a letter to Middelburg of the 31st March 1704 that the Company had "built a house at Stellenbosch for the Rev. Beck" (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p237). This house, however, was almost certainly at Drakenstein, as will be discussed in Chapter 9.4.2 (p532).
51 Hugo’s reference for the passage quoted is "Resol. L.& H. 19 Mei 1704" (Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, Note 2, p33).
52 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p33. Hugo’s exact words in this regard were "...want aan die ligging van Mahieu se huis is nie te twyfel nie".
53 See Chapter 7.3.3, Note 24, and Chapter 7.5.3, Note 10.
54 It is possible, therefore, that Van der Bijl’s research in the Deeds Office is unreliable, particularly as none of the plots on the title-deeds could have been keyed into a contemporary plan of the overall town, the earliest example of which dates only from 1817.
57 Stander’s reconstructed plan [Fig 190] distorts Stade’s drawing by locating both of these buildings further to the west than as shown in the 1710 depiction [Fig 203]. Moreover, the attribution of the gable-ended house to "Van den Berg" is almost certainly incorrect. Mahieu must still have been living in this house in December 1710, when he saved it from the flames at risk of life and limb as related by Kolbe (Kolbe, P. Nauwekeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol II, p437). It is hardly likely that he would have vacated the most impressive house in the village, which he himself had built only five years previously as related by Adam Tas (see Note 56, above). The evident distortion of Stander’s reconstructed plan, which differs in many
respects from Stade’s drawing of 1710, also casts doubt on the other title-deed attributions made by Hugo and Van der Bijl. Further discussion on the lack of correspondence between this plan and Stade’s drawing will be found in Chapter 9.3.2.

58 Leibbrandt, H.C.V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p335 (see also Chapter 9.3.3, p484). Smuts states that the secretary’s "house and office" was across the street from the drosdy at 2 Ryneveld Street (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries, Stellenbosch, 1979, p417), but this was the case only after the re-occupation of the drosdy. The site in question ("Colonieshuis 3") was occupied by the Landrost while the drosdy was being repaired. Leibbrandt, incidentally, adds to the confusion by suggesting that the "Colonies Huis" to which the Landrost was to be moved was the drosdy itself (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1696-1708, p335).


62 "Naast ’t Rechthuis is een gevangenism..." (Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, pp209-210).

63 Hugo, A.M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963. Note 4, p35. The dimensions, however, do not correspond with the plan reconstructed by Stander [Fig 190], which is illustrated in this publication.

64 For further discussion of the possible location of the prison and the stables, see Chapter 9.3.3, pp491-492.

65 Stade is probably accurate here, as he shows a large number of trees within the boundaries of individual plots. However, few are depicted between the facades of the buildings and the edges of the streets.


69 Leibbrandt, H.C.V. Journal, 1699-1732, Cape Town, 1896, p244.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3.2


2 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, Fig 31, p50.

3 Smuts, Stellenbosch. Fig 56, p86. Fransen’s alterations to the Stander plan concern firstly the distance between the “Swart” and "Emmenes" houses, which he shows further apart. Secondly, he shows the "Van den Berg" house as a T-plan separate from the lateral extension drawn by Stander, and with two out-buildings behind the house at right angles to the street, although only one such out-building appears on
Stade's drawing. Thirdly, he depicts the "Pastorie" ("Colonieshuis 2") as a U-plan rather than the L-plan shown by Stander. Fourthly, he shows the so-called "Conterman" house, which does not appear on Stade's perspective, as a rectangle instead of the L-plan drawn by Stander. Fifthly, he relocates the out-building shown by Stander as parallel to but behind the drostdy to a position aligned with its depth, and balances it with another out-building on the other side: neither of these two locations are supported by Stade's perspective.

4 Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, p168. Vos agrees substantially with Fransen's interpretation, but introduces a few variations and extra buildings. The variations concern firstly the "Van den Berg" house, which he depicts as an L-shaped rather than a T-plan house, separated from the neighbouring Sax house, although Stade shows them as contiguous; he also correctly omits Fransen's extra out-building perpendicular to the street. Secondly, he reduces the "Pastorie" ("Colonieshuis 2") to an L-plan, as shown by Stander, as opposed to Fransen's U-plan. Thirdly, he adds a shallow T-planned lean-to extension to the Schreuder house. Fourthly, he relocates the western out-building of the drostdy to a position across the river which does not correspond with Stade's perspective: this he identifies as the stables. Fifthly, he relocates the out-building to the east of the drostdy at an angle, in contradiction to the evidence of Stade, and suggests that this was the mill. Lastly, he also relocates the so-called "Scheffer" house further away from the river than as shown by Stade, and at a different angle.

As far as additional buildings are concerned, Vos gives definite locations for two unidentified houses on Drostdy Street, one on its south-western corner and the other slightly to the north, and for Callebassen Craal outside the immediate confines of the village. None of these buildings, however, appears on Stade's perspective. Other houses which have been given tentative locations by Vos are the "Coopman" house and the "Couchet" house, which he acknowledges could have been built immediately after the fire of December 1710.


7 Fransen makes reference to Hugo's suggestion that the church had "proper built-up end-gables" (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p84), but offers no criticism. Significantly, though, the "corrected" perspective does not appear as an illustration in this publication.

8 See Chapter 9.3.4.

9 Vos suggests that the front rooms of the Van den Berg house (or "Loubsehuis") date from the 18th century, although later than the fire of 1710. If he is correct, the
narrowing of Dorp Street must have taken place during the 18th century, rather than after the fire of 1803. However, he provides no archaeological plan of this house or any firm evidence for its dating. Moreover, he makes no reference to the house set back from the street in Hertzog’s survey, nor does he provide any explanation for its atypical siting (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp175-176).

10 As suggested by Vos’ plan of Stellenbosch in 1780, which shows no buildings corresponding with those of “Van Tonderen” (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, Fig 16, p55).


14 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p244.

15 See Chapter 9.3.1, pp468-469, and Chapter 9.3.5, pp506-508.

16 For the significance of this distinction, see Chapter 9.3.1, p468.

17 See Chapter 9.3.4.

18 See Note 10, above.

19 For further discussion of the site of the original church, see Chapter 9.3.4.

20 Vos mentions a “beplante pleijn” in front of the drostdy, but the earliest reference he quotes dates from the 10th December 1709 (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp41-45). This post-dates the Van der Stel period and predates Stade’s drawing by only two months, revealing that these trees could have been no more than saplings. Given that Stade shows full-grown trees in the position of the present Drostdy Street, it is probable that the “beplante pleijn” was between the drostdy and Dorp Street, and that the indigenous trees along the later Drostdy Street had not yet been uprooted. The formal grove shown on Stander’s plan is therefore unlikely to have existed at this date. Vos also states that “the sites traditionally assigned to the Drostdy, its stables and the second mill were likewise found to be incorrect” (Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, p65). However, no archaeological plans have been provided for the “correct” siting of the drostdy and stables, or for the mill.

21 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in “Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien”. Amsterdam, 1726. Vol 5, p f.32; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behoorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, p141. Given that Valentyn did not describe the drostdy in detail during his brief visit to the village, it is possible that he did not see it, and that his description was based on hearsay. It is unlikely, though, that his informants (the local burghers) would not have mentioned a formal avenue of trees leading to the drostdy had one existed.
22 Vos notes that the original name for Dorp Street was the "Stellenbosche eerste straat" (Vos, H. N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp41-45). This could have been because it corresponded with the position of the original wagon road from the Cape and was thus historically the first street in the village. However, it could also suggest that the drostdy to which it led was the principal building in the village, rather than the temporary church, and that Drostdy Street had not yet been established.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3.3

1 Mossop, E. E. Journals of the Expeditions of Olof Bergh (1682 & 1683) and Isaq Schriiver (1689). Cape Town, 1931, p51. "Baas Arie" was the chief carpenter Adriaen van Brakel.

2 See Chapter 9.3.1, pp462-466.

3 The secretary was Jan Mahieu, previously sick-comforter, the erection of whose house had been described by Adam Tas in 1705 (see Chapter 9.3.1, pp468-469).


6 See Chapter 9.3.1, pp465-466.

7 The second drostdy was probably completed in 1708, the third was erected after the 1710 fire, and the fourth was built after another fire in 1762 (Smutts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, pp87 & 108). Hugo could not accept that the first drostdy was double-storeyed, and suggested that the lower floor comprised only the cellars, on the premise that the cellars of the present Theological Seminary are considerably higher than any others in the village (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, p12).

However, the Theological Seminary is a conversion of the fourth drostdy to be built on the same site, with a different plan from that of the first. The documentary evidence, moreover, is explicit about the first drostdy having been double-storeyed over at least its front three rooms. Given that the upper storey was removed for reasons of structural instability, Hugo's argument becomes untenable, as the drostdy depicted by Stade would have consisted of a cellar and nothing else.

The similarity between Hugo's theory on the drostdy and Fransen's reconstruction of Constantia is striking in that neither acknowledges the contemporary descriptions of these two buildings as being double-storeyed (see Chapter 8.5, pp400-401).

8 See Chapter 9.3.1, pp465-466.


13 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters received, 1695-1708*. Cape Town, 1896, p472.

14 Vos, H N. *An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860*. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp134-135. The statement that the U-plan was already in existence on the Peninsula is questionable, as no examples are known other than the exceptional case of Simon van der Stel's Constantia. Vos suggests that the drostdy "may have been similar to the homestead of Commander (sic) Isbrand Goske". However, the building to which Vos refers probably dates from more than a century later than the brewery commissioned by Governor Goske, which was sold to Lieutenant Dubertijn in 1684 (see Chapter 7.2.1. Note 45). His reconstructed plan of the drostdy is thus anachronistic, based as it is on a type which was only to be developed later in the 18th century.

15 Constantia was almost certainly commenced in 1685, thereby predating the drostdy by two years.

16 The location of these dormers on Vos' reconstruction is suggestive of Heydt's depiction of Constantia in 1741. after the centre gable had collapsed [Fig 140], and of Rach's depiction of Greenmarket Square in 1762 [Fig 66]. However, there is no evidence that such an arrangement existed at the Cape prior to 1710.

17 The letter of the 18th April 1708 supports this contention, as it states that "the whole" was broken down apart from the passage and the front two rooms, suggesting that there was further accommodation to the rear. However, there is no mention of a reduction in accommodation.


23 The drostdy is shown diagrammatically in three maps of the early 1700s. In M1/1162 [Fig 163] the graphic convention for farmhouses is used, while in M1/1182 [Fig 166] and M1/1193 it appears with a central tower. All of these depictions, however, are stylized symbols rather than accurate representations.

24 It also appears in M1/1183 with a central door flanked by a single window on either side, a hipped roof and a central finial.

25 Smuts, F. *Stellenbosch Three Centuries*. Stellenbosch, 1979, Fig 31, p50 (Stander plan) [Fig 190] and Fig 56, p86 (Fransen plan) [Fig 192]; and Vos, H N. *An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860*. Stellenbosch, 1993, Fig 9, p43 [Fig 193].
26 This location suggests that the primary entrance to the two rooms at the back was from the front wing, rather than from the court. The fireplaces in these rear rooms could equally have been located on their outer sides, thereby creating two axes on plan, parallel to the facade. The former location is more likely, however, as the front rooms could have been used as a formal access to those behind, whereas the courtyard entrances would have been of a more private nature.

27 Fransen's comments on Stade's drawing of the drostdy require mention here: "It seems hard to believe that such an important building did not have some sort of gable over its entrance. It also seems rather low in comparison with other buildings in the village, and we know that the 1763 Drostdy had high foundations and lofty rooms; but perhaps we are now guilty of over-estimating the accuracy of what is after all but a sketch made during a fleeting visit" (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p84).

This commentary epitomises the widely held view that Stade's drawings must be inaccurate whenever they do not conform with conventional theories of Cape Dutch architectural development. Instructively, Fransen makes no reference to the collapse of the first drostdy, nor does he mention that the building shown by Stade was its less imposing successor.


