

https://dspace.org/

Early architecture at the Cape under the VOC (1652-1710) : the characteristics and influence of the proto-Cape Dutch period

Fitchett, Rowallan Hugh

1996

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/23037

Fitchett, Rowallan Hugh (1996) Early architecture at the Cape under the VOC (1652-1710) : the characteristics and influence of the proto-Cape Dutch period, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,<

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

EARLY ARCHITECTURE AT THE CAPE UNDER THE VOC (1652-1710): THE CHARACTERISTICS AND INFLUENCE OF THE PROTO-CAPE DUTCH PERIOD

Rowallan Hugh Fitchett

VOLUME II

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Architecture, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Johannesburg, 1996

8. THE PENINSULA

8.1 THE EXPANSION INTO THE PENINSULA

Although the VOC had not intended to establish a colony at the Cape, and had hoped to confine its presence to Table Valley, it was not long before the Company commenced agricultural activities on the Peninsula. Soon afterwards the first lands were granted to the freeburghers, initiating an expansion that was not only detrimental to the profitability of the Company, but also deprived the Khoi of their traditional grazing lands and ultimately eradicated their entire culture [1].

The first mention of the desirability of settling freeburghers at the Cape was made on the 27th April 1652, only three weeks after Van Riebeeck's arrival. He suggested that Chinese, Mardijckers (liberated slaves) or Hollanders would be suitable for cultivating the lands in Table Valley and behind the Lion Mountain [2].

Arable land and pasturage were discovered at Rondebosch on the 18th September 1652 during a search for sources of timber [3], and the damage to the crops in Table Valley caused by strong winds on the 13th January 1653 again raised the suggestion that the more sheltered valleys beyond the Salt River should be cultivated by free farmers [4].

This idea, however, was discouraged by the Visiting Commissioner Demmer on the 26th April [5], and the first garden beyond the immediate vicinity of the Fort was only established a year later, on the 29th January 1654. This was at the Salt River itself, next to the Duijnhoop redoubt, and was worked by the Company's employees rather than by freeburghers [6].

It appears, though, that the Directors were not averse to the idea, as a letter was received from Amsterdam on the 6th October suggesting the settlement of free families at Hout Bay [7]. Van Riebeeck replied on the 28th April 1655 that more suitable lands had been found at Rondebosch, where timber and reeds were also available for the building of houses [8].

Following further wind damage to the crops in Table Valley, it was decided on the 11th October 1655 that the lands at Rondebosch would be exploited [9], the name "ronde bosjen" having first been recorded on the 9th September in the journal of an expedition

to the interior led by the corporal Willem Muller [10]. These lands would be cultivated by freeburghers, and authorization for this was received from Holland on the 30th October [11].

The decision to proceed with a new Company's garden at Rondebosch was finally made on the 6th May 1656, and the ploughing of the first experimental quarter morgen was begun on the 17th [12]. Further extensions were marked out by Van Riebeeck on the 9th and 10th October, its area having already been increased to two and a half morgen. He also gave instructions for the lands to be fenced with poles in order to keep out the horses and cattle [13].

The first two garden plots at Rondebosch are shown on a 1656 map of the settlement [Fig 110], on either side of the wagon road to the forest. They are described as having been "sown for a trial", and being protected by a small watch-house [14].

On the 15th October Van Riebeeck made a comparative investigation of the wind conditions at Table Valley and Rondebosch, and found that the latter was far better protected. It was therefore decided on the 24th to discontinue all grain production in Table Valley and undertake it instead "at the Ronde Bosjen and further away". Table Valley would now be used solely for pasturage [15]. A similar investigation was made on the 16th November of the area behind the Lion Mountain (in the vicinity of the present Sea Point and Green Point), to see if it was as well protected as the lands at Rondebosch. It appeared that the weather was calm, but the soil was "rather poor". Nevertheless it was decided that an attempt would be made with grain cultivation, as these lands were much closer to the Fort than those at Rondebosch and were thus more easily protected from the Khoi [16].

The decision to establish free farmers at Rondebosch was finally taken in 1657, and it was mentioned on the 19th February that a number of people were willing to accept their discharge from the Company [17]. They were taken out to inspect their lands the following day [18], and the first two parties of freeburghers were settled on the 21st February 1657.

The first of these, "Harmen's Company", consisted of five farmers. They had "chosen the land on the other side of the Fresh River, named by us the Amstel (now the

Liesbeeck), below and directly opposite the forest where our woodcutters are, near the crooked tree, about 3 (Dutch) miles from the fort". This area was to be called Groenevelt, and it would be protected by a redoubt to be erected about a quarter of a mile beyond it.

The second party, "Steven's Colony", comprised only four farmers. These had "selected a spot about a mile nearer the fort at the Ronde Doorn Bosjen, on this side of the river or Amstel, stretching from the small bridge leading to the forest to the spot chosen for the redoubt...". This area would be called Hollandsche Thuijn, and it would be protected by the said redoubt [19].

The first detailed inspection and accurate survey of the Cape Peninsula was undertaken from the 22nd to the 26th March 1657. The party, which included Van Riebeeck and the Visiting Commissioner Rijckloff Van Goens, travelled over Kloof Nek to Hout Bay, where they spent the first night. This was inspected and surveyed the next morning, after which the party moved on through Hout Valley and over "the kloof called the Pas" (Constantia Nek) to the "isthmus between Table Bay and False Bay". The outlying parts of the latter were inspected and surveyed on the 24th, and the night was spent at the house of "Harman's" company of freeburghers. The Cape Flats were investigated on the 25th, and measurements were taken of the shortest distance between Table Bay and False Bay. The following day they returned to the Fort, and instructions were given for accurate charts to be prepared [20].

The results of this survey are probably recorded in the map of the Peninsula numbered M2/16 [Fig 111], incorrectly dated 1734 [21]. The beaconed line across the Cape Flats is shown, as are the first three of the freeburghers' houses ("Drie burgers huijsies" as captioned on the map) on the recently granted lands at Rondebosch. The freeburghers' lands were inspected again by Commissioner van Goens on the 9th April, when he issued instructions regarding the boundaries of their farms [22].

Van Riebeeck was also granted a piece of land by Van Goens, as mentioned in his instructions of the 16th April 1657, on condition that this was confirmed by the Seventeen. This land, which had already been inspected on the 16th November of the previous year, was behind the Lion Mountain and was to be used for grain fields and

orchards [23], and experimental ploughing was commenced on the 1st June [24].

The Company's orchard at Rondebosch was first mentioned on the 14th May 1657, revealing that the VOC had not relinquished all its farming activities to the freeburghers [25]. Indeed, of the twenty morgen now under cultivation at Rondebosch, six were still in the possession of the Company, as noted in an inspection on the 31st of that month [26].

On the 28th June the Company's lands in Table Valley were flooded by heavy rains, but those at Rondebosch were undamaged because of trenches which had been dug around them to divert the stormwater from the rivers. The freeburghers' lands had been inundated, however, as they had not followed the Commander's advice to entrench them in a similar manner [27]. The entrenchment of these lands was begun on the 10th July, with the assistance of some soldiers under the supervision of the sergeant who had been responsible for the entrenchments at the Company's garden in Rondebosch [28].

Orders were also given on the 12th July for the Company's orchard to be entrenched, as the fence of palings was not strong enough to keep out the cattle [29]. Work was commenced on the 19th, the trench being eight feet wide and three feet deep [30]. The site of the orchard, mentioned here for the first time, was described on the 17th June 1659 as being "hard by the Company's granary and near the bridge opposite Harman's dwelling" [31].

It was mentioned on the 27th July 1657 that the lands behind the Lion Mountain, which had been granted to Van Riebeeck earlier in the year, were now needed as pasturage for the Company's cattle. As a "responsible" Commander, he had therefore exchanged them for the farm at Boscheuvel [32], but it is tempting to speculate that the agricultural experiments commenced on the 1st June had not been entirely successful, and that he was only too willing to relinquish this unproductive land [33]. Van Riebeeck's request to exchange his lands was permitted by Commissioner Joan Cuneus, in his instructions of the 18th March 1658 [34], and approval for the original grant was given by the India Council in a letter from Batavia received on the 16th April 1658 [35].

The farming activities at Rondebosch brought about a conflict of interests with the Khoi, who had actually been occupying some of these lands when they were selected by

the freeburghers on the 20th February 1657 [36]. Van Riebeeck's insensitivity to the issue of land ownership was compounded by his attitude towards the resolution of the problem. When asked on the 27th July where the Khoi were to graze their cattle now that they had been deprived of their usual pasturage, he told them that they could use the coastal strip along the Gevelbergen (the Twelve Apostles) between Kloof Nek and Hout Bay, but only on condition that they were prepared to sell cattle to the Company. Moreover, they would not be permitted to occupy Table Valley or the pastures behind the Lion Mountain, as these were reserved for the Company's cattle [37].

The colony at Rondebosch continued to expand, as noted on the 2nd December 1657, when it was decided to grant another four farms of fifteen morgen each. These were to the east of the Liesbeeck River "below the Table Mountain and the Bosbergen" [38]. There was also a concomitant increase in numbers, and by the 30th May 1658 there were already 51 freeburghers at the Cape, owning 89 slaves, out of a total population of 360 [39].

The location of the freeburghers' lands on the Peninsula is shown on M3/9, a map dating from 1657 [Fig 112]. The majority of these were on the eastern side of the Liesbeeck River, as was Van Riebeeck's farm at Boscheuvel. The Company's grain fields and orchard, however, were on the western side between the river and the wagon road to the forest.

The fishermen's lands at the Salt River were first mentioned on the 13th November 1658, comprising six morgen of cultivation. It is possible that these were on the site of the old Company's garden near the Duijnhoop redoubt [40].

The suitability of the Peninsula for pasturage was first mentioned on the 30th November, when it was decided to erect a cattle kraal at Rondebosch. The cattle would be able to graze as far as the Boscheuvel and on the flats beyond the Liesbeeck River, thereby allowing the overgrazed pasturage in Table Valley and beyond the Lion Mountain to recover [41]. No mention was made, however, of alternative grazing lands for the Khoi.

Instructions were received from Batavia on the 13th December to limit the extent of the settlement [42], and further orders to this effect were received from Amsterdam on the

7th May 1659 [43]. Van Riebeeck replied to Batavia on the 4th June that he was not intending to expand the settlement, as sufficient cultivable land was available between the Fort and the Boscheuvel [44]. It was decided on the 9th August, moreover, that no more land would be granted at Rondebosch for grain production, in order to preserve sufficient pasturage for the cattle. The farms of the Company, and the freeburghers Steven, Vreden, Boom and Reijnierssen, now comprised a total of about 170 morgen [45].

The freeburghers' lands were recorded in detail on a 1660 map of the Peninsula [Fig 113], which included the land grants made since 1657 [46]. Although less clearly presented than the 1657 map [Fig 112], the names of all the title holders are shown [47]. Little expansion had occurred, only two farms having been added along the western side of the Liesbeeck River [48].

Despite Van Riebeeck's agreement to limit the settlement, two more farms of thirty morgen each were granted at Boscheuvel, the furthest extent of the colony, on the 11th September 1660 [49].

The Khoi had been confined to the eastern side of the Salt and Liesbeeck rivers (the latter named here for the first time) on the 5th July 1658 [50], as a result of hostilities with the Dutch settlers. However, a request was made on the 6th November 1660 that they should be allowed to return to their lands behind the Boscheuvel and in the Hout and Bergh Valleys. This was granted on condition that they kept outside the limits of the settlement and only used approved routes when visiting the Fort [51].

It was noted on the 20th December, though, that they would soon have to be banned from the Peninsula entirely, as the Company would be needing all the pasturage for its growing numbers of livestock [52]. This confirmed the increasing encroachment on traditional grazing lands already seen in the settlement of free farmers at Rondebosch, and which was to be exacerbated in the later colonization of Stellenbosch and the inland districts. Indeed, by the 4th July 1661 the colonists and their dependents numbered 144 people, comprising 73 freemen, 12 women, 20 children and 39 slaves [53].

Van Riebeeck, who was expecting soon to be relieved of his duties as Commander at the Cape, offered his farm at Boscheuvel for sale to the Company in 1661, believing

that none of the freeburghers would be sufficiently competent to manage it. The price would be established by the next Visiting Commissioner, in order to avoid any suspicion of connivance.

Following an inspection by representatives of the Council of Policy on the 18th July 1661, it was agreed that the farm would be purchased by the Company. It was the most protected from the winds of all the farms on the Peninsula, and had the additional advantage of being defended by the Houd den Bul watch-house nearby. The farm comprised 101 morgen of cultivated land enclosed by a hedge, and included 1244 fruit trees and thousands of vines. The farming activities were performed by two free Dutch farmhands and eight slaves, with the help of 22 draught oxen.

It was also decided that all fruit cultivation would be transferred to Boscheuvel, as the strong winds at Rondebosch were stunting the trees in the orchard (contradicting the favourable investigations carried out in 1656). The old orchard would be used as a nursery garden instead [54].

There is no record of the Company's purchase of Van Riebeeck's lands at Boscheuvel, which were finally sold on the 28th November 1665 to Jacob van Rosendael for 1600 guilders, the amount to be paid in three instalments [55]. According to Boeseken the reason for this was that Commissioner Overtwater had stated in 1663 that further farmlands should be granted only to the freeburghers, and that the Company should not expand its landholdings. The lands already farmed by the Company could be retained, but only as experimental farms to serve as exemplars to the freeburghers [56].

The pasturage of cattle at Hout Bay was first mentioned on the 30th January 1668, when orders were given for another site to be selected for the cattle kraal there [57]. This was done on the 25th July 1669, following the loss of two oxen killed by lions, when "a drier and more suitable place" was found by Lieutenant Coon "on the slope of the hill beneath the trees" [58].

A further decision was made on the 4th March 1670 that pigs as well as cattle would be reared at Hout Bay. Land at "de boerewoning" (in Hout Valley) was also said to be suitable for growing sweet potatoes, and the wood-cutters there would be able to keep an eye on the animals [59].

Instructions were also given by Commissioner van den Brouck in 1670 for the granary and all the Company's lands to be leased to the freeburghers, in order to divest itself of all agricultural activities. No leaseholders came forward, however, and the lands remained in the Company's possession [60].

Instructions were given on the 2nd July 1672 for the sheep sheds at Hout Bay to be repaired [61], and the herdsman's hut and the cattle kraal there were mentioned on the 1st November, in connection with another attack by a lion [62].

On the 14th October 1672 the burgher returns revealed 64 freemen, 53 Dutch servants ("knechts"), 39 married women, 65 children, and 63 slaves, including women and children [63].

The exploration of the coastline of False Bay was first ordered on the 11th January 1673. By this time the Company had already erected a cattle post at Hottentots-Holland [64].

A count of the Company's livestock was made between the 7th and 9th July 1676. These were located at Bommelshoeck [65], the Steenberg, the "Boereboomen" at Hout Bay, the "Schuur" at Rondebosch, and the Rietvallei [66], as well as at the Fort in Table Valley [67].

This was followed by another report, compiled between the 14th and 18th December 1676, on the Company's outposts at Hout Bay, the Corenschuur, 't Bosch, the Ruijterstal, Uijtkijck and Keerdekoe [68]. This revealed stations on the eastern and western sides of the Steenbergen, at the Rondebosch granary, and three at Hout Bay. One was at the beach, one at "De Boereboomen", and the third at the "Houte Klincke" [69].

The freeburghers were given orders on the 23rd March 1677 to dig ditches or plant thorn-trees around their lands, to protect them from the continual damage caused by stray livestock [70]. This is another instructive entry, as it reveals an absence of initiative on the part of the colonists.

Two more loan-farms were also granted at Hout Bay on the same day [71], and grazing lands were handed out at the Steenbergen on the 25th February 1678. The recipients

were two of the Company's shepherds who had taken their discharge, "Hemminck Huijsen" and Claas Gerrits [72]. The former, whose house in the town has already been described [73], was to become one of the wealthiest burghers at the Cape.

It was mentioned on the 13th December 1684 that certain lands, the location and extent of which were not disclosed, had been granted to Adriaen van der Stel, the second son of the Commander, Simon. He had resigned from the post of "adsistent" in order to become a freeburgher, after his father had been berated for nepotism by the Seventeen [74]. This is an important reference, as it reveals the expanding landholdings of the Van der Stel family prior to the Governorship of Wilhem Adriaen.