29 The first of these structures appears to have been mistaken for the farmhouse of Welgevallen in Stander's and Fransen's reconstructed plans of Stade's drawing, despite the scale discrepancy between it and the farm building behind. The second of them is not shown at all. Stander, moreover, introduces a non-existent outbuilding on the western edge of the drostdy property, its front end aligned with the rear wings of the principal building. Fransen goes further and aligns it with the drostdy itself, and also shows a matching building on the other side. Stade's evidence, however, supports neither interpretation (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, Fig 31, p50 (Stander plan), Fig 190 and Fig 56, p86 (Fransen plan), Fig 192).

30 See Chapter 9.3.1, p470.

31 See Chapter 7.6.2, p327.

32 See Chapter 9.3.1, p471, and Chapter 9.3.5, p503.

33 See Chapter 9.3.1, p470, and Chapter 9.3.2, pp478-479.


35 Hugo suggests, however, that the stables were on the island ("aan die binnekant natuurlik"), in other words on the inner side of the river, despite the fact that it was more likely to have burst its banks on the outer side.

He also states that this was without doubt ("sonder twyfel") the building demolished in 1962 on the property of the Theological Seminary. This is questionable, as a stable re-erected after the fire of 1710 is unlikely to have survived for 250 years. It is more probable that the structure to which Hugo is referring was built at the time that the fourth drostdy was erected (Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, pp207-208).
37 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p244.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3.4

2 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch. p25. Given that no such addition was mentioned in the contract for the repairs to the church, it is possible that the initial window openings had not been glazed and had therefore not required opening sections. Four hinges, moreover, suggest two casements rather than the four suggested by Hugo, as these would not have been hung on a single hinge.
3 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch. p27.
4 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch. pp23-24. The removal of the mound suggests that the ditch alone was considered to be a sufficient barrier against wild beasts.
5 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch. p29; and Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p248.
7 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p217.
9 The letter to Holland of the 18th March 1699 described the "little church of Stellenbosch getting too small and damp", which suggests that the latter problem would not have been solved by a new cross-wing. Leibbrandt's translation does state that the Governor "consented to have it enlarged and made more convenient, as a cross formed, and parish church", but this could have been referring to a new and enlarged church (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1696-1708, p101). This possibility is supported by the following three entries concerning the church first projected in 1698: "For the congregation at Stellenbosch, where you intend to build a church, we have decided to send you a minister" (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708, Cape Town, 1896, p217); "Having received the necessary permission for building this church" (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708, Cape Town, 1896, p164); and the entry on the 8th November 1718 (not 8th September as referenced by Hugo) concerning the funds collected in 1698 "tot formeeringhe eener Cruijskerk" (De Wet, G C. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel V, 1716-1719. Cape Town, 1964, pp311-314). All three entries suggest a new building rather than additions to an existing structure. Hugo notes that all the correspondence until 1715 regarding the replacement of the burned-out church referred to its rebuilding, and that the first mention of a new structure was in 1717 (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, pp53-54). This could have been because the first reaction to the loss of the temporary church was to repair it as an interim measure.
However, when its walls had deteriorated to such an extent that it would have had to be rebuilt from its foundations, the decision was evidently made to commence the permanent church first suggested by Van Rheede in 1685 and first contemplated by the church council in 1698.

10 Hugo mentions that the floor was tiled, and that these tiles were replaced in 1708. They were removed from the ruins in 1720 by the minister Beck for use in the new church (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, pp28-29).

Vos, on the other hand, states on the basis of documentary evidence that the floor was originally paved with bricks, but that these were replaced by tiles in 1709 (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, p148).


13 Hugo notes that the reason for the relocation of the church on a considerably smaller site is not provided in any of the contemporary documents. His suggested explanation is that it was re-sited in order to avoid the prevailing winds and the possibility of a future conflagration (Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch. p54). This explanation was repeated in Smuts (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p250)


16 The church appears on the following maps preserved in the Cape Archives: M1/17, c1691 [Fig 161]; M1/1162, c1701 [Fig 163]; and M1/1158, c1701 [Fig 164]. In all cases the depictions are variations on a rectangular gabled nave with a tower at one end, evidently a cartographer’s symbol for religious buildings.

17 This similarity was also noted by Hugo, although he confused the issue by referring also to the British belltower over the Burgher watch-house, which he dated "after 1755" instead of 1829 (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963. pp26-27).

18 For the "porch" of the church, see Chapter 9.3.1, p469.

19 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp384-385. There is also the possibility that Leibbrandt mistranslated this passage, and that classes were held in the body of the church itself, where more space would have been available. Without immediate access to the original manuscript of the document in question, however, which falls outside the research parameters of this thesis, the present author can make no conclusive statement in this regard. Perhaps significantly, though, no reference to the "porch" is made by Hugo or Vos.

22 See Chapter 7.5.2, pp277-279.
23 See Chapter 9.4.2, p533.
28 While Hugo's interpretations of Stade are more than thirty years out of date, it is disconcerting to see that as recently as 1987 Fransen compromised on the Stellenbosch church by describing it as having half-hipped ends, instead of the full hips clearly depicted by Stade (Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an investigation into stylistic modes in the architecture and applied arts at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1820. Pietermaritzburg, 1987, p327).
30 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch. p41.
31 Vos, who is convinced that the site located by Hugo is that of the original church, attributes the off-centre siting to the inaccuracy of surveying at the time (Verbal communication, May 1995). However, the mislocation of a centre-line by 24 feet over a total distance of 222 feet, an inaccuracy of more than ten percent, is stretching the incompetence of the surveyor beyond reasonable limits.
32 If, moreover, the 22-foot width referred to internal rather than external dimensions, this would have given an overall width of 26 feet, assuming 2-foot wall thicknesses. The building would then have been located centrally in the block, 98 feet from Plein Street and from Church Street. It is more likely, though, that the temporary church was slightly mislocated, given the internal proportional relationships which will be discussed below.
There is also the possibility that Plein Street was widened by 26 feet subsequent to Hertzog's survey, but this is unlikely. The probable widening of the street on its northern rather than its southern side, prior to 1817, has already been discussed.
34 The subdivision of the large block into ten plots corresponds partly with the nine plots shown on Hertzog's 1817 survey [Fig 189], and this could be seen as evidence contrary to the argument presented above.
However, the existence of an unsubdivided plot on the eastern side of the block along Ryneveld Street suggests that this plot was consolidated at a later stage, particularly given that it has two buildings facing Plein Street on its northern side. This is also the case in the plot immediately to the west of it, whereas the block containing the so-called church is considerably narrower.
It could be, therefore, that the two plots to the east of the "church" block were
originally divided into four, as was the single plot along Ryneveld Street. These eight plots, together with the two flanking the "church" would have constituted the original subdivision. The other four plots to the west would therefore have formed a later extension to this block, explaining the discrepancy between its present size and the roughly square churchyard depicted by Stade.

It must be noted that these conclusions are drawn only from Stade's drawing and Hertzog's survey, without the opportunity of confirmatory research in the Deeds Office, or for checking Hugo's dimensions in situ.

35 Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, p38. The reference quoted by Hugo reads as follows: "...om de plaats alwaar de vorige kerk heeft gestaan, met een op de oude fundamenten op te halene ringmuur van de te verkopene erven af te sluiten".

36 Hugo, Die Kerk van Stellenbosch, p38.


38 A possible explanation for these discrepancies is that after Fick had completed the "scheymuur", Beyleveld converted it into a "ringmuur" and built the charnel house. However, this "ringmuur" was unlikely to have surrounded the site of the original church, as discussed previously.


40 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, p148.

41 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, pp152-154.

42 For contemporary dimensions of the church, see Chapter 9.3.1, p466.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3.5

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p244.


4 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch). Vol 5, pp 1,31-32; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation). Vol 1, p141. This entry, which also describes the route taken to Stellenbosch during his visit in 1705, confirms that Valentyn had actually seen the village with his own eyes prior to the fire. However, he could not have stayed long, given the brevity of his accounts of the church and drostdy in comparison with his detailed descriptions of the Cape Town church and hospital and of the Van der Stel's residences at Constantia and Vergelegen.


6 Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good
Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1944, Part Three, p43. Mentzel mentioned in addition that "The Government was also commanded to build there, a suitable Raadhuis, a residence for the Landdrost, a gaol for arrested persons, and a dwelling for the Assistant Landdrost and for the veldwagters (or gendarmes)."

7 Mentzel. Description (English translation). Part Three, p44. Plagiarism was common at the time, and was not considered to be dishonourable, even the Dutch Reformed minister Valentyn making use of the practice.


9 Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, Fig 8, p42 (Conterman); and pp71 & 77 and Fig 27:1, p78 (Scheffer).


11 Vos states that both "the miller and the secretary to the mill lived in the millhouse" in 1707 (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp91-93).


13 Vos does not provide any archaeological plans for the houses on the southern side of Dorp Street, but does suggest that the "Loubserhuis" dates from the 18th century (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pl75 and Fig 78, p168). This is the only house whose title-deed correspondence cannot be reconciled, suggesting that its location was described ambiguously.

14 Vos locates the "Pietersz" house on the site of "Colonieshuis 1" (No 9), on the western side of the intersection (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, p175 and Fig 78, p168). This is the only house whose title-deed correspondence cannot be reconciled, suggesting that its location was described ambiguously.


16 Vos. Colonial Stellenbosch. p175.

17 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch. Fig 11, p48.

18 Vos. Colonial Stellenbosch. p175.


21 For the possibility of a grant of 1709, see Chapter 9.3.2, pp479-480.


25 The number of bricks must have been incorrectly recorded, as it would have provided only ten square metres of walling.

26 Thus providing a bearing surface of one foot on either side.


28 It is difficult to determine the length of this western extension along Dorp Street. The five-foot dimension has been based on the outside of the narrow c1710 foundation, but this does not continue across the rearward extension. Here another foundation is shown a further two feet to the west, but Vos dates it as later than 1710 [Fig 210].

29 Vos, unfortunately, does not disclose the nature of the foundations dated 1694 and c1710.

30 See Chapter 9.3.1, p467.

31 See Chapter 7.6.2, pp325-326.


33 His replacement as Landdrost in 1696 is recorded in the legend of Hertzog's 1817 survey of Stellenbosch (Cape Archives. Map Collection: M2/726), and his wife was described as a widow in a letter to Holland dated August 1696 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p28).

34 The wall was removed on the 10th December 1712 (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1869. Stellenbosch, 1993, p150). The cellar, together with the other "Linnes-erven", was sold to Jan Botma on the 12th December 1710, five days before the fire (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, pp211-212). Botma already had an out-building on his farm Welgevallen across the river, and would therefore have had no need to use the cellar on the land which he had probably bought for speculative purposes. It would thus have caused him no inconvenience to offer it to the community for use as a church.

35 See Notes 32 and 34. Linnes is unlikely to have built a house here as he would have lived in the drostty until he died in office in 1695/96. It is also unlikely that his widow built the house, as she was granted permission in August 1696 to receive her "pay" (presumably pension) in Holland, suggesting that she returned to her home town Amsterdam after the death of her husband (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p28).

36 Stander's reconstructed plan [Fig 190] shows this empty plot having the same width as the other two, but Stade's drawing reveals that it was only a quarter of the length
of the block, suggesting unequally sized plots. This is confirmed by the survey plan of this block illustrated in Hugo, although here the buildings numbered 10 and 11 are shown as discontinuous (Hugo, A M and Van der Bijl, J. Die Kerk van Stellenbosch 1686-1963. Cape Town, 1963, p211).

41 Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, Fig 90, p190.
42 The other is Paradijs, the house of the Company's wood-cutter at Newlands. This house, however, dates from after the period of this thesis, having been built only in 1719/20, and the inventory dates only from 1768 (Hall, M, Malan, A. Amman, S. Honeyman, L, Kiser, T and Ritchie, G. The archaeology of Paradise. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series, Vol 7, 1993).
44 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, p191.
45 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, pp185-191.
47 Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, pp185-191. Although he does not state as much in his text, it is clear from his developmental sequence that Vos believes that the positions of the windows were altered in c1735/40, in c1770 and in c1800 (Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, Fig 90, p190).
48 The revised arrangement shown in Fig 218 gives access to the lean-to only from the bedroom, as the foundations of the southern wall of the lean-to are too close to the angled northern wall of the "voorhuis" to permit room for a doorway. This, however, might have been an advantage, as the store for valuables was reached only from the most private room of the house, thereby improving its security.
51 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, p169.
52 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, p184.
53 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, pp177-181.
54 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, pp177-181.
55 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, pp177-181.
56 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, pp177-181.
57 Vos, Colonial Stellenbosch, pp182 and 184.
The master-builder Diederik, who had also built the Colony's stables (see Chapter 9.3.3, p470), was probably responsible for a number of houses in and around the village. It is possible, therefore, that the house occupied by Elsevier was located on the outskirts of the village.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3.6

1 See Chapter 9.3.3, p488.
2 Similar to the "early-straight" type in Cook's classification (Cook, M A. Some notes on the origin and dating of Cape gables. Africana Notes and News, March 1947, pp31-50. Her classification was expanded in Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, pp4-21).
3 One of them, the Schreuder house (No 12), has been restored with an asymmetrical facade and half-hipped ends rather than the full hips depicted by Stade. However, the house as restored is a later and larger building than the house depicted by Stade. Vos' archaeological excavations have revealed that the positions of the original internal walls cannot be reconciled with the present facade openings (see Chapter 9.3.5, pp513-517).

The restorers' opinion that the Stade drawing is "neither accurate nor clear" must therefore be based on the mistaken premise that no subsequent alterations were undertaken (Fagan, G and G. Schröder House - the oldest documented dwelling in SA. Restorica 1, December 1975, pp36-38).

Woodward also believes that the irregular facade is correct for a date of 1710, despite the evidence provided by Stade and her own rejection of the T-plan of the house as restored (Woodward, C S. The interior of the Cape house, 1670-1714. Pretoria, 1982, p48).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.3.7

1 Vos provided the identification of this gabled farmhouse as Idas Vallei (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, p104).
3 Walton also notes the symmetrical nature of this house. However, he dismisses the centre gable as a mere "dormer", and does not stress the importance of this element, which he states was uncommon outside Cape Town until the 1750s (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989, p17).
4 Walton suggests that the farmhouse was the gabled end-entry building depicted by Johannes Mulder in 1689 [Fig 174], and that during the next thirty years "a long rectangular farm building had been built nearby and a kapstylvnis, which probably housed the servants" (Walton, J. Old Cape Farmsteads. Cape Town, 1989, p16).
The unlikelihood of the main building being the original farmhouse has already been raised (see Chapter 9.2.3, pp446 & 447-448). It is possible that the earlier house had been converted into the out-building to the right. But Walton's contention that this was a "long building" is not necessarily supported by Stade's drawing.

5 The identification of this farmhouse as Bergzicht was also made by Vos, but he makes no mention of its atypical form or its centre gable, stating that the latter feature occurred only at Voorgelegen and Idas Vallei (Vos, H N. An historical and archaeological perspective of colonial Stellenbosch 1680-1860. Stellenbosch, 1993, p104).

6 The one possible exception is the first pavilion in the Company's garden above Cape Town, which was described by Tachard as having a similarly wide central opening (see Chapter 7.6.2, pp321-323). This began as a garden store, and the central space was probably used as a covered off-loading area. The same might also have been the case at Bergzicht.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.4

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.4.1

1 As stated by Fransen and Cook (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, pp200-201).


3 Kolbe, Beschryving (Dutch translation). Vol I, pp117-121. This sequence is repeated by Valentyn, but since there is no evidence that he travelled as far inland as Drakenstein, his information was probably derived from Kolbe (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behoorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Part I, pp158-163).


NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.4.2

1 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town. 1961, pp195-196. Bax states that the first services were held in a hut ("een verlaten hutte") abandoned by one of the French refugees after he had moved elsewhere. Later they were held in a room on a farm, and from 1695 to 1717 in a shed described in 1715 as "een seer bouwvallige hutte" (Bax. D. Nederlandse invloed op de oudste Kaapse kerkgebouwen. Bulletin van de Koninklijke
None of this information appears in the Resolutions of the Council of Policy, and must therefore have been derived either from the church records or the resolutions of the Landdrost and Heemraden, sources which fall outside the research parameters of this thesis.


5 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched, 1696-1708*. Cape Town, 1896, p221.


13 Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien"*. Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p 136; and Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende* (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Part I, p163. As mentioned previously, there is no record of Valentyn's ever having seen the Drakenstein church, and his description here must have been based on Kolbe. His criticism of the burghers, however, appears to have been his own opinion.


16 De Wet, *Resolusies*, Vol V, p154. Fransen and Cook maintain that it was built in 1715 and 1716 (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. *The Old Buildings of the Cape*. Cape Town, 1980, pp200-201), but there was still work to be done on the 22nd December 1716, as stated in the Resolutions (De Wet, *Resolusies*, Vol V, pp122-123).


18 An unidentified structure is shown at Drakenstein on M1/17, a map of the settlement dating from c1691 [Fig 161]. This was probably the church, as it is
depicted diagrammatically as a rectangular structure with a tower at one end. It appears in the same position on M1/1181 [Fig 162] and the later M1/1182 [Fig 166], both enlargements of M1/17 extending as far north as Saldanha Bay. In the first of these the building is described as "Franse predikant", and in the second as "Eglise Francois".

The church is shown again on M1/1162 [Fig 163], a map of the whole settlement dating from the early 1700s. It is not annotated, but is depicted in the same diagrammatic convention employed for the church at Stellenbosch. It is located to the west of the road leading from the "Bangehoek" to the "Babiloonsche Tooren", about half-way between the two, instead of on the river as suggested in M1/17. The water-mill is now indicated on the banks of the river.

The church is depicted in more detail on M1/1159 [Fig 165], where single windows are symmetrically positioned on either side of a central doorway in the rectangular nave, which adjoins a tower to the right, with its own entrance. Clearly not an accurate representation of a freeburgher's shed, this sketch follows the graphic convention employed for the Stellenbosch church, but suggests a smaller structure.

Despite the unsubstantiated suggestion that it was "probably the building to the right of the main road" (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch: Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, p247). While it is tempting to speculate that Stade composed his drawing with the church in the foreground, this is not a conclusive argument.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.4.3

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p199.
2 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p316.
6 Leibbrandt, Letters Received, 1696-1708. p322.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.4.4

1 Kolbe, P. The present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis). London, 1731, Vol 2, pp47-48. The Dutch translation is more descriptive in this regard: "Daar is ook nog geen dorp, zoo als in die van Stellenbosch aangelegd, maar de ingezetenen wonen hier en elders van elkander verspreid" (Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop (Dutch translation). Amsterdam, 1727, Vol 1, pp114-115).
2 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe
3 Seen on out-buildings at the contemporary Vergelegen and also employed in Van
Riebeeck's period, but unlikely here as a similar downward slope does not appear
on the other side.
4 But the angle is not steep enough, and the eaves-line would have been
uncomfortably low.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9.5
1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp433-434.
The letter announcing the dismissal of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel was received at
the Cape in the ship "Cattendijck" on the 17th April 1707. He was not given the
option of remaining at the Cape as a freeburgher, as his father had been, but was
recalled to Holland together with the Secunde Samuel Elsevier, the Minister Petrus
Kalden, the Landdrost Starrenburg, and his brother Frans van der Stel. The last, a
freeburgher, was to leave at once (Boeseken, A J. Simon van der Stel en sy
2 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape
Town, 1962, pp2-3; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town,
1896, p125.
3 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol IV, pp48-49.
6 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape
Town, 1962, pp77-79.
8 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape
Boeseken, however, disregarded this evidence and subscribed to the theory that the
house was only partially demolished. Moreover, she ignored the evidence of
Walgate, a source whom she quoted, who stated that the walls consisted almost
entirely of debris, as will be revealed later in this chapter.
10 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape
Town, 1962, pp106-107; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town,
1896, p197.
11 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol IV, p120; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1699-1732,
pp204-205.
12 Botha, C G. Collectanea: First Series. Cape Town, 1924, p89.
13 It should be stressed that Cnoll appeared to be using the words "huijsinge" and
"wooninge" for buildings rather than dwelling houses. His reference to more than
one such structure within the octagon, therefore, is not an indication that the
Governor's residence was still standing (Botha, Collectanea, pp71 & 90).
14 Bogaert, A. *Historische Reizen door d’oostersche Deelen van Asia*. Amsterdam, 1711, p102; Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoopen in “Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien”*. Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 4, pp c.144-145; Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende* (English translation). Cape Town, 1973, Part II, p285; and Fouche, L. *The Diary of Adam Tas*. 1705-1706. London, 1914, p89. These amounted to no more than a mention of the existence of this large estate, but Bogaert and Valentyn later described the farm and its buildings more comprehensively.

15 Van der Stel, W A. *Korte Deductie*. Amsterdam, 1708, pp45-54. Although there had been previous letters of complaint about the conduct of the Governor, the "Korte Deductie" and the "Contra-Deductie" made reference to a specific list of complaints. This petition ("klagskrif") against Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel was compiled late in 1705 by Adam Tas and Henning Hüsing and circulated for signing in January 1706. The document was handed over to the ship’s doctor ("skeepsarts") Abraham Bogaert, who carried it to Holland with the return fleet (Boeseeken, A J. *Simon van der Stel en sy kinders*. Cape Town, 1964, pp187-190).

16 Van der Stel, Korte Deductie, p5; and Leibbrandt, H C V. *The Defence of Willem Adriaan van der Stel*. Cape Town, 1897, p6.

17 Van der Stel, Korte Deductie, p6; and Leibbrandt, Defence, p7.

18 Van der Stel, Korte Deductie, p12; and Leibbrandt, Defence, p14.

19 The present author’s translation differs considerably from that in Leibbrandt’s "The Defence of Willem Adriaan van der Stel", as the latter is inaccurate in many respects.


23 Anonymous, *De Regte en Waare Oorsprong en Gevolg Der laatste Onlusten aan Caab van Goede Hoop* ("Neutrale Gedagten"). Amsterdam, undated. This work has been attributed to Abraham Bogaert, but its style is far more provocative than his account in "Historische Reizen", and is more suggestive of a legally than of a medically trained mind.


26 However, Kok’s plan of the Trippenhuis in Amsterdam annotates rooms of similar size as "garderobes", suggesting that the term could have been in common usage at this time (Kok, A A. *Amsterdamsche Woonhuizen*. Amsterdam, 1946, p94).


29 Van der Heiden, J and Tas. A. Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van
de valsheit der uitgegeevene Deductie. Amsterdam, 1712, pp4-5.
30 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. p74.
31 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp128-129.
32 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp129-130.
33 These could also have been glazed bricks rather than tiles, but the colours are of
particular significance, as Delftware is usually associated with the colours blue and
white.
34 Van der Heiden, J and Tas. A. Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van
de valsheit der uitgegeevene Deductie. Amsterdam, 1712, p i30.
35 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp278-279. Boekeken ridiculed the
accounts of Vergelegen in the "Contra-Deductie", particularly the notorious bath
with its mirror on the ceiling. However, she omitted to mention that its description
was not derived from a "wild rumour", as she suggested, but from the sworn
statement of the very man who had built it (Boekeken. A J. Simon van der Stel en
36 Walton suggests that this was for finches or canaries rather than pigeons (Walton, J.
Cape dovecots and fowl-runs. Stellenbosch, 1985, p3).
37 Van der Heiden, J and Tas. A. Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van
de valsheit der uitgegeevene Deductie. Amsterdam, 1712, p131.
38 This reference indicates that Vergelegen was not sited on the old Company’s post,
as suggested by Markell (Markell, A B. Building on the past: the architecture and
archaeology of Vergelegen. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series,
Vol 7, p72).
39 Van der Heiden, J and Tas. A. Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van
de valsheit der uitgegeevene Deductie. Amsterdam, 1712, p132.
40 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp133-134.
41 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. p137.
42 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp162-163.
43 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp138-139.
45 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp146-147 & 161-162.
46 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. pp161-162.
47 Van der Heiden and Tas. Contra-Deductie. p234.
48 This cannot have been because Van der Stel was anxious to conceal the extent of his
establishment, as he had no qualms about inviting Valentyn to Vergelegen in 1705.
49 Kolbe, P. Nauwkeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van die Kaap de Goede Hoop
51 Kolbe, P. The present state of the Cape of Good Hope (English precis).
53 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost

54 The print in Bogaert was essentially the same as that in the “Korte Deductie”, although there are some differences in detail which will be discussed below.