By the 12th February 1691 there were 25 free wine farmers in the Cape District [75], and an edict was proclaimed on the 19th October requiring all the free landowners in the district to have their lands measured by the surveyor. They were also ordered to present plans showing the positions of the farmhouses and out-buildings on their lands [76].

It is probable that the result of the survey in question is M1/273, a map of the settlement dated c1691 by the Cape Archives. An identical copy, M1/17 [Fig 114], contradictorily dated c1700, was also sent to Holland, where the Algemeen Rijksarchief have more cautiously dated it as 17th century.

The map names the owners of the farmlands along the Liesbeeck River, and indicates the Company's establishments at Rustenburgh and the granary. It also gives a detailed description of the forests on the mountain sides above the agricultural lands. Simon van der Stel's extensive holdings at Constantia ("Gouverneur van der Stel sijn boulant van granen en wyn") are shown, together with three further farms towards False Bay. More grain fields and vineyards appear in the Hout Bay Valley, as well as its forest. This map is a graphic illustration of the further development of the Peninsula, despite the fact that new agricultural lands had already been established at Stellenbosch and Drakenstein.

On the 14th July 1695 orders were received from the Seventeen that the Company was to begin selling off its lands to the freeburghers, with the intention of eventually divesting itself entirely of its agricultural activities [77]. Rustenburg, however, was still

owned by the Company in 1698, when it was described by Leguat: "The Company has another Garden about a League off (from Table Valley), which lies in a better Soil, and is more shelter'd from bad Winds. You have there long Walks of Oaks, as far as your Eye can well reach, and a large Wood of young Trees of the same kind rais'd from Acorns" [78].

The freeburghers on the Peninsula were instructed again on the 29th August 1704 to enclose their lands with hedges or ditches, to prevent them from being damaged by stray livestock [79]. They had evidently not complied with the orders in this regard issued in 1677, justifying in part the Van der Stels' opinion that they were indolent and recalcitrant [80].

Kolbe's map of the whole settlement, M1/1162 [Fig 115], inaccurately dated c1695 by the Cape Archives [81], shows the Company's farm Rustenburg as a rectangle with the farmhouse at the lower end. It also appears on M1/1164, an undated map of Table Bay which must also be later than 1710 [Fig 116] [82].

M1/1162 forms the basis for Kolbe's more detailed map of the Peninsula, M1/1163 [Fig 117], entitled "Caarte van de Colonie van de Kaap". Here two farms are shown beyond Rustenburg, annotated here as "Rust en werk". These are "Nieuwland" (Newlands) and "Wyn en Brood". This, incidentally, is the first appearance of Nieuwland, the Resolutions making no mention of the decision to move the Company's garden away from Table Valley [83]. Beyond these, further farmlands ("Bouwland") are shown extending towards False Bay. These were presumably Simon van der Stel's lands beyond Constantia (which is incorrectly annotated here as located at Kloof Nek), which would explain why they were not described, as they had not been officially sanctioned [84].

These farms appear again on M1/1177 [Fig 118], the southern half of a survey extending from False Bay to Saldanha Bay, also dating from the period of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. Three are shown to the east of Rustenburg, forming a line westwards of the "Compagnies Beestestal" (probably the old cavalry stables), the closest of which is "Rust en Werk". To the west is a slave lodge (not mentioned in the Resolutions), and beyond this are the farms "Nieuwland" and "Wyn en Brood",

followed by another three on the road to Hout Bay.

New farmlands appear on M1/1165 [Fig 119], Valentyn's map of Table Bay, which probably dates from 1699. Despite being annotated "'t Ronde Bosje" and "Nieu warmoes land groot 40 morgen", these lands are not in the positions of Rondebosch and Newlands on the Peninsula, but are in the vicinity of the Company's post at Vissershoek. The former is shown as a number of adjoining farms with an irregular outline, suggestive of the freeburghers' lands at Rondebosch. The latter is a formally planned rectangle, with the farmhouse at the lower end of a central axis, similar to Nieuwland. This suggests that they could have been mislocated on this map.

These two farmlands are shown together with Rustenburg on M1/1162 and M1/1164 [Figs 115 & 116], and together with "Rust en werk" (as annotated) and "Nieuwland" on M1/1163 [Fig 117]. This could suggest that there were other farms with the names "Rondebosje" and "Nieuwe Warmoesland" along the banks of the Diep and Salt Rivers, but it is more likely that the depictions of these farms were later corrections to the original map.

Kolbe mentioned the Company's "very spacious, rich and beautiful Gardens" at Rondebosch and Newlands. He described the former as follows: "In one of 'em stands, erected at the Company's Expence, a noble Pleasure-House for the Governour, and near it a beautiful Grove of Oaks, call'd the Round-Bush, from which this Garden takes its Name, being call'd the Round-Bush Garden" [85]. He also mentioned that the garden was protected by a deep ditch and a dense row of trees, which enclosed it on both sides [86].

Valentyn (1714) described the Company's establishment at Rustenburg as comprising 26 morgen, most of which were planted with vines: "In addition to this vineyard there were also other lovely plantations, oak avenues and magnificent orchards; and the finest thing here was that there was a very decent house nearby, with various convenient rooms above and below" [87]. He also mentioned that the vegetable garden at Nieuwland comprised forty morgen, and had been established in 1700 by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel [88]. This figure corresponds exactly with the extent of the "Nieu warmoes land groot 40 morgen", which was mislocated on Valentyn's map [Fig 119].

The expansion into the Peninsula had begun rapidly, but did not maintain its momentum, and the area was still relatively sparsely inhabited in 1710. This was largely due to the opening up of the colonies of Stellenbosch and Drakenstein, which will be described later. Nevertheless, there was no longer any space for the Khoi, its original inhabitants, who were excluded even further from their traditional grazing lands by the Company's expansion into the inland districts.

8.2 THE PENINSULA DEFENCES

The initial expansion into the Peninsula required not only the erection of houses and out-buildings for the farmers, but also necessitated an extensive system of fortifications. Although these had been abandoned by 1710, when the Khoi had long since been forced out of the Peninsula and been relegated to the lands beyond Stellenbosch and Drakenstein, these people were formidable adversaries of the Dutch in the early years of the settlement.

In fact, the defence of the Peninsula was a matter of priority even while the Company confined its activities to Table Valley. This became evident after the killing of a Company's herd-boy and the abduction of its cattle by the Khoi on the 19th October 1653 [1]. However, it was only in 1656 that the first watch-house was erected, following two years' discussion on the most suitable solution to the problem. Although the Company's herds needed to be protected, it was also necessary for the Khoi to have access to the Fort, in order to continue the trade in cattle.

Van Riebeeck's first idea was to convert the Peninsula into an island, which he raised on the 22nd April 1654 in a letter to the Seventeen. However, he did acknowledge that this would prevent further trade with the Khoi unless they were confined on the island under the Company's control. Quite how this would be done, given the time it would have taken to excavate a canal, was not explained [2].

Another suggestion was made in a letter from the Seventeen dated the 6th October 1654 that a fort should be built to protect the anchorage and potential farmlands at Hout Bay [3]. This was considered to be unnecessary, however, as outlined by Van Riebeeck on

the 28th April 1655 [4], and no fortifications were erected at Hout Bay until the second half of the 18th century.

The proposal to convert the Peninsula into an island was raised again by Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens, who visited the Cape briefly from the 21st April to the 9th May 1655 [5]. He was in favour of cutting a canal to link Table Bay with False Bay, and sent instructions from St Helena on the 4th June for its position to be located and its distance measured [6].

By this time, however, Van Riebeeck had reservations about the project, as he outlined in a letter to Batavia dated the 24th July 1655. These involved the nature of the terrain and the large number of men required [7]. The Seventeen also had their doubts about the practicability of the project, as expressed in their letter of the 30th October. They suggested instead that forts or redoubts might be built to protect the Peninsula [8]. The India Council were also opposed to the canal project, as mentioned in a letter from Batavia dated the 24th December [9].