56 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p.33; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol I, pp.149-151.

57 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p.34; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol I, p.151. Valentyn’s use of “Kaap Falso” (the present Cape Hangklip) rather than “Baaij Falso” is misleading. Vergelegen actually faced across False Bay towards the present Swartkopberge, to the south of Simon’s Bay. (Topo-Cadastral series, 1:250,000, 3318, CAPE TOWN. Pretoria: Government Printer, 1982).

58 Valentyn, Beschryvinge (Dutch), Vol 5, p.34; and Valentyn, Beschryvinge (English translation), Vol I, p.153.

59 The contemporary meaning of “Heeren huys” was “a Lord’s house” (Sewel, W. A Large Dictionary, English and Dutch. Amsterdam, 1727). Its use in the caption to the site plan in the “Contra-Deductie” was probably intentionally ironical, making reference to the pretensions of Van der Stel and his overbearing and intolerant attitude. A manor house is defined in the “Shorter Oxford Dictionary” as “The mansion of the lord of a manor”. While certainly a powerful Governor, Van der Stel was not a member of the landed aristocracy, a class that has never been recognized in South Africa except in its indigenous cultures. The use of the term “manor house” for the farmhouses of the later 18th century is likewise pretentious and misleading, but has never been questioned. This term, still in general use, creates the illusion of a culture more “aristocratic” than it was in reality.

60 The descriptions in Dutch of the buildings or features appearing on the drawing are taken from the legend and given the same numbers. The English translations are taken from Smuts (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries. Stellenbosch, 1979, pp.180-181).

62 The positions of these out-buildings are shown incorrectly in Pearse’s plan, which also takes the liberty of “correcting” the original to suggest a triple H-planned residence, as will be referred to later (Pearse, G E. Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. Cape Town, 1968, p.46).

63 Biermann, B E. Boukuns in Suid-Afrika. Cape Town, 1955, pp.15-20. This argument is repeated by Tijmens (Smuts, F. Stellenbosch: Three Centuries.
Stellenbosch, 1979, pp183-184); and by Fransen (Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an investigation into stylistic modes in the architecture and applied arts at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1820. Pietermaritzburg, 1987, pp311-312).

Biermann restated his contention in 1989 (Biermann, B E. Oor die bronne van ons volksbarok. Architecture SA. July/August 1989, pp25-28). This has been accepted by subsequent writers in the field, including Brink (Brink, Y. The octagon: an icon of Willem Adriaan van der Stel's aspirations? South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series, Vol 7, 1993, pp92-97) and Markell (Markell, A B. Building on the past: the architecture and archaeology of Vergelegen. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series, Vol 7, 1993, pp71-83).

64 Biermann's analysis was evidently based on the perspectives only, without reference to the plans. Fransen, moreover, states inaccurately that the four out-buildings immediately outside the octagon were "placed symmetrically along two axes" (Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an investigation into stylistic modes in the architecture and applied arts at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1820. Pietermaritzburg, 1987, p311).


66 A Rhineland Rood was 12 feet in length (Mohr, A H. Vestingbouwkundige Termen, 's-Gravenhage, 1983, p29).

67 This was probably an engraver's error, caused by the fact that the detailed plan showed only the landing and omitted the steps.

68 This, incidentally, is 2 feet longer than it should have been, given that his internal length for the "galdery" was 80 feet. Gerritszoon's discrepancy here will also be discussed when evaluating the evidence.

69 These walls are probably also an engraver's error, as was the case with those "enclosing" the staircase and terrace leading to the principal facade of the Governor's residence, noted above.

70 The detailed plan shows the cross-shaped granary with arms of equal length, whereas the site plan shows an elongated Greek cross. The dimensions on the former, however, suggest that the latter is the more accurate representation.


72 Markell, Vergelegen, pp71-83.

73 Walton, J. Water-mills, windmills and horse-mills of South Africa. Cape Town, 1974, p37. Walton incorrectly attributes this drawing to Abraham Bogaert, who never saw Vergelegen himself. Moreover, the version which Walton illustrates is not the one which appears in Bogaert's "Historische Reizen", but is the original print depicted in Van der Stel's "Korte Deductie".

74 Smuts, F. Stellenbosch Three Centuries, Stellenbosch, 1979, p185. This is the engraving which is illustrated in Bogaert's "Historische Reizen". Its detailed
differences suggest a re-engraving of the original print.


76 Walton suggests that these were decorative wall-anchors (Walton, J. Some South African decorative wall-anchors. Restorica 21. April 1987, pp6-11). This is improbable, as this out-building was no wider than the others, which were devoid of any such ties. Moreover, Markell's reconstruction of the slave lodge [Fig 232] reveals that the tie beams did not continue across the full width of these buildings because of the presence of internal piers (Markell, A B. Building on the past: the architecture and archaeology of Vergelegen. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series. Vol 7, pp71-83). The reason for Walton's misconception is probably the diagonal nature of the engraving process employed, as revealed in his enlargement of this drawing.


The present author was well aware that these two drawings depicted the inner and outer facades of Vergelegen when writing his article on the triple gable, but assumed that this would be obvious to a professional readership (Fitchett, R H. The triple gable at the Cape. Architecture SA. March/April 1986, pp27-31). Fransen in his thesis, however, suggests an ignorance on the author's part in this regard (Fransen. Classicism etc. Note 3.41. p369). As an analogy, it was similar to Boschendal rather than to Rhone, to use two adjacent examples in the Drakenstein valley dating from the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Boschendal is orientated away from its farmyard, but the entrance to Rhone is reached between two flanking out-buildings, in the "Baroque" manner.

79 As seen in Rach's drawing of the Burgher watch-house before the casements were replaced by sliding sashes, and stated by Obholzer as still existing at 93 Bree Street, Cape Town, and at Warburg (Matjeskuil), in the Klapmuts district (Obholzer, A, Baraitsre, M and Malherbe, W A. The Cape House and its interior. Stellenbosch, 1985, p156).

80 Fransen describes the "segment-shaped pediment" of this gable as standing "firmly in seventeenth-century Dutch Classicism". However, he also suggests that the engraving "perhaps exaggerates the ostentation of the farmhouse" (Fransen, H. Three Centuries of South African Art. Johannesburg, 1981, p54).


82 Or "eyebrows" in local terminology, as used by Floyd and Walton, and the "hats' eyes" of Pryce-Lewis (see Sources Consulted).
83 Pryce-Lewis has pointed out that the correct height to width ratio should be 1:3.8, based on Theal. "quoting contemporary sources" (presumably Van der Stel for the height of 19 feet and Zevenhoven for the width of 72 feet). Pryce-Lewis, O. Vergelegen: two drawings. Architecture SA. September/October 1988, pp46-47. While the drawing in the "Contra-Deductie" reveals a ratio of 1:2, that in the "Korte Deductie" is closer at 1:3.25.

84 The only Cape Dutch example known to the author with a full-width cornice below the eaves line is Kromme Rivier in Stellenbosch, built in 1831 (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Houses of the Cape. Cape Town, 1965, p54).

85 It should be stressed again that Bogaert’s engraving is derived from the original print in the "Korte Deductie".

86 Pryce-Lewis’ proportional reconstruction of the octagon facade (Pryce-Lewis, O. Vergelegen: two drawings. Architecture SA. September/October. 1988. pp46-47), which he states "is not intended to be a conjectural restoration", nevertheless makes a number of "conjectural" assumptions. The first is that the "floating" cornice in the "Korte Deductie" is correct. The second is that the semi-circular pediment surmounting the gable was above the roof, whereas the "Contra-Deductie" depicts only the finial as projecting. This finial, incidentally, he has depicted as a keystone. The third is that the dwarf-gables are shown as swept dormers ("bats’ eyes"), and the finials have been converted into keystones similar to the one on the main gable. These would have been impracticable on a swept dormer.

87 The excavations revealed dimensions of "almost 40 x 12 m" for the slave lodge, equal dimensions for the mill/stable of "122 Cape feet by 38 Cape feet", and dimensions for the wine-cellar of "150 Cape feet in length and 38 Cape feet broad" (Markell, A B. Building on the past: the architecture and archaeology of Vergelegen. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series. Vol 7, 1993, pp74-78).

88 The reconstruction of the slave lodge shows the internal supports as timber posts rather than the masonry piers described by Markell in her text. She does state, however, that those in the mill/stable were probably of timber, on account of the small size of their foundations and the absence of any evidence of brickwork (Markell, A B. Building on the past: the architecture and archaeology of Vergelegen. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series. Vol 7, 1993, p81). The latter are more likely, corresponding as they do with the masonry piers in the similarly triple-aisled hospital, a point not noted by Markell. However, the hospital does not appear to have had the mansard roofs of the Vergelegen out-buildings, which seem to have been unique at the Cape. The complexity of these roofs reinforces the argument that an even more complex roof, with internal drainage, was used on the Governor’s residence at Vergelegen.


91 Mentzel referred to the “entrance hall” of the Cape-Dutch farmhouse being used as the principal dining room during his stay at the Cape in the 1730s (Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1944. Part Three, pp242-243 & 284).


97 Fransen and Cook describe "only the back third" of the house, facing the octagon, as having been demolished (Fransen, H and Cook, M A. The Old Buildings of the Cape. Cape Town, 1980, pp192-194). This could suggest that they acknowledged that the original house faced west rather than east. However, it is more likely that they were referring to the back in relation to the present house, as Fransen states elsewhere that the main facade of Van der Stel’s Vergelegen faced the octagon.


100 Obholzer, A, Baraitser, M and Malherbe, W A. The Cape House and its interior. Stellenbosch, 1985, p196. If these really are the original roof timbers, it can only be because the purchaser of the portion containing the demolished residence had also bought the salvaged roof timbers and used them in the new building which he erected. This, however, would have permitted wider spans than those in the present house (the widest of which are 18 feet long), and therefore suggests that the 24-foot long timbers of the original house were not re-used.


102 Fransen, Classicism etc, pp75-76.


105 Pryce-Lewis, O. Vergelegen: two drawings. Architecture SA. September/October, 1988, pp46-47. The front and back walls of the central hall of the farmhouse are omitted from both contemporary plans, suggesting at face value that this could have been an entrance route to the residence, but this is unlikely for three reasons.
Firstly, had this been the case, the whole complex would have been rotated through 90 degrees, with the "propylaeum" located on the side of the octagon reached from the road to the Cape. Secondly, the staircase and terrace of the residence, shown on one of the plans and suggested on the other, would have faced the octagon rather than the avenue. It is more likely that the omission of the lines linking the two wings of the transverse plan of the farmhouse was due to the fact that it was not raised above the ground and reached by steps, as was the case with the residence. Thirdly, a "voorhuis" between the two front rooms of the farmhouse is described by Van der Stel himself, and by two of his employees, as quoted by Bogaert. It appears, moreover, that Pryce-Lewis was not aware that this structure was a farmhouse. One would hardly have approached the main façade of a Governor's residence through the entrance hall of his overseer's house.

109 These dimensions were scaled off the two perspectives, using the 72-foot width of the main façade as a datum.
110 The reconstructed plan is based on Gerritszoon's dimensions, Remkes' plan, and the measured drawings of the existing house prepared by Rennie and Goddard.
111 Obholzer describes the residence as having a hipped "Mansart" (sic) roof, and suggests that the roofing materials were clay tiles rather than thatch (Obholzer. A. Baraitser, M and Malherbe, W A. The Cape House and its interior. Stellenbosch, 1985, p155). However, only the out-buildings at Vergelegen had mansard roofs, the main house having a hipped roof as was clearly depicted in both the "Korte Deductie" and "Contra-Deductie" perspectives. The accuracy of these two drawings can be inferred from Stade's views of Constantia and Henning Hüsing's town house, the latter almost contemporary with Vergelegen. There is no evidence that the roof was tiled, and Valentyn would surely have commented if this had been the case. Tiled roofs had already been abandoned in Cape Town as an unsuccessful experiment and, moreover, a thatcher was mentioned as having been employed at Vergelegen.
113 Biermann, B E. A contribution to the study of the origins of colonial architecture at the Cape. Cape Town, 1952, pp7-8 and commentary on Plate XI.
114 The "symmetry" of Vergelegen as symbolising the domination of Van der Stel over the landscape (Biermann) and the burgher population (Markell) has already been addressed (see Note 63, above).

Another aspect of its octagonal layout which has also been raised is its so-called sense of fortification. This was first suggested by Roosgaarde-Bisschop, who
introduced the notion that the double walls were for defensive reasons (Roosegaarde-Bisschop, G. De Oorsprongen van de Kaapse bouwkunst. Bulletin van de Koninklijke Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond. Jaargang 65, 1966, pp22-23), whereas they were actually enclosures for animals, to protect them from wild beasts, as noted by Valentyn.

Fransen repeats this argument, referring to the double walls which created the "inward-looking character of the octagonal enclosure" for reasons of "protection and togetherness in a vast and as yet largely untamed environment" (Fransen, H. Classicism, Baroque, Rococo and Neoclassicism at the Cape: an investigation into stylistic modes in the architecture and applied arts at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1820. Pietermaritzburg, 1987, pp311-312). If protection and defensibility had been a real consideration, it is likely that the buildings outside the octagon would also have been grouped around a yard, as was the case with the Company's stables in Cape Town. However, these seven out-buildings were left entirely unprotected.

Markell goes further, and suggests that the octagonal enclosure was not only for protection against wild beasts, but was also symbolic of the exclusion of a hostile burgher population (Markell, A B. Building on the past: the architecture and archaeology of Vergelegen. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series, Vol 7, 1993, pp80-81). Given that seven of the out-buildings were outside this enclosure, that the residence faced away from it and was therefore unprotected, and that the "double construction" was clearly to provide animal enclosures and service yards, this evidence suggests that the layout was derived from an attempt to combine these elements geometrically, and not for reasons of protection.

Markell also suggests that the engraving of Vergelegen in Van der Stel's "Korte Deductie" conveyed "a distinct sense of danger and of isolation on a frontier. The size of the lions on the surrounding mountainside, the proximity of the well armed Khoi in the foreground, and the thin, palisade-like quality of the surrounding wall combine to suggest a general air of beleaguerment... Van der Stel's drawing of his estate as frontier outpost, beset by dangers, suggests that he felt the danger and isolation as a reality. The danger that confronted him, however, may not have been that of the wild animals in the mountains behind, but of the social conflict that his controversial practices as Governor engendered" (Markell, Vergelegen, p80). This is improbable, as noted almost three centuries ago by the anonymous author of the "Neutrale Gedagten". Van der Stel was merely attempting to give this impression in the "Korte Deductie", an impression which still appears to be accepted at face value. Significantly, Valentyn gives no indication of danger in his first-hand account of the estate (apart from mentioning that the 8-foot high octagon walls served to protect the livestock against wild beasts), although his journey was made in the dark and his coach arrived only at midnight. Besides, given that Van der Stel's cattle posts extended a further sixty Dutch miles eastwards, he could...
hardly have felt that Vergelegen was on the edge of civilization. Markell states, moreover, that the "walled octagonal garden, whether it was perceived as fortress or as pleasure garden, was a demonstration of power" (Markell, Vergelegen, pp80-81). It is unlikely that it was perceived as either, nor was it a pleasure garden. It was a citrus orchard planted to obscure the sight and odour of the animal enclosures surrounding it, and was at the back rather than the front of the house. With the knowledge that the house faced away from the octagon, with an unprotected front facade, the fortress analogy becomes untenable.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 10

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.1

1 See Chapter 9.2.1.

2 St Helena Bay was first inspected on the 24th September 1652 (Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655*. Cape Town, 1952, p61; and Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669*. Cape Town, 1957, pp7-8). However, an unfavourable report was received on the 14th November (Thom, *Journal*, Vol I, pp81-99). Another report was submitted on the 8th November 1672, suggesting that a fort should be erected there (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676*. Cape Town, 1902, p88), but no further action was taken in this regard.

3 The evidence for the buildings on the islands is derived solely from contemporary verbal and visual sources. Those at Saldanha Bay, however, although hardly addressed in contemporary sources, have been the subject of archaeological excavation.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.2

1 It was suggested on the 24th November 1652 that the Khoi leader "Harry" should be banished to the island together with his wife, his children and his followers (Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655*. Cape Town, 1952, pp102-103).

However, the first mention of a convict actually being sentenced to banishment there was only on the 15th March 1657, and this sentence was commuted the following day (Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658*. Cape Town, 1954, pp101-102). It was mentioned on the 29th May 1657, though, that three exiles had been banished to the island (Thom, *Journal*, Vol II, p121).

2 The first sheep were taken over on the 14th May 1653 (Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655*. Cape Town, 1952, p156).

3 The suitability of the anchorage was first mentioned on the 21st February 1654 (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, p226).

4 First mentioned on the 18th March 1654 (Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655*. Cape Town, 1952, pp219-220). A train-oil boiler had been erected by the 30th March 1654 (Thom, *Journal*, Vol I, pp220-223), but there is no further reference to this activity until the 11th March 1710, when a resumption of the industry was suggested (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p232).


6 The first rabbits were sent to the island on the 3rd April 1654 (Leibbrandt, H C V.

7 The collecting of shells was first mentioned on the 5th June 1655 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, p316), and continued on a regular basis throughout the period of this thesis. See also Chapter 11.3.2.

8 The first lime-kiln on the island was established on the 6th June 1655 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, pp316-317). See also Chapter 11.3.3.

9 Stone quarrying was first mentioned on the 29th May 1657 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, pp321-322), but it was found on the 19th July that the stone disintegrated in the rain (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town, 1954, pp132-134; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp106-107). The quarrying of limestone was suggested on the 28th February 1667 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p214), and the first mention of slate being quarried was made on the 17th September 1671 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p26). The latter was to become a major industry on the island.

10 The beacon fire was first suggested on the 16th April 1657 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p238).

11 Pig breeding on the island was first mentioned on the 24th November 1659 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp156-157).
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4 Thom, Journal. Vol I, pp219-220; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp32-33. This had been completed the by the 30th March, close to the shed which had already been erected, and produced enough water for ships to be supplied in emergencies (Thom, Journal. Vol I, pp220-223).

5 These were sent on the 24th March 1654 (Thom, Journal. Vol I, p220).


7 See Chapter 9.2.4, pp457-458.

8 See Chapter 6.3.2, pp98-99, and Chapter 10.3.1, p595.


17 See also Chapter 6.3.2, pp101 & 104.


23 See also Chapter 6.3.2, pp101 & 104.


25 This is another indication that the earliest buildings at the Cape were not entered transversely as were the later townhouses and farmhouses.

26 See Notes 37-44, below.


29 The request for nails had been turned down on the 8th September 1657 (Thom, Journal, Vol II, p152).


1958, pp4-5. This entry could suggest that palisaded construction (as described by
Vos - see Chapter 7.2.2, Note 62) was not unknown at the Cape. However, the
supervisor on Robben Island might have been misinterpreting his instructions in the
light of his own memory of Northern European traditions. Significantly, the
carpenter's instructions were to build a timber-framed structure, clad with planks on
the one side and wattle-and-daub on the other. Moreover, the supervisor's
misconception that the "palisaded" wall should be on the more protected side and
the wattle-and-daub wall on the more exposed side suggests that he had no practical
experience of building construction.

48 This is consistent with its description as a "large timber sheep shed" in a letter to
the Council of Seventeen dated the 5th March 1659 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters
despached from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III. Cape Town, 1900, pp76-77).
49 See Chapter 6.3.2, pp104ff.
50 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town,
53 See Note 7, above.
54 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town,
1958, p304.
55 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagen'aer, 1662-1666.
1901, p14.
56 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p104; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670.
p79.
57 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p105; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p80.
58 This could have been the kitchen or the milk cellar. However, it is unlikely that
either of these structures would have been placed between the house and the
landing-place. One would have expected that they would rather have been located
behind the house, in order not to obscure its view of the anchorage.
59 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagen'aer, 1662-1666.
Pretoria, 1973, pp118-119; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape
Town, 1901, pp89-91.
60 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p128; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p96.
61 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p143; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670,
p107. This cannot have been the new timber dwelling erected in February, and
must therefore have been an additional house.
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.2.3

2 See Chapter 10.3.2, p598.
3 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, pp240 & 329.
8 There is no other reference to the "commissioners'" inspection of the island in the Journal, Resolutions or Letters.
13 This map also shows a battery where the Chavonnes Battery was located, and therefore cannot be dated earlier than 1714 (see Chapter 6.7, p174).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.2.4

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, p226.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.2.5

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape
NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.3

1 It was given this name by Joris Spilbergen in 1601 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I. 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, pp81-99).

2 The suitability of the island for this purpose was first mentioned on the 14th November 1652 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I. 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, pp81-99).


4 The free Saldanha traders' involvement in this industry was first mentioned on the 5th May 1662 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape. 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p256).

5 The last reference to train-oil was on the 26th October 1708, when a sergeant was sent to the island to supervise the industry (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p394).

6 The availability of shells on Dassen Island was first noted on the 17th November 1653 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I. 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1652, p189-192).

7 These were off-loaded on the 4th August 1655 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I. 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1652, p334).

8 The garden was first mentioned on the 12th October 1654 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, pp152-154), but there was no further mention of it after the 4th March 1670, when it was decided that no trees would be planted there (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp23-31).


11 First mentioned on the 15th September 1668 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp378-379), but the possibility of stocking the island with sheep had already been raised on the 22nd April 1654 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662.
Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, p.264).
12 The resolution to abandon the island was made on the 11th January 1673
(Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape
13 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town,
1959, pp.319-322.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.3.1

1 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town,
1952, p.61; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I,
3 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town,
1957, p.11.
4 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape
Town, 1900, pp.374 & 382.
5 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town,
8 Walton does not refer to this difference his article on the "kapsteilhuis" (Walton, J.
The South African Kapstyllhuis and some European Counterparts. Restorica 10,
9 As mentioned on the 27th October 1657 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck;
10 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape
Town, 1900, pp.286-287.
11 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town,
1954, pp.148-149.
13 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape
Town, 1900, p.339.
14 See Chapter 10.3.3, p.599.
15 First mentioned on the 15th September 1668 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die
17 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, pp.261-262. It is not clear for how long the
freeburghers had been breeding their own sheep on the island, or how extensive
their building activities had been.
18 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town,
1957, p.390.
20 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town,
According to the Journal, however, timber and a carpenter had already been sent for the purpose, following a request dated the 30th September 1669 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, pp301 & 303).


Seals were now being hunted for the train-oil they provided, and not for their skins.

First mentioned on the 22nd November 1706 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p110; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters Received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p404).

Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters Received, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p405.
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6 Leibbrandt. Letters despatched, 1652-1662. Vol II, p339. It was resolved on the 16th October 1657 that these guns would be sent to Robben Island, and a boat was sent for the purpose on the 27th October 1657 (See Chapter 10.2.3, Note 4).