Nevertheless, Van Riebeeck did investigate its feasibility on the 4th February 1656. He discovered that the Sweet River (now the Liesbeeck) was continuous as far as the present Zeekoevlei, but was separated from False Bay by "10 or 12 successive ranges" of sand dunes. Moreover, the river flowed very slowly and was often interrupted by smaller lakes.

He therefore reported that the project was impracticable. Apart from the expense of cutting through the dunes, the sand of which would be blown back into the canal anyway, the water would not flow fast enough to prevent the Khoi and their cattle from swimming across. Another disadvantage of the canal was that no further cattle trading with the Khoi would be possible if all communication were severed. It appears from the wording of this report that Van Riebeeck was against the canal project from the outset, but was obliged to go through the exercise of investigating its feasibility in order to fulfil the instructions of the Visiting Commissioner [10].

Van Riebeeck's report on the canal was sent to the Seventeen on the 25th March 1656, when he mentioned that their alternative suggestion to build redoubts appeared to be more practicable [11]. This was followed by a resolution on the 1st May that the

possibility of erecting a small earth redoubt at Rondebosch was to be investigated [12].

Van Riebeeck went out on the 6th May 1656 to select a site for the proposed redoubt. A suitable location was found about two and a half miles from the Fort, behind Table Mountain. The redoubt would command an extensive view of the land available for cultivation, and of the pasturage which would be used for the Company's cattle. It was also intended to build three or four watch-houses between the redoubt and the Fort. These would be eighteen to twenty feet square with walls eight feet high, provided with loopholes, and would form a defensive line securing all the Company's lands from attack by the Khoi. The cost of the redoubt and the watch-houses would be minimal, as the necessary materials (earth, stone and timber) were all available in the vicinity, and the erection would be carried out by the Company's employees [13].

It was mentioned on the 17th May that "a small watch-house built of sods with a thatched roof" had already been erected at Rondebosch. This was presumably a temporary fortification, given the speed with which it was built [14]. The position of this watch-house is indicated on M1/14, a 1656 map of the Peninsula [Fig 110], protecting the two plots of land that had been sown as an experiment. The site of a projected redoubt is also shown, some distance to the south of these lands. This information is repeated on M1/15 [Fig 121], another map dating from 1656, which also shows the location of the three proposed watch-houses. One of these was at Rondebosch, one was close to the mouth of the Salt River, and the third was between the others, on the near side of the Liesbeeck River.

These proposals were communicated to the Seventeen on the 10th June 1656, when it was stated that it would soon be necessary to reserve all the Peninsula pasturage for the Company alone. A chart [15] was also sent, showing a redoubt "2 (Dutch) miles from the Fort" and "3 or 4 watch-houses" in-between [16]. These plans were approved on the 6th November, in a letter sent from Amsterdam [17].

Instructions had already been sent from Middelborgh (sic) on the 12th October for the canal project to be abandoned, and authorization was given for a redoubt to be built, garrisoned by "12 or 15 men" [18]. Further instructions were sent by Rijckloff van Goens, on the 27th December, for a site for the redoubt to be selected before his arrival

as Visiting Commissioner the next year [19].

Work on the permanent redoubt at Rondebosch was commenced on the 3rd February 1657, when the required bricks and timber beams were transported there [20]. On the 7th Van Riebeeck gave instructions for the bushes inside the Ronde Doorn Bosjen to be cleared away. This would make an effective shelter for the cattle and could also serve as a further means of defence around the projected redoubt. This suggests that the redoubt was intended to be located within the circle of thorn bushes, but the final site for the structure had not yet been chosen. The final selection was made by Van Riebeeck on the 19th February [21], and the site was described on the 21st as being "in the neighbourhood of the proposed bird trap" [22].

Progress on the redoubt was interrupted by the arrival of Rijckloff van Goens, on another visit of inspection. Still convinced that his canal project was a practicable proposition [23], his report of the 16th April 1657 dealt with this matter first.

The canal would be 5125 roods or two and a half Dutch miles long, twelve feet wide and six feet deep. According to the sergeant Jan van Harwaerden, who was experienced in this work, the excavations could be completed by seventy workmen in three months. Van Goens did acknowledge, however, that such a canal could result in the silting up of False Bay due to the north-westerly winds in the winter months, and of Table Bay due to those from the south-east in summer [24].

The alternative to the canal was the excavation of entrenchments and the erection of fortifications between Table Bay and False Bay, which Van Goens maintained would be more expensive. The trenches, sixteen feet wide at the top and eight feet deep, would have to cover a distance of 6800 roods. They would, moreover, need to be commanded by fifteen redoubts and more than a hundred ravelins, fourteen of which would be provided with watch-houses. His estimate of the garrison required for patrolling this distance was between 65 and 76 men [25].

Van Goens' report mentioned the proposed redoubt and watch-houses only after dealing extensively with his own two proposals. He was critical of Van Riebeeck's plan, stating that it could only be effective in protecting the freeburghers' lands in the immediate vicinity [26]. He therefore made a third suggestion: to erect five strong redoubts each

garrisoned by eight men, which would command the passes used by the Khoi to cross the mountains of the Peninsula [27].

Nevertheless, he did issue instructions on the 16th April 1657 for two watch-houses to be built behind Table Mountain, together with a redoubt at the Boscheuvel. The latter was to have a view of False Bay and of the pass between the Steenbergen and the Boschbergen [28]. The redoubt at the Boscheuvel, however, together with the one at Rondebosch adjoining the orchard and the proposed cattle kraal, was to be postponed until the end of the sowing season. A third redoubt near Harman Remajenne's colony, on the other hand, was to be commenced at once [29].

Letters were sent to Batavia on the 18th April 1657 and to the Seventeen on the 23rd, informing them of Van Goens' latest proposals [30]. Van Riebeeck was more supportive of the second plan in his further letter to the Seventeen dated the 20th May 1657. This involved a line of 3500 roods from Table Bay towards the False Bay dunes, but instead of cutting through them it would be diverted a further 3300 roods westwards in order to reach the Steenbergen. The fortification would comprise an eight-foot high embankment with a canal or moat ten feet wide and six to eight feet high, either on the inner or the outer side [31]. In addition, fifteen redoubts armed with two eight-pounders would be built 500 roods apart, each garrisoned with five men. Ravelins would also be placed between them at intervals of fifty roods, each of the centre ones provided with a single eight-pounder. The others would be defended by soldiers armed with muskets.

The intention of this proposal was to confine the local Khoi within the settlement, where they could be kept under the control of the Company and prevented from hindering its cattle trade with the wealthier Saldanhars. This trade would now be carried out at the redoubts, which would be located outside the embankment [32].

Another letter to the Seventeen, dated the 21st June 1657, stated that a decision was still awaited regarding the project outlined above. However, the redoubt at the Company's orchard and the "two or three" watch-houses would be commenced without delay [33].

On the 29th June, Van Riebeeck carried out another inspection of the site where the projected canal with its redoubts and ravelins was to be located. He found it so

inundated by the winter rains that the redoubts would be washed away as well as the canal, as was made evident by the damage done to the work already begun in accordance with the orders of Rijckloff van Goens [34]. Convinced of the impracticability of this plan, he wrote to the Seventeen again on the 1st July, warning them of the expense of the labour that would be wasted on a project doomed to failure [35].

Three projects for the defence of the Peninsula are shown on M2/16 [Fig 111], a map of the Peninsula probably dating from 1657 [36]. The first (Caption D) involved the redoubts mentioned above, situated along the shortest line between Table Bay and False Bay which had been surveyed on the instructions of Rijckloff van Goens.

The second project (Caption E) avoided the dunes along False Bay by branching off at right angles from this line and then returning to the "hoek van de groot steenbergen" in the vicinity of the present Muizenberg.

The third project (Caption F) comprised five redoubts which would seal off the routes through the mountains, but only three of these are shown, at the Steenbergen, at the Boscheuvel and at Kloof Nek.

Having decided for the second time to abandon Van Goens' proposed canal, Van Riebeeck resumed the task of selecting sites for the Rondebosch redoubt and the watch-houses on the 9th July 1657. For the main redoubt he found "an excellent spot between the houses of Jan Reijnierssen and the other freemen of Steven's Colony". This was on a hill which overlooked the Company's orchard and all the freeburghers' lands.