NOTES TO CHAPTER 10.3.3


2 As recorded in a letter to the Council of Seventeen, dated the 9th April 1662 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape

4 Although the VOC monogram had already been carved on the “Rijpermonde” rock, Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens gave orders on the 16th April 1657 that a pole carrying a board with the Company’s arms was to be erected on the island (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, pp255-256, 261-262 & 263).
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1 As noted by Schrire and Deacon (Schrire, C and Deacon, J. The indigenous artefacts from Oudepost I, a colonial outpost of the VOC at Saldanha Bay, Cape. South African Archaeological Bulletin, Vol 44, 1989, pp105-113). According to Raven-Hart, orders to establish a post at Saldanha Bay were sent by the Seventeen on the 19th December 1668. These were complied with in April 1669 (Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, p99).


3 First mentioned on the 19th November 1661 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp435-436), the last reference to this industry was made on the 11th March 1710 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1962, pp153-158). This activity was at first entrusted to the free Saldanha traders, but had been taken over by the Company by the 13th December 1684 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp95-100).

4 First requested on the 3rd October 1653 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck’s Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651 - Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p135), and last mentioned on the 21st April 1674 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p195).


8 The collection of firewood was first suggested on the 7th November 1659 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume 11, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp152-154), first undertaken on the 19th March 1660 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III. Cape Town, 1900, p142), and last mentioned on the 17th June 1699 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received. 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p203).
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3 Although ships did occasionally supply themselves with water and firewood in emergencies (See Chapter 10.4, above).


6 As mentioned on the 9th September 1676 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p281).

7 Somewhat ambiguously, as the letter was addressed to Dassen Island, where the seal hunters were based (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II. Cape Town, 1900, p233).

8 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II. Cape Town, 1900, p284.

9 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II. Cape Town, 1899. pp230-232. This had previously been ordered as early as 1652, but evidently had not yet been done, as can be seen from a reprimand dated the 27th November (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I. Cape Town, 1900, pp64-66).


15 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III. Cape Town, 1900, p175.
16 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p159.
18 On the 21st April 1674, when a vessel loaded with shells and "limestone" sank when attempting to leave the bay (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676, Cape Town, 1902, p195).
21 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II, Cape Town, 1899, p181.
23 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p274.
24 As mentioned on the 24th April 1669 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p274).
27 Schrire states elsewhere that "60 lbs of nails" were also mentioned in VOC 4004, suggesting further that the "lodge" was timber-framed rather than of masonry construction (Schrire, C, Cruz-Uribe, K and Klose, J. The site history of the historical site at Oudepost I, Cape. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series. Vol 7, 1993, p24).
31 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p331.
32 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p337.
34 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676, Cape Town, 1902, p11.
36 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p75.
44 Dated c1700 by the Cape Archives, but it can be no earlier than 1708 as the depiction of Vergelegen from the "Korte Deductie" appears on the map.
46 Inaccurately described as a "curtain wall" by Schrire et al (Schrire, Site history Oudepost I, p21).
47 Since Vergelegen (begun 1701) appears, but the Chavonnes Battery (begun 1717) is not yet shown.
50 See Chapter 8.6, pp417 & 418-420.
52 Moreover, Schrire herself acknowledges that "its stratigraphic position suggests that GCL was not the first structure built here" (Schrire, Site history Oudepost I, p23).
53 Schrire, C. Excavating archives at Oudepost I, Cape. Social Dynamics. Vol 16, No 1, 1990, pp12-13. This, unfortunately, is not shown on Schrire's plan [Fig 254].
55 As further supported by the dating of "Oudepost I" to 1700 at the earliest, on the basis of clay pipe bore analysis (Yates, R and Smith, A B. A Reevaluation of the chronology of Oudepost: a reply in part to Schrire. South African Archaeological Bulletin. Vol 48, 1993, pp52-53). This would mean that "Oudepost 1" was contemporary with the present author's dating of the so-called "Posthuijs" at Muizenberg, despite its asymmetrical plan in comparison with the latter. The greater formality of the Muizenberg building would be explained if it had indeed been built as Simon van der Stel's private fishing house (see Chapter 8.6).
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1 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, pp78-80.


3 Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662*. Cape Town, 1958, pp296-298; and Boeseken, A J. *Resoluusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669*. Cape Town, 1957, pp251-252. This resolution followed Van Riebeeck’s report on the 9th December 1660, following his personal inspection, that Lacus Bay (now Noordbaai) was extremely dangerous (Thom, *Journal*, Vol III, pp293-296). It was also mentioned in a letter to the Seventeen dated the 9th April 1662 that it was very difficult for ships to leave the bay, because of contrary winds (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, pp216-217).


The first instance of Saldanha Bay actually being used for this purpose was on the 20th December 1654 (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, pp412-414).


6 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p212.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.1

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.1.1


5 Thom, Journal, Vol I, p220. It had already been decided on the 5th July 1653 that the walls of the fire-proof storehouse would be of masonry (Thom, Journal, Vol I, pp161-162), and the inadequacies of the original timber buildings were mentioned again on the 2nd April 1655 (Thom, Journal, Vol I, pp303-304).


13 "RONDEPALEN, tot stutten van boerehuijsen off andersints die onder over 't cruijs 6 duijmen dick zyn moeten gelden:

   "'t stuck van 7 off 8 voeten lanck ......................................................4 stuijvers
1 van 9 off 10 voeten lanck .................................................................6 stuijvers
1 van 11 off 12 dos. lanck .................................................................8 stuijvers

"Voorts van 12 voeten aff te rekenen tot 20 off 24 voeten lenghte, sal voor ijder voet een stuijver meer betaelt worden, 't welck bedragen souw een gulden.

"RONT GEMEEN PAGGERHOUT, daermede men thuijnen off cralen omheijnt.

thuijnen off cralen omheijnt. guldens stuijvers
"Voor 't stuck van 6 off 7 voeten:.........................................................0 ...............2
Van 8, 9, off 10 do. lanck: .................................................................0 ...............3

"Maer moeten ten minsten soo dick wesen.
dat 4 duijmen over 't cruijs halen cunnen.

"SPARREN, van 17 off 18 voeten lenghte en 2 ½ off 3 a 4 duijm dickte ijder: .................................................0 ...............2

"LATTEN, daer men riet op vastbint, en maer ronde stockjes zijn voor 't hondert:........................................1 .............10

"SPORTTEN als op de herm rontom 't fort staen
4 duijm breet, en 2 dos. dick ijder:.........................................................0 ...............2
"BALCKEN, besnoeijt van 5 duijmen dick in 't
viercant, en 11 off 12 voeten lanck: ............................................. 1 ......... 0
1 van 6 duijm dick, en 13 of 14 voeten lanck: ............................................. 1 ......... 10
1 van 7 do. dick, en 15 off 16 do. lanck: ............................................. 2 ......... 10
1 van 8 do. dick en vorige lengte: ............................................. 4 ......... 0
1 van 9 do. dick, en 17 off 18 do. lanck: ............................................. 5 ......... 0
1 van 10 do. dick, en 19 off 20 do. lanck: ............................................. 8 ......... 0
1 van gelycke dickte, en 23 off 24 do. lanck: ............................................. 9 ......... 0
1 van een voet dick en 25 off 26 do. lanck: ............................................. 11 ......... 0
"MOERBALCKEN: 1 van 14 duijm in 't viercant dick
en 24 voeten lanck: ............................................................................. 12 ......... 10
1 van 15 do. dick en 25 off 26 voet lanck: ............................................. 15 ......... 0
1 van 16 do. dick, en 27 off 28 v <oet> lanck: ............................................. 20 ......... 0
1 van 18 do. dick, en 29 off 30 v <oet> lanck: ............................................. 36 ......... 0
"PLAETINGHS. 1 van 6 duijm breet 3 do. smal
en 20 voeten lanck: ............................................................................. 2 ......... 0
"GORDINGS, gelijck de plaetinghs 5 duijm
viercant, en 20 voeten lanck: ............................................. 2 ......... 0"

Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape
Town, 1957, pp293-294; and Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaatboek, Deel I (1652-
1707). Cape Town, 1944, pp74-76.

14 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town,

15 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape
Town, 1961, pp236-238. This entry reveals that the double casements during the
proto-Cape Dutch period had taller proportions than those found in surviving Cape
Dutch houses. The latter are square or slightly wider than square, and are also
larger in size, varying between 4' 6" by 4' 6" and 5' 4" by 5' 0", according to
Pearse (Pearse, G E. Eighteenth Century Architecture in South Africa. Cape Town,
1968, p26).

16 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol III, pp232-233. For Woodward's contention that some
of the early buildings were log-cabins, and that of Vos that they were of palisaded
construction, see Chapter 7.2.2. pp231-232 & Note 62.
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.1.2a

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeek's Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape
Town, 1897, pp102-104; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the

2 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape
Town, 1900, p172.
5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I. Cape Town, 1898, p264.
8 Mauritius was abandoned on the 26th December 1657 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part II. Cape Town, 1899, p50).
14 Instructions were first given on the 8th July 1667 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p224).
15 The last requisition was made on the 11th June 1709 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1962, pp99-101).
17 The last shipment for the Castle was mentioned on the 10th October 1673 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p164).
19 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol III, p341. This expedition was also mentioned on the 30th May 1699 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters Despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, pp114-115).
20 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters Despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p115. Leibbrandt spells the second island "Marsseveen".
22 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p320. A last request was made on the 10th August 1708, but there is no record that any more timber was sent before the end of 1710 (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched.
23 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p238.
29 On the 18th April 1708 (Leibbrandt, Letters Despatched, 1696-1708, p346) and again on the 10th August 1708 (Leibbrandt, Letters Despatched, 1696-1708, pp388-389).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.1.2b

1 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, pp59-61. This date marks the first exploitation of the forests, timber having been collected for the foundations of the sentry-boxes.
2 Thom, Journal. Vol I, p166. An entry of the 11th June 1653 refers to two or three beams being transported from the forest every day on a locally made two-wheeled cart drawn by two oxen, which reveals that wood-cutting was being undertaken on a regular basis before the 1st August (Thom, Journal, Vol I, p160).
3 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck’s Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p149.
10 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town, 1954, pp103 & 104. This was the first of many instances of men from the fleets being used in the forest while in harbour, the last during the period of this thesis being recorded on the 8th May 1676 (Leibbrandt. H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 &


This is probably incorrect, as Leendert Cornelissen's forest was some distance from that owned by the Company. The forest offered to Roeloff Zieuwertssen was to have been located between them (see Note 12, above).


Boeseken, Dagregister en Briefe, pp107-108; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, pp81-82. The English translations of the names of the trees are Leibbrandt's.

Boeseken, Dagregister en Briefe, p109; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p84.

Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaathoek, Deel I (1652-1707). Cape Town, 1944, pp117-118. This edict was renewed on the 10th July 1676 (Jeffreys, Plakkaathoek, Vol 1, pp130-131) and on the 8th April/11th June 1680 (Jeffreys, Plakkaathoek, Vol 1, pp162-163), as also revealed in the resolution of the 8th April 1680 (see Note 21, below).


This was in connection with an edict proclaimed on the 7th/11th September 1693, prohibiting the grazing of freeburghers' cattle between these two points (Jeffreys, M K. Kaapse Plakkaathoek, Deel I (1652-1707). Cape Town, 1944, pp283-284). This edict was renewed on the 5th/15th March, 1694 (Jeffreys, Plakkaathoek, Vol 1, p287) and on the 10th January 1704 (Jeffreys,


However, Abraham van Riebeeck, writing in 1676, attributed their names to more esoteric origins: "At last we reached the desired hill, where at the side a bridle-path runs to the mine. Up this we rode, seeing far away on the left the Table Bay [actually False Bay] with the rocks lying in it; and close to us was a forest lying below us in a deep valley, which, because because it lies in a deep and very gloomy pit, has got the name of 'Hell', as also [the forest] which lies on the top of the hill was called 'Paradise'" (Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, p193. Quoted in Hall, M, Amman, S, Honeyman, L, Kiser, T and Ritchie, G. The archaeology of Paradise. South African Archaeological Society Goodwin Series, Volume 7, 1993, pp40-41). The mine in question, however, was at Witteboomen, a considerable distance beyond the Paradise excavated by Hall. This, together with Van Riebeeck's confusion between Table and False Bays, casts doubt on his "etymology". Moreover, a deep ravine beneath the forest of Paradise does not correspond with the topography of the excavated site, suggesting that "Hell" was considerably closer to Witteboomen, and probably at the bottom of Constantia Nek. Mentzel's explanation (to which Hall makes no reference) that the timber was easier to retrieve from "Paradise" than from "Hell", which corresponds with Van Riebeeck's description of their height relative to the road, is therefore more plausible.
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1 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, pp37-38 and p44, respectively. Neither of these two Journal entries is specific about the location of the forest, the first merely referring to it as being "inland". However, Hout Bay is explicitly mentioned in that of the lst October 1652, when it was stated that the Bay had been discovered by the two Assistants "shortly after our arrival here" (Thom, Journal Vol 1, p65).


6 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc. Part I; Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897. pp148-149.

7 The last entry being on the 2nd December 1654 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I. Cape Town, 1900, pp402-404).


12 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1662-1670*. Cape Town, 1901, p194.

13 Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1662-1670*. p227. Hout Bay was used regularly as a source of timber from this time, the last entry being on the 3rd April 1691 (Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707*. Cape Town, 1961, pp236-238).

14 Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669*. Cape Town, 1957, p373. It is not clear whether the forest referred to was at Hout Bay or was Leendert Cornelissen’s old forest behind Table Mountain (“d’ hel en leen bosch”), both of which were mentioned.


16 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676*. Cape Town, 1902, p205.


18 Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707*. Cape Town, 1961, pp61-62. The leaseholders were the free sawyers Hendrick Direcxz van Embden and Hendrick Coster.

19 Boeseken, *Resolusies*, Vol III, pp236-238. The leaseholders were the brothers Joost and Borchard Pietersz of Isenberg.


21 The regulation prohibiting freeburghers from cutting firewood elsewhere than at Hout Bay was reintroduced on the 20th July 1693 (Boeseken, *Resolusies*, Vol III, pp270-271).

22 For the dating of this map, see Chapter 8.1, p344.
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1 First ordered on the 23rd October 1660, and delivered on the 29th November (Thom, H B. *Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662*. Cape Town, 1958, pp272-274 & 291), but the lack of firewood in the bay was mentioned again on the 4th May 1661 (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-
1662. Vol III. Cape Town, 1900, pp197-198). The only further references to the provision of firewood were on the 23rd May 1687 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, p163) and the 17th June 1699 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p203).

2 Wood-cutting there was first mentioned on the 6th March 1673 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p117), and the firewood was shipped to the Cape on the 1st April 1673 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp121-123). No further instances of wood-cutting are recorded at False Bay during the period of this thesis.

3 The cutting of timber there was first mentioned on the 10th November 1672 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, pp88-89). The forest had already been discovered on the 30th December 1671 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp36-38).

4 The last reference to wood-cutting was made on the 13th October 1674 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p217), and a shortage of timber was mentioned on the 11th July 1676 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp267-268).

5 See Chapter 9.3.1, pp465-466.

6 Bogaert, A. Historische Reizen door d'oustersche Deelen van Asia. Amsterdam, 1711, p102.


8 Leibbrandt, H C V. The Defence of Willem Adriaan van der Stel. Cape Town, 1897, pp170-171; and Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708, pp149-151.


12 Van der Heiden and Tas, Contra-Deductie, pp208-209.
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5 Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707*. Cape Town, 1961, pp210-211; and Jeffreys, M K. *Kaapse Plakkaatboek, Deel I (1652-1707)*. Cape Town, 1944, pp254. This was also mentioned by Valentyn (Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien"*. Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p f.142; and Valentyn, F. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende* (English translation). Cape Town, 1973, Part II, pp233).


10 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p10. A resolution to this effect had already been made on the 21st April 1699 (Leibbrandt, *Journal, 1699-1732*. pp8-9), and a letter to the Seventeen dated the 1st March 1700 confirmed that this number had in fact been planted in the winter of the previous year (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched, 1696-1708*. Cape Town, 1896, pp140-141).


14 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p196. Mentzel also mentions that the streets of Stellenbosch had been planted with oak trees (Mentzel, O F. *A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope* (English translation). Cape Town, 1944, Part III, p43).
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.3.2

3. Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, pp88 & 108. The last request was on the 7th December 1699 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p236).
4. Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, pp55-56. The origin of this shipment was, however, not disclosed.
8. Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957 (entries too numerous to mention, but available in the indexes of these two sources).
10. Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1652, p157. The beach behind the Lion Mountain was mentioned as a temporary supply on the 26th October 1672 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676, Cape Town, 1902, p84).
11. Dassen Island was first mentioned in this regard on the 15th November 1653.
but only two more shipments were made, one in 1654 and the other in 1655.

12 Shells at Saldanha Bay were first mentioned on the 3rd October 1653 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p155), and continued to be shipped until the 21st April 1674 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, pp194-195). However, only seven shipments were recorded throughout this entire period.


21 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p86.


23 Valentyn, however, also mentioned that the freeburghers collected coral-stone ("kraalsteen") for lime-burning beyond the kloof between the Table and Lion Mountains (Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p f.10; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Vol 1, pp69-70).
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6 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, p153; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p115. Another kiln was also being filled on the 16th August 1664, but there is no mention of when it was fired.


9 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe, p378. Further references to the firing of lime-kilns were made in November 1671; in April, September and November 1672; and in December 1673.


Raven-Hart is therefore incorrect in stating that lime was not burned on Robben Island. The last reference to a lime-kiln on the island was made in 1699, thus confirming the accuracy of its illustration by Cortemunde in 1672 (Fig 245) and its description by Leguat in 1691 and Langhans in 1694 (Raven-Hart, A. Cape Good Hope 1652-1702: The first 50 years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers. Cape Town, 1971, Vol 2, p514).

11 First mentioned on the 1st April 1673 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, pp121-123). The last cargo arrived on the 13th December 1676, the freeburghers having contracted to supply the Company at 3 guilders per tun (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p303). This contract was cancelled on the 11th March 1680, as the price was considered to be excessive (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad; Peel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp319-322).

12 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad; Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1715, pp153-158.
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.4.1

1 See Chapter 11.5.1, p633.


3 Thom, Journal, Vol I, p164. This was the first of many instances of men from the ships being seconded to assist in stone-breaking.


5 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, pp144-146.
6 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, pp158-160. This was granted on the 24th December 1655 (Leibbrandt, Letters received, 1649-1662. Part I, p248).


13 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp332-333. The “stone” from Robben Island was actually slate, as confirmed on the 22nd May 1666 (Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp376-377 & 383).


15 Boeseken, Dagregister en Brieue, pp210-211; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, pp151-152.


19 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, p76. The freeburghers were initially unwilling to transport the stone, as noted on the 5th March (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, pp76-77), but were ordered to do so on the 4th May 1672 (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol II, p89).


21 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p130.

22 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p133.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.4.2

1 See Chapter 11.4.1, p629.

2 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town,
3 See Chapter 11.4.1, p629 (Notes 7 & 8).
12 Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p100. Leibbrandt describes it as a "slab", but it was almost certainly of slate.
14 The first shipment was received on the 30th November 1664 (Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p176; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p131), and the last on the 23rd January 1676 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676, Cape Town, 1902, p233). A further request was made on the 23rd April 1676, but there is no record of whether it was ever sent (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p250).
16 The first was on the 2nd August 1664 (Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666. Pretoria, 1973, p155; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p116). The last was on the 10th October 1664 (Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p166; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p125).
19 See Chapter 6.6.2, p136.
22 Mentzel, O F. Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part I, pp62-63. Having arrived at the Cape only in the early 1730s, his information must have been based on hearsay.
23 Raven-Hart, A. Scenes from the Cape of Good Hope in 1741 as drawn by Johann Wolfgang Heydt. Cape Town, 1967, p6. The "Water-Casteel" was the Chavonnes Battery, commenced in 1714.
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.5.1
1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p102.
7 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, pp122-124.
13 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p301.
14 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, pp88-89; and Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-
Boeseken, Dagregister en Briefe, pp322-323. The shipment was received on the 12th January 1665 (Boeseken, Dagregister en Briefe, p183; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p136).

Boeseken, Dagregister en Briefe, p168; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p126.

Boeseken, Dagregister en Briefe, p235; and Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p168.


The first was on the 16th May (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp55-56) and the second on the 1st June 1672 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p58).

Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1671-1674 & 1676. Cape Town, 1902, p156. Described as "blue bricks (moffen)" by Leibbrandt.


Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters received, 1695-1708. Cape Town, 1896, p237.


See Chapter 11.5.3.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.5.2

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p102.

2 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol 1, Cape Town, 1900, pp88 & 108.


5 See Chapter 7.3.1, p239.


7 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad; Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town,
Cook states that what were later to be called "Batavian tiles" were imported from the Netherlands and not from Java. She states that the name "Batavia" was the usual name for Holland, derived from the "Batavi" who lived in the Northern Netherlands during Roman times.

This was not the case during the period of this thesis, however, where the only references to Batavia are in connection with the seat of government of Netherlands India. She notes that the name was used officially in the name "Batavian Republic". However, this Republic ruled the Cape only from 1803 to 1806, and it was probably from this time that the term "Batavian tiles" became part of local Cape Dutch popular terminology.

She is certainly correct, however, in stating that it would have been more logical to send tiles from Holland as ballast in the empty ships than to waste space by shipping them from Batavia (Cook, M A. The Cape Kitchen. Stellenbosch, 1973, p20; and Obholzer, A, Baraitser, M and Malherbe, W A. The Cape House and its interior. Stellenbosch, 1985, p42).

Nevertheless, a request was made to Batavia (in Java) on the 6th September 1664 for 3000 square floor tiles for the new hospital (Ras, A C. Die Kasteel en ander vroeë Kaapse vestingwerke, 1652-1713. Cape Town, 1959, p31).

The first was on the 30th November 1702 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp391-393).

The second was on the 12th August 1710 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715. Cape Town, 1962, pp169-170).

Valentyn, F. Beschrywinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726, Vol 5, p f.18; Valentyn, F. Beschrywinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Part I, p101; and Mentzel O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part I, p116. However, Kolbe refutes the flat-roofed nature of the slave lodge, revealing that it had a lean-to roof hidden behind the external parapet (see Chapter 7.5.7, p312).

Mentzel O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1921, Part I, pp63-64 & 104-106. Other writers also refer to the flat roofs in the Castle, but less descriptively.

"Pannen" were first mentioned on the 26th July 1658 (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp161-163), and "dockpannen" on the 5th January 1666 (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol I, pp338-339).


NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.5.3

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeeck's Journal, etc. Part I, Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p.102.
3 See Chapter 11.5.1, p.633.
6 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, p.330. This number is small in comparison with earlier and subsequent kilns, suggesting that 60,000 was the correct quantity produced.
18 Boeseken, A J. Dagregister en Briewe van Zacharias Wagenaer, 1662-1666.
26 Boeseken, Resolusies. Deel II, p43.
34 Mentzel, O F. A Geographical and Topographical Description of the Cape of Good Hope (English translation). Cape Town, 1925. Part II, pp90-91. Mentzel arrived at the Cape more than twenty years after the end of the period of this thesis. However, it is unlikely that any major changes had been introduced to the technology of brick-making.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.6

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.6.1

2 For further collapses and repairs to the walls and bastions of the Fort, see Chapter 6.3.1 (numerous references).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.6.2

1 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Riebeeck’s Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655*. Cape Town, 1897, p104.
3 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, pp100 & 116. Requisitions for smiths’ coals were made throughout the period of this thesis, the last of eighteen recorded shipments being received on the 25th March 1710 (Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715*. Cape Town, 1962, pp162-163; and Leibbrandt, H C V. *Journal, 1699-1732*. Cape Town, 1896, p236).
5 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p300.