A particular advantage of this site was that only two watch-houses would now be needed, instead of the three or four which had previously been contemplated. One of these would be located across the Salt River, a half-hour's walk beyond the Duijnhoop redoubt. The principal redoubt would be built the same distance beyond the first watch-house, and the second watch-house would be situated an hour's walk further away, above Harman's Colony [37].

The site of the Rondebosch redoubt was approved by the Council of Policy on the 17th

July 1657, and it was resolved that construction would be commenced at once. The redoubt was to be "a small Royal, or 16 feet square, and to have two storeys with a flat roof and an overhanging parapet for mounting two pieces". It would command all the cultivated lands from the shore of Table Bay to the Boscheuvel, "with the exception of the Company's sowing lands situated somewhat in a valley behind another hill below the forest opposite Harman's farm". These were only partly visible, but would be protected by one of the watch-houses which would be within sight of the redoubt. This one and the other watch-house at the Salt River, however, were not considered to be necessary yet, and their construction would be postponed. Finally, it was decided to give the new redoubt the name of "Coorn-hoop" [38].

Van Riebeeck pegged out the plan of the Corenhoop redoubt on the 24th July in order for the masons to begin construction [39]. On the 30th the foundations were laid and work was commenced on its brick walls [40]. By the 3rd August construction was progressing well, and it was hoped to complete the redoubt in fourteen days' time [41]. This was an optimistic estimate, however, as it was only ready for occupation on the 25th September 1657 [42].

No visual records survive of the form of the Corenhoop redoubt, but its location is shown on the 1657 map of the Peninsula [Fig 112], which gives the positions of the lands granted to the freeburghers. The redoubt was sited at the present Mowbray, about two-thirds of the way between the shore and the Company's lands at Rondebosch. None of the watch-houses are depicted, but a "project van de gravingh" is indicated along the edges of the Liesbeeck River from the Corenhoop redoubt to the shore. This was the experimental excavation for the canal carried out under the orders of Rijckloff van Goens.

Having decided not to proceed with the canal or the project for entrenchments, redoubts and ravelins, Van Riebeeck investigated Van Goens' third proposal, as described in a letter to the Seventeen dated the 31st August 1657. This involved the erection of five redoubts to confine the local Khoi within the Hout Bay valley. He suggested that the two at the Steenbergen should be dispensed with, but that three should be built in the Hout Bay valley, one at the "Clooff" pass (Constantia Nek), and one half-way along the "Gevelbergen" (Twelve Apostles), between the "Lion Clooff" (Kloof Nek) and Hout

Bay. These redoubts would be constructed of stone and timber found on site, and would each initially be garrisoned by twenty men. Half of the men would be used to build the redoubts as quickly as possible, while the others would contain the Khoi within the valley [43].

Instructions were received from the Seventeen on the 9th October 1657 that the entrenchments were to be held in abeyance, but that work could proceed on the Peninsula redoubts [44]. The authorities in Batavia also believed that the former project would require too large a garrison, and suggested that it would be more economical to guard the passes traversed by the Khoi. This was outlined in a letter dated the 17th December 1657 [45].

However, Van Riebeeck made another inspection on the 8th and 9th February 1658, and discovered that there were so many passes that at least ten or twelve redoubts would be needed, with "extended wings or entrenchments" 400 to 500 roods long and eight feet high. These, moreover, would have to be manned continuously by more than 100 soldiers [46]. The project was thus dismissed as impracticable, and this decision was conveyed to the Seventeen in a letter dated the 22nd February [47].

The Visiting Commissioner Joan Cuneus was also critical of the proposed canals or redoubts, as revealed in his instructions of the 18th March 1658. Apart from the expense of the former and the garrison required for the latter, he did not believe that either would be effective in confining the Khoi. Moreover, once they had escaped they would be unwilling to return, and the Company would no longer have a source of cattle [48]. Orders were finally received from Amsterdam on the 16th April 1658 that the project for the canal and redoubts was not to be proceeded with [49]. Instructions were also sent on the 2nd September that the plan to erect redoubts at the passes used by the Khoi was also to be abandoned [50].

The Corenhoop redoubt had been described again on the 31st March 1658 in a letter to the Seventeen. It was 16 feet square, built of brick, with a projecting breastwork "flat at the top" [51]. The redoubt, which was garrisoned by the freeburghers, was provided with two "small metal guns" on the 3rd July, following fears of a Khoi attack [52].

As all three proposals for enclosing the Peninsula had now been rejected, Van Riebeeck

made another inspection of the Khoi approach routes on the 15th July 1658 [53]. The Liesbeeck River appeared to offer the most likely barrier, as it was only fordable in a few places. Further investigations, begun on the 23rd and completed on the 26th, revealed that the most suitable place for halting the Khoi was along the freeburghers' wagon road, where an opening had been cleared through the dense forests on either side. This opening was close to "Vasagie's" house at the foot of the Boscheuvel, and located at a spot where the Commander had already suggested to Van Goens that a watch-house or small redoubt should be erected. It also appeared that the Liesbeeck River could be made navigable up to this point, but this could not be confirmed until its banks had been cleared of rushes [54]. Work on the clearing of the Liesbeeck was in progress on the 21st November and it was hoped that, if the shallower places were deepened, the river would prevent the further abduction of the Company's and freeburghers' cattle [55].

It was resolved on the 29th May 1659 that more cannon should be provided for the protection of the Peninsula. Two five-pounders would be positioned at the Company's granary, and a two-pounder at the Corenhoop redoubt, to supplement the one already in place there. A four-pounder would also be mounted at the Boscheuvel for the protection of the free sawyers [56].

Further investigations of the terrain, made on the 31st July and 2nd August 1659, led to a provisional decision to erect a defensive fence protected by two watch-houses. It was found that the place where the Khoi most frequently made off with the cattle was about 500 roods wide. This could be closed off with a fence similar to those "made of poles which one finds at cattle marts in the Fatherland" [57].

Van Riebeeck decided upon the final location of the defensive fence on the 5th August. It would extend from "the twisted tree" (presumably the origin of the name of Kromboom Road at Rondebosch) "between the dwellings of Harman and Brinckman, as far as the forest of the free sawyer Leendert Cornelissen of Sevenhuijsen, close by the Clooffpas" [58]. Two days later Van Riebeeck made a survey of the distance to be covered by the defensive fence. Measurements were taken between the seashore and Jan Reijnierssen's house on the banks of the Fresh River, and the shortest distance was found to be 500 Rhineland roods. The second stretch of fence, "beyond the twisted

tree", would be measured as soon as possible [59]. This second stretch, extending to the free sawyer's forest, had been found to be 1100 to 1200 roods long, as noted on the 9th August when the project was approved by the Council of Policy.

The project involved first the deepening of the Liesbeeck River between Jan Reijnierssen's house and the "twisted tree above the house of Jan Maertense". The river would not provide sufficient deterrent to the Khoi upstream or downstream of this stretch, and a defensive fence would therefore be erected on either side. This would be constructed of "stakes and 2 high cross-bars or beams 4½ Rhineland feet above the ground and 6 inches in diameter".

The decision was also taken to erect two small timber watch-houses next to the fence, each of them twelve feet square. One of them ("Keert-de-Koe") would be sited 100 roods from the Liesbeeck and Salt rivers, and the other ("Kijckuijt") would be located on the dunes next to the shore. Both positions afforded an extensive view, and both were on the routes most often used by the Khoi. A third watch-house ("Houd-den-Bul") would also be built to protect the plough oxen at Boscheuvel.

Work on the project was to be commenced at once and, in order to expedite it as quickly as possible, a division of labour was proposed. The Company's wood-cutters and carpenters would be responsible for the shorter stretch between the shore and Jan Reijnierssen's house, as well as the first two watch-houses. The other, longer, section would be offered to the free sawyer Leendert Cornelissen at the rate of sixteen stivers per rood. He and his eight free labourers were to cut and prepare the timber in the forest, after which it would be transported to site at the Company's expense.

A detailed specification of the construction of the fence was provided: "In every rood 2 stakes each 6 inches across at the thin end and 8 feet long, 4 feet of which are to be charred to make it last longer, since it must be driven into the ground to a depth of 3 feet. This means that five feet will be above ground. Thirteen-foot beams of similar thickness shall be tenoned to the top of these stakes and scarfed together. Halfway up these stakes, between the top beam and the ground, another beam shall be attached of the same length but 4 inches in diameter, so that the cattle can be properly kept inside and can neither be driven under nor over it." It was estimated that this portion of the

fence should be completed in three to three and a half months. The free sawyer was given two or three days to consider the offer, but the Company's wood-cutters and carpenters were ordered to begin at once. Work would proceed simultaneously on the fence and on the two watch-houses, which were to be built of "beams and boards" [60].

Another inspection of the defensibility of the Liesbeeck River was carried out on the 12th August 1659, as a result of which a change of plan was resolved the following day. It was discovered that the upper section from the twisted tree to the free sawyer's forest was densely overgrown on the eastern bank for much of its length. Since the openings could be closed off by planting more bushes of the same kind, it was decided that it would be unnecessary to build a fence here. The latest measurements, moreover, showed that this stretch was almost 1500 roods long.

The other stretch of 500 roods, between Jan Reijnierssen's house and the sea, was devoid of trees and had very sandy soil, so the only practicable barrier was a defensive fence. The Company's foresters had already begun cutting the neccessary timber, and the carpenters were busy prefabricating the watch-houses at the Fort [61]. All three of them would be twelve feet square, constructed "from cross-beams and boards" and roofed in timber. Once the parts had been completed they would be transported separately and assembled on site.

The free sawyer had evidently been offered the contract for this shorter stretch of defensive hedge as compensation for the cancellation of the longer section. However he did not accept it as he considered the rate of sixteen stivers per rood to be too low. Therefore, since the Company had only a limited number of wood-cutters and carpenters, it was decided to employ four of his best forest workers at a daily wage of ten stivers until the project was completed [62].

By the 22nd August 1659 the "pega-pega" (the defensive hedge) had already been extended 600 roods from the free sawyer's forest, and the construction of the first watch-house was begun on the 25th. In the morning the framework was transported on four of the freeburghers' wagons to the site, which was marked out by Van Riebeeck. Once this had been done, the carpenters began erecting the structure which was then clad with boards. The watch-house was twelve feet square and eight feet high, with a

projecting breastwork three feet deep. It was given the name "Uijtkijck" as it was placed on a high dune near the shore.

The next day it was hoped that the masons would begin work on the second watch-house. This would be similar to the first, but built of stone, because there was not enough timber for the cross-beams available on site. Work was also progressing on the erection of the defensive fence [63]. The masons were indeed set to work on the second watch-house on the 26th August 1659. Nearly all the stone required had been transported to the site, the timber for the beams and the roof was almost ready, and the foundations had already been laid. This structure, to be called "Keert de Koe", was situated "between the Salt River and the fresh Liesbeecq River on a high and overgrown dune-like hill, right in the middle of the route or ford which the Hottentots take". It was 340 roods from the "Kijckuijt" watch-house, separated from the latter by the Salt River [64].

By the 2nd September 1659 the two watch-houses were almost complete, and good progress was being made with the defensive hedge. The stonework of "Keert-de-Koe" was ready to receive its timber superstructure and roof, which had been prepared at the Fort and brought to the site in segments. It was therefore hoped that it and the timber watch-house "Kijckuijt" would be completed within the week [65].

On the 15th Van Riebeeck tested the strength of the defensive hedge by driving the strongest cattle against it, but they were unable to break through the barrier. The hedge was described as being "constructed of branches like a pega-pega", was over 1150 roods in length, and had been completed in twenty days by thirty men [66]. On the same day three carpenters in the nearby forest were put to work on the preparation of the timber for the third watch-house, which was to be called "Hout den Bul". This would also have a framework of beams clad with boards [67].

On the 27th September 1659, men from a ship in harbour were sent ashore to assist in transporting the timber for the defensive fence, and on the 30th Van Riebeeck marked off the site for the third watch-house, "Hout den Bul". Instructions were also given for the banks of the river to be strengthened and steepened where necessary, in order to prevent the Khoi from driving their cattle across [68].

The positions of the first two watch-houses, "Kijck Uijt" and "Keert de Koe", are shown on a 1660 map of the Cape Peninsula [Fig 113] which identifies the owners of the farms along the Liesbeeck River. "Kijck Uijt" was located on the other side of the Salt River from the Duijnhoop redoubt, some distance to the north, while "Keert de Koe" was about a third of the distance between "Kijck Uijt" and the Corenhoop redoubt. The third watch-house, "Houd den Bul", does not appear, but its position between Leendert Cornelissen's forest and Van Riebeeck's farm at Boscheuvel is shown on a map reconstructing the freeburghers' lands on the Peninsula [Fig 120] [69].

None of the defensive measures described so far had offered any protection to the freeburghers settled on the eastern side of the Liesbeeck River. This omission was addressed on the 7th November 1659, when it was resolved that further fences would be erected, similar to the one under construction between the "Keert de Koe" and "Kijckuijt" watch-houses.

These farmers would use their own wagons to collect as many poles and beams from the forest as were needed to enclose their lands. The timber would be prepared by the Company's wood-cutters, and its carpenters would assist the farmers in the erection of the fences. In order to complete the work as soon as possible, they were given permission to cut timber in any of the forests except those belonging to the Company or the free sawyer. The fences were to consist of poles eight feet long, "well scorched" at one end, and placed six feet apart. They would be joined by two "double cross-beams", as in the fence being constructed by the Company [70].

Further defensive measures were proposed on the 25th February 1660, when the boundary of the settlement was measured and found to be a distance of 3673 roods. It was now proposed to plough up the entire perimeter and sow it with bitter almond trees, brambles and thorn bushes in a strip one rood wide, thereby enclosing the settlement with a continuous defensive hedge. It was estimated that the ploughing would take no longer than two or three weeks, and that the hedge would be fully grown in four or five years' time [71].

It was also mentioned on the 25th February that a watch-house would be built for the mounted guards along this boundary, 1320 roods from the shore. Cattle would be

permitted to enter or leave the settlement at one point only, at the discretion of the mounted guards, as decided on the 27th April. This was through a barrier which had been erected between the "Kijck Uijt" and "Keert de Koe" watch-houses and was under the surveillance of both [72].

These defensive measures, involving forts and watch-houses linked by a defensive "schutting" (the fence/hedge), were approved by Commissioner Sterthemius in 1660 [73].

By the 27th May 1660 the mounted guards' stable was sufficiently complete to be occupied by the guards and their horses [74]. It was described in a reference of the 6th November as being situated "the furthest afield and commands the whole position" [75]. The earlier entry also referred to the "parapet" of the watch-houses, presumably the "projecting breastwork" mentioned before [76].

The preparation of the ground having evidently been completed [77], Van Riebeeck gave orders on the 12th July for the planting of the defensive hedge to be commenced [78]. However, it was decided on the 20th December that the hedge would have to be extended, as increasing numbers of livestock were having to be grazed beyond the limits of the settlement. It was also acknowledged that at some stage the Khoi would have to be deprived of their grazing lands altogether, in order to provide sufficient pasturage on the Peninsula for the Company's and the freeburghers' cattle [79].

The extensions to the defensive hedge were begun on the 13th May 1661 [80], when Van Riebeeck marked out the additional area to be enclosed. This included the Boscheuvel and the Baers River, the latter flowing into False Bay. On the 17th instructions were given for the extended hedge to be measured and surveyed, in order that it could be entered on a map before Van Riebeeck's departure [81].

The construction of the cavalry watch-house was first described in the report of Commissioner Andries Frisius, dated the 4th July 1661. It was "provisionally composed of planks, and covered with straw", thus following the usual early Cape practice of timber construction. However, the brick Corenhoop redoubt, which was no longer garrisoned as it had become unnecessary, was soon to be demolished, and its bricks would be used to erect a permanent cavalry stable [82]. The demolition of the redoubt

was formally resolved by the Council of Policy on the 5th July 1662 [83].

The defensive hedge was evidently not as impenetrable as had been expected, repairs already being needed on the 31st October [84]. Moreover, deficiencies regarding its defensive capability were also revealed on the 22nd November by the Khoi, who preferred not to acknowledge its existence. They grazed their cattle "right up to the Company's stockade within the recently planted defensive hedge", not only trampling down the young trees but even knocking over the boundary poles [85].

Further protection for the defensive hedge was outlined by Van Riebeeck in his instructions of the 5th May 1662 to his successor Zacharias Wagenaer. Once a year a strip of land one rood wide was to be ploughed along both sides of the hedge, to serve as a fire-break. This was necessary because the freeburghers and the Khoi burned the dry grass at the end of each summer [86].

The positions of the mounted guards' stable and of the defensive hedge are shown on the reconstructed map of the Peninsula [Fig 120]. The former (described as the "Ruiterwacht") was located alongside the hedge, between the Corenhoop redoubt and Rondebosch, and the latter was sited some distance beyond the furthest extent of the freeburghers' lands to the east of the Liesbeeck River [87].

Further damage to the defensive hedge was noted on the 18th December 1662, some of the plants having been trampled by cattle, and others near the "Keert-de-Koe" watch-house having been burned. This could have been avoided if Van Riebeeck's plan for fire-breaks had been implemented, but it was not practicable on account of the small number of men and oxen. Wagenaer therefore suggested that two or three feet should be dug over on either side, instead of the twelve feet originally specified [88]. More serious fire damage to the defensive hedge was reported on the 5th March 1663, when a length of 1000 roods was destroyed at the Boscheuvel, despite the efforts of the "Houd-den-Bul" garrison to put out the flames [89].

It was mentioned on the 15th April 1664, in a letter to the Seventeen, that two more redoubts and another cavalry watch-house would be needed for the protection of the freeburghers' lands. One of the redoubts would be located on the Boscheuvel and another at its foot. The cavalry post would replace the existing one, the timber structure

of which was beginning to rot [90]. A single redoubt below the Boscheuvel was marked out by Wagenaer on the 5th June, but there is no further mention of its construction or completion [91].

The "Kijckuijt" redoubt and the cavalry stable were both severely damaged in a storm, as reported on the 18th August 1664. The Santhoop redoubt was also affected, as mentioned the following day, when masons and carpenters were sent to make repairs [92]. A final decision had evidently been made by the 24th October to erect a new cavalry stable built of brick. Wagenaer and the free brick-maker Mostaert therefore went to look for a suitable site for a brick-kiln in the vicinity of the Liesbeeck River [93]. The walls must have been reaching completion by the 7th December, when men from a ship in harbour were sent to collect the timber which had already been prepared for the roof [94].

The defensive fence was damaged again on the 19th December, when a stretch in the vicinity of the "Keert de Koe" watch-house was knocked down by a herd of cattle driven by the Khoi. One of the soldiers who attempted to prevent this received serious head injuries in the ensuing confrontation [95].

The two redoubts at the Boscheuvel, which had been pegged out a year previously, were mentioned again in a letter of the 19th April 1665 to the Seventeen. The erection of these would now be commenced, and the roofing of the cavalry stables completed [96]. Wagenaer also mentioned in his instructions to his successor, Cornelis van Quaelbergh, that a second "Ruiterwag" and two more redoubts had been pegged out. The first redoubt would be opposite the Company's garden Rustenburg, and the second at the foot of the Boscheuvel. The cavalry stable would be across from the house of the freeburgher known as "Broertjie" [97].

The new cavalry stable was described as larger and stronger than its predecessor, having been built of brickwork, and as being further inland with its entrance facing the sea. It appears, however, that none of these fortifications had been commenced by 1669, when their necessity was again brought to the attention of the Seventeen in a letter of the 15th April [98]. Wagenaer had also stressed the importance of erecting a redoubt at the Boscheuvel, armed with at least four cannon, to protect False Bay from a

possible enemy landing. He also suggested that a watch-house should be built at the mouth of the Salt River to prevent the smuggling of goods from the ships in harbour [99].

Volquardt Iversen described the Peninsula defences in 1667/1668: "Besides the Fortress, which has many guns and a strong garrison, they also have a redoubt in which a guard is set, and in addition fifty horsemen who have their camp outside the Fortress, to keep good watch" [100].

The possibility of a canal separating the Peninsula from the mainland was raised yet again in 1671, this time by the son of Rijckloff van Goens the elder. This involved a further inspection of the terrain, which was described as follows by Robert Padbrugge on the 8th March: "We went to make a cursory examination of the possibility or otherwise of cutting off the promontory from the mainland by joining the fresh water which flows both along the Liesbeeck and elsewhere, and thus runs separately into the Table Bay and the Bhaij Fals, the Hon. Advocate of the Hon. Coy. having been informed of this and ordered to look into it closely with the knowledge of the Hon. van Goens Junior; but since his Honour had already departed and this close examination could have awakened ill-feeling concerning the Hon. Commandeur, it was done in a cursory manner only..." [101]. This, fortunately, was the last reference to this ill-conceived and impracticable plan.

The possibility of erecting a watch-house above IJsselsteijns Bay (the present Simon's Bay), for signalling the arrival of ships in False Bay, was raised on the 30th December 1671, but no further action seems to have been taken in this regard [102].

The old redoubts "Kijckuijt" and "Keert-de-Koe" were inspected on the 8th June 1676 by Governor Bax and the master carpenter and mason. As they were found to be in a state of imminent collapse, it was decided to rebuild them with walls of stone [103]. This work had already been completed by the 16th, when they were inspected again by the Governor [104]. However, orders were given by the ex-Governor-General Rijckloff van Goens in 1681 that all the old and dilapidated redoubts were to be demolished [105].

The "Kijckuijt" watch-house still appears on M1/3308 [Fig 123], a map of the

Peninsula probably dating from 1687 [106], although Van Riebeeck's other fortifications are not shown. Appearing for the first time, however, is the "Posthuijs" in False Bay, although there is no reference to its establishment in the Resolutions. Nor are there any further visual records of this structure until 1740, when it was shown as the "Comps Vispost" at Vis Baaij, beyond Kalkbaaij, in M1/988 [Fig 124]. Although this map is very inaccurate, the "Posthuijs" is shown here in the same position as on all the maps quoted in Note 106. It is likely, therefore, that this 17th century building was at Fish Hoek rather than at Muizenberg, casting doubt upon the attribution of the structure which was restored at the latter location in the 1980s [107]. The first survey plans of the "Posthuijs" at Muizenberg date from 1787 [Fig 125] and 1790 [Fig 158]. These both show a T-shaped house flanked by a rectangular building, the latter aligned with the house but angled slightly back from it.

The "Keert de Koe" watch-house and the "Comps Beestestal" (probably the old "Ruijterwacht") are also shown together with the "Kijckuijt" redoubt on M1/17 [Fig 114], a map probably dating from 1691 [108]. By contrast, the "Posthuijs" in False Bay does not appear.

The "Posthuijs" and the "Vischhuijs" mentioned above both appear on M1/1177 [Fig 118], however, which is half of a survey map extending from False Bay to Saldanha Bay, dating also from the period of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. The former is shown in the "Zand Valey" and the latter further to the south-west in "Esselsteins Bay", eastwards of the lime-kiln. Kalk Bay, however, is shown to the east of the "Posthuijs", which is confirmed on this map as being at the present Fish Hoek, whereas the "Vischhuijs" appears to be at the present Simon's Bay.

The Peninsula defences were mentioned for the last time in a letter to Batavia dated the 10th March 1708, when the old cavalry stables were described as being used for the accommodation of exiles from Macassar [109]. This was confirmed by Kolbe in 1713 [110] and Valentyn in 1714 [111], both of whom mentioned that there was no trace of the earlier defences, of which they gave inaccurate accounts based entirely on hearsay.

The Peninsula defences were no longer necessary by 1710, the end of the period of this thesis, as the Khoi had long since been evicted from their traditional grazing lands.

Nevertheless, they had been an essential component of the early years of the Dutch occupation of the Peninsula, as illustrated so graphically by the labour expended on their construction.

8.3 COMPANY'S BUILDINGS ON THE PENINSULA

8.3.1 RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

8.3.1a EARLY BUILDINGS

Few residential buildings were erected by the Company on the Peninsula, but these are nevertheless important as they reveal information about the early country houses which has not been addressed in the standard sources.

The first of them to be mentioned, on the 5th July 1662, was the dwelling of the gardeners and slaves at Rondebosch. This old straw house ("oude stroijehuijs"), situated in the orchard next to the road to the forest, was leaking badly and had become irreparable. It had probably been erected in 1656, when the garden was first established, and is another instance of the impermanent nature of the Company's early buildings at the Cape.

It was therefore resolved to demolish this structure and replace it with a new brick building. The bricks, timber and ironwork would be obtained from the nearby "Coornhoop" redoubt, which was about to be taken down. The new dwelling would be one storey high, and only as large as the available materials would permit, indicating the economy practised by the Company with regard to its minor buildings. The ground floor would be used by the gardeners, while the lockable loft above would be reserved for the Company's use [1].

The new house had evidently been substantially completed by the 13th July 1663, when Commander Wagenaer spent the night there [2]. However, he discovered two omissions [3], and made another inspection on the 22nd August, when he encouraged the workmen to complete their task [4]. This building was also inspected by Commissioner Pieter van Hoorn on the 31st August 1663, when he described it as "a new, pleasing

house belonging to the Company" [5].

Another house along the road past the orchard at Rondebosch was built in 1666, as related in a letter to the Seventeen dated the 22nd May. This was divided into two by a "middelmuijr", the one half being rented by the free smith, and the other by the free wagon-maker [6]. The semi-detached nature of this structure, which could well have contained two workshops rather than two dwellings, could suggest the introduction of a building type not encountered in the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century.

There are no contemporary visual records of these early Company's buildings on the Peninsula. Moreover, apart from the "Posthuijs" at Muizenberg [7], the only early residential buildings on the Peninsula to have been the subject of archaeological excavation have been those of the Company's wood-cutters at Paradise, in the present Newlands forest. These, however, date from after the period of this thesis and will therefore not be described [8].

8.3.1b RUSTENBURG

The most important of the Company's residential buildings on the Peninsula was Rustenburg, its house at Rondebosch [1]. This had evidently been erected by 1666 [2], when it was described by De Rennefort. He was presumably one of the party comprising "the Monsieur de Mondevergue, the Dutch Commandant and his wife, and the two French Directors" who visited Rustenburg in 1666. They "took carriage... two leagues inland to a house belonging to the Dutch East-India Company, very well built and very sumptuously furnished" [3].

The Company's "pleasure house Rustenburgh" was not mentioned in official records until the 25th August 1671, when it was first visited by Commander Hackius [4]. However, the house and lands were leased to two of the freeburghers on the 3rd May 1673, as its profits did not cover its maintenance costs [5].

By the 26th November 1682 the house at Rustenburg was again in the hands of the Company, when it was mentioned that three exiled princesses from Macassar would be accommodated there [6]. It was also used for meetings of the Council of Policy on the 5th February, 24th March and 11th April 1685 [7], and as lodgings for the officers of a

wrecked Portuguese ship, as resolved on the 11th May 1686 [8].

The use of Rustenburg for Council meetings is explained by Boeseken's statement that Simon van der Stel lived mainly at Rustenburg from 1683, appearing at the Castle only for church services and when required for other duties [9]. This is confirmed by Captain Jos. Haddock, who stopped at the Cape in 1683. He was invited to dinner by Simon van der Stel, and was then taken "to his country house about 3 or 4 miles in the Bay & is amost (sic) pleasant place as any in Europe, being planted with most sorts fruits & flowers with many pleasant walks in the garden" [10].

Valentyn visited Rustenburg in 1685 [11], but he did not describe the building or its farmlands in any detail, although his account was complimentary. When he returned to the Cape in 1695 he was told that the Governor, Simon van der Stel, was not at the Castle but was living at the Company's "pleasure-house" at the "Ronde Boschje" [12]. This is a further indication that Rustenburg was worthy of offering residence to a Governor.

Rustenburg was also mentioned in 1685 in the instructions of Visiting Commissioner van Rheede, when he gave permission for the "wijnparshuijs aen 't Ronde Bosjen" to be enlarged" [13]. He did not, however, describe the house itself.

Kolbe (1713) described the building at Rondebosch as "a noble Pleasure-House for the Governour" [14], and mentioned that the garden was divided into two parts by the road leading from the town to Constantia. Access was provided by two large gates, facing each other across the road. The lower of these consisted of iron railings rather than a door, while the upper one was provided with a watch-house for a sentry when the Governor was in residence. These gateways both appear on Josephus Jones' much later plan of the gardens and buildings at Rustenburg, dated 1791 [Fig 126].

The "excellent pleasure-house" ("treffelyke lusthuis") was situated behind the upper gateway and contained a number of comfortable rooms ("vele gemakkelyke vertrekken"), one of which was reserved for the gardener [15]. There was also a stable for the Governor's horses, and a smaller house ("een laag huijsje") for the Governor's guard and for the slaves who worked in the garden [16]. A number of straw huts were also found in the garden itself, for sheltering the slaves who guarded it at night [17].

Valentyn, writing about his fourth visit to the Cape in 1714, described Constantia and Rustenburg ("'t Rondebosje") as having farmlands and houses ("hofsteden") which stood out from the others on the Peninsula [18]. The comparison with Constantia is explained by his description of Rustenburg as an "exceedingly handsome house" with "several commodious rooms" on the upper and lower storeys [19]. This clearly reveals that Rustenburg was a double-storeyed house, which possibly formed the precedent for this arrangement at Constantia itself and in Cape Town.

There are no depictions of Rustenburg in the 17th and early 18th centuries. However, Woodward has drawn attention to two inventories of the property: "The first, which is dated 1673, gives a detailed description of house, garden and orchards while the second, dated 1677, merely covers the house - and that in almost identical terms... The first inventory description of this 'noble Pleasure-House' reads, 'In 't voorhuijs... Int Zijdcamertje... Op d'Groote bovencamer... in 't eene cleijn camertjie daeragter... In 't Ander cleijn camertje... Noch op diverse plaetsen [followed by tools and kitchenware]'". On the basis of this inventory, Woodward interprets Rustenburg as "a smallish double-storeyed house with two downstairs rooms and three upstairs rooms", and comments on the absence of a kitchen [20].

The absence of a kitchen could be explained by a possible reference to an outside kitchen at Rustenburg [21], and the certainty of this arrangement at the Company's guest house in the gardens above the town has already been established [22]. The two-roomed nature of the lower floor appears to be unlikely, however, as Rustenburg probably also had a large central hall flanked by smaller rooms on either side, as at the guest house. In other words the "Zijdkamertje" was probably balanced by a servery and stair-hall on the other side, the former comprising one of the "diverse plaetsen" used for the preparation of food. Above, the "Groote bovencamer" probably corresponded with the "voorhuijs" beneath, and the "cleijn camertje daeragter" could well have been to the side rather than behind. If this were the case, it would have been balanced on the other side by the "Ander cleijn camertje".

There is no firm evidence in the Company's records for the date of the erection of Rustenburg other than that it was already in existence in 1671, when it was used by the sickly Commander Hackius, who was to die in December of that year. Whether this

was the double-storeyed house described by Valentyn in 1714 cannot be established, but the inventories of 1673 and 1677, which both describe it as double-storeyed, suggest that this was indeed the case.

Rustenburg could thus have been the earliest example at the Cape of a house with a "voorhuis" wider than the rooms on either side, in contrast to the practice of the Cape Dutch buildings of the later 18th century. It could also have been the precursor of the similar plans of the later Company's houses in the gardens above Cape Town and at Nieuwland, and Simon van der Stel's Constantia. Despite Mentzel's disparaging comments in the 1740s that it was only "of modest design" [23], Rustenburg probably had a considerable influence on later architectural developments at the Cape.

8.3.1c NIEUWLAND

There is even less contemporary evidence about Nieuwland (the present Newlands House) than there is about Rustenburg, and none at all in the Resolutions of the Council of Policy.

Kolbe (1713) made no reference to the house, mentioning only that thirty slaves were employed in the garden [1]. Valentyn (1714) wrote in complimentary terms about the Company's garden there, which he stated was established by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel in 1700, but also made no mention of any buildings [2].

A house does appear on M1/1165 (c1699) at the lower end of the central axis of the inaccurately located farm [3], flanked by symmetrically