The absence of requests over the intervening thirty five years does not indicate that the Cape had become self-sufficient. It merely reflects the cursory nature of the records of the period. Iron and nails continued to be sent to the Cape, as revealed in the inventories of items written off from the accounts of the iron warehouse.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.6.3


There is the possibility that the "groote" and "klijnd." were referring to their thickness, as in "groove" and "fijne". This is unlikely, however, as the terminology is consistent in all four references, although the spelling differs.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11.6.4

1. Leibbrandt, H C V. Riebeek's Journal, etc. Part I: Dec 1651-Dec 1655. Cape Town, 1897, p102. Another two casks of linseed oil were requested from Batavia on the 5th August 1653 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol I, Cape Town, 1900, p184).
3. Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, pp206-208. Tar was also used on the 16th April 1666 in an attempt to waterproof the tiled roof of the rice warehouse (Leibbrandt, H C V. Journal, 1662-1670. Cape Town, 1901, p178).


6 Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol II, Cape Town, 1900, p256.

7 The last entry was on the 28th October 1710 (Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715*. Cape Town, 1962, pp183-185).
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.1

1. See Chapter 8.3.2b, p378.
2. See Chapter 7.5.3, p291.
3. Bax mentions that Pieter Dirck van Dort had been chief carpenter from 1693 to 1696 (last mention), and that his successor, Jacobus van der Steen (first mentioned in 1699), had worked on both the hospital and the church. On the basis of this evidence he suggests that Dirck could have been the designer of both buildings, on account of their cruciform similarity (Bax, D. Nederlandse invloed op de oudste Kaapse kerkgebouwen. Bulletin van de Koninklijke Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond. Vol 71, No 1, 1972, Note 62, plO). This is illogical, as it is unlikely that the demoted Dirck would have been given any design responsibility. Within his terms of reference, the only candidate could have been Van der Steen, whom Bax described earlier as having been chief house-carpenter from 1701 (sic) to 1705. He suggests, moreover, that Van der Steen could have also been the person responsible for the design of Vergelegen (Bax, Nederlandse invloed, pp3-5). His name, however, was not mentioned at all in the documentation describing the erection of this complex (see Chapter 9.5). Apart from the inconsistencies, these attributions are extremely unlikely, as the Medieval tradition of craftsman/architect was no longer current in official circles in the late-17th century.
H C V. Letters and documents received. 1649-1662. Part II. Cape Town. 1899, pp330-331).


18 See Chapter 7.2.1, pp203-207.


21 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, p64. His responsibility for progress on the Castle, together with that of Lieutenant Breijtenbagh and the surveyor Wittebol, was formally outlined on the 27th June 1672 (Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol II, pp92-93).

22 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp330-331. Schut’s appointment to this position predates Coon’s by six years, suggesting that Coon took over after he had left the Cape. Coon was given command of the garrison guarding the old Fort on the date of Schut’s appointment.


24 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p394. This was almost certainly M3/10 [Fig 21], a plan showing the town and both fortifications.


27 Boeseken, Resolusies. Vol II, pp44-45. See also Chapter 7.5.3, p291.


30 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp265-266. For his position as surveyor, see Chapter 12.2, and for his activities as chief gardener, see Chapter 12.7.

31 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoope in "Oud en Nieuw Oost
Indien". Amsterdam, 1726. Vol 4, p c.103.
32 Bogaert, A. Historische Reizen door d'oostersche Deelen van Asia. Amsterdam, 1711, pp527-528.
34 Here the word "fabryk" could have been used in the sense of "architect", but no specific buildings were documented as having been designed by Slotsboo.
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1 Botha, C G. Collectanea: First Series. Cape Town, 1924, pp26-27; Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726. Vol 5, p f.137; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaeken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1973, Part II, p211. Simons suggested that the surveyor should also have some understanding of architecture, as he claimed that its laws were "observed only passably" at the Cape. Evidently he was unaware of the Renaissance proportions "observed" and implemented in the new hospital and at Vergelegen.
10 Boeseken, Dagregister en Briewe, p377.
11 Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1668. Cape Town, 1957, pp367-368. The other was the captain of the garrison, Olof Bergh, who was sentenced on the 14th April 1687 for stealing cash chests from the wrecked Portuguese ship "Nostra Senora de los Milagros", while in command of a salvaging
operation. These were found buried in his garden (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707. Cape Town, 1961, pp159-161, p350).

12 This is contradicted by the Resolution of the 11th April 1672 (see Note 14, below), which states that he arrived as a cadet in 1669. His initial salary of 10 guilders, however, was correct.


16 First mentioned on the 22nd July 1673 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, pp144-145), and last on the 8th August 1673 (Leibbrandt, Journal, 1671-1676, p154).


19 This plan is not dated by the Cape Archives, but a redrawn version (M1/377) is given a date of 1693. Most writers in the field accept this date, and none who have questioned it have realized that Wittebol was its author. For analysis of the 1679 date proposed here, see Chapter 7.1, Note 48.


21 Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol III, Note 4, p266. For his appointment as inspector of works see Chapter 12.1, and for his activities as chief gardener, see Chapter 12.7.


23 Bogaert, A. Historische Reizen door d'oostersche Deelen van Asia. Amsterdam, 1711. pp527-528. For his activities as engineer and supervisor of works, see Chapter 12.1.


25 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1699-1732. Cape Town, 1896, p215. This plan, unfortunately, does not appear to have survived.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.3

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.3.1


7 Bax, P. Nederlandse invloed op de oudste Kaapse kerkgebouwen. *Bulletin van de Koninklijke Nederlandsche Oudheidkundige Bond*. Vol 71, No 1, 1972, Note 62, p10. This contradicts his earlier statement on pp3-5 that Jacobus van der Steen of Delft was chief house-carpenter from 1701 (sic) to 1705.


A brief reference had also been made to the "master carpenter" Pieter Albertsz of Amsterdam on the 14th March 1701 (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched, 1696-1708*. Cape Town, 1896, p171). It is unlikely that he was the chief carpenter, though, if Jacobus van der Steen did indeed assume the position in 1701. The letter concerned his request for his wife and children to be sent over from Holland, and he would hardly have relinquished his position before a reply had been received a year later.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.3.2


2 Confirmed on the 24th November 1656, with a salary of 16 guilders a month (Boeseken, *Resolusies, Vol I*, pp84-85), and last mentioned on the 14th December 1657 (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, pp423-424).


10 Boeseken, A J. *Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel IV, 1707-1715*. Cape Town, 1962, pp153-158. He was also described as the ex-chief wood-cutter in the "Contra-Deductie" (1712), having admitted that he had been responsible for the preparation of the timber for the buildings at Vergelegen (Van der Heiden, J and Tas, A. *Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van de valsheit der uitgegevene Deductie*. Amsterdam, 1712, pp148-149).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.3.3


5 Boeseken, *Resolusies*, Vol I, p239. The exact words of the original Resolution are more graphic than the account presented above: ":...sigh dagelijcx ende langs soo meer gedebaucheert aenstelt met drinken, clincken, vechten, smijten ende leelijck spreken &a...".

6 He accused her of infidelity, claiming personal experience in the matter (Leibbrandt, H C V. *Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662*, Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p451-452).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.4

1 A "master mason" was reported to be ill on the 27th June 1652, but his name was not disclosed (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume I, 1651-1655. Cape Town, 1952, pp47-48).


5 Mentioned as "master mason" on the 31st May 1657, with a salary of 22 guilders per month (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III. Cape Town, 1900. p288). He was presumably the "chief mason" referred to on the 21st March 1658, when he was bitten by a lion while on an expedition to the interior (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume II, 1656-1658. Cape Town, 1954, pp244-250).


8 Said to have proficiency in "architectura", and promoted to chief mason on the 12th April 1664, with a salary of 20 guilders a month (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp313-316).

This is an interesting entry, as he was the only craftsman to be credited with these abilities. He was, not surprisingly, a mason rather than a carpenter. However, the buildings erected in the 1660s had little architectural pretension, and it is unlikely that even master craftsmen would have been responsible for the design of the more imposing structures of the first decade of the 18th century. Commissioner Simons' recommendation that a qualified surveyor with a knowledge of architecture should be sent to the Cape (see Chapter 12.2) is instructive in this regard.

9 Promoted to chief mason on the 7th May 1666, with a salary of 20 guilders a month (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp341-348).

10 On the 31st January 1678, in connection with the postponement of construction of the new Cape Town church, where he had been at work (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp222-228). He
was also mentioned in 1687 as the supervisor of the construction of the Stellenbosch church (see Chapter 9.3.1, p466).


12 Gijsbert Arensen of Bommel was the first to be mentioned, on the 1st February 1659, in connection with an expedition to the land of Monomotapa (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp8-10; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp182-183).


NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.5


5 Leibbrandt, Journal, 1662-1670, p171.


9 Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop in "Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien". Amsterdam, 1726. Vol 5, p f.10; and Valentyn, F. Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behorende (English translation). Cape Town, 1971, Part 1, p71. See also Chapter 11.5.3, p639.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.6


2 Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp436-437. He had been confirmed as blacksmith’s assistant on the 1st May 1660, with a salary of 12 guilders a month, but there is no mention in the Journal or


4 With a salary of 18 guilders a month (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669, Cape Town, 1957, pp341-348).

5 With a salary of 15 guilders a month (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680, Cape Town, 1670-1680, pp54-57).

6 With a salary of 16 guilders a month (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel III, 1681-1707, Cape Town, 1961, p318).

7 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched, 1696-1708, Cape Town, 1896, p345.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.7


6 Thom, Journal, Vol II, p386. It appears, though, that he was only a "master gardener workman", as revealed in the 1658 list of deceased Company’s servants (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662, Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p308), and indicated by his low salary. It seems, however, that he acted as chief gardener, as no other person was mentioned in this position between 1657 and 1659.

7 The precise date of his promotion is not given, but he was mentioned as a "master gardener" in the muster-roll of the 5th March 1659 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662, Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p295). He left the post to become a free gardener on the 15th May 1660 (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662, Cape Town, 1958, pp367-368; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669, Cape Town, 1957, p261).

8 Confirmed on the 23rd March 1661, with a salary of 25 guilders a month (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662, Cape Town, 1958, pp367-368; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-

9 Confirmed on the 15th April 1662, with a salary of 25 guilders a month (Thom, H B. Journal of Jan van Riebeeck: Volume III, 1659-1662. Cape Town, 1958, pp487-490; and Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel I, 1651-1669. Cape Town, 1957, pp277-279). He was last mentioned on the 10th April 1665, when his salary was increased to 36 guilders a month (Boeseken, Resolusies, Vol I, p324-330). He had been second gardener under Hendrick Boom, and had also taken his discharge in October 1657 (Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters despatched from the Cape, 1652-1662. Vol III, Cape Town, 1900, p264). However, he had returned to the Company's service by 1660, once again as second gardener (Leibbrandt, Letters despatched, 1652-1662. Vol III, p298), prior to his promotion.


11 Promoted to chief gardener on the 11th April 1672, with a salary of 20 guilders a month (Boeseken, A J. Resolusies van die Politieke Raad: Deel II, 1670-1680. Cape Town, 1959, pp77-81).


13 The first reference to Hartogh in his capacity as farm manager at Vergelegen appears in the freeburghers' petition against Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel, which the Governor himself published in his own "defence" (Van der Stel, W A. Korte Deductie. Amsterdam, 1708, pp45-46).

14 Van der Heiden, J and Tas, A. Contra-Deductie ofte Grondige Demonstratie Van de valsheit der uitgegevene Deductie. Amsterdam, 1712, pp4-5. This entry also refers to him as "Stedehouder" at Vergelegen.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 12.8

1 Boxer also provides salary scales for VOC personnel. These agree with those derived here from the promotion lists, but also give the salaries of the "Predikanten" (f80-100, equal to Senior Merchants) and the "Krank-bezoekers" and "Ziekentroosters" or sick-comforters (f30-36), which do not appear in the Resolutions (Boxer, C R. The Dutch Seaborne Empire 1600-1800. London, 1965, pp300-302).

2 See Chapter 12.1.

3 See Chapter 12.2.

4 See Chapter 12.4.

5 See Chapter 12.7.

6 See Chapter 12.3.1.

7 Leibbrandt, H C V. Letters and documents received, 1649-1662. Part I, Cape Town, 1898, pp130-132.
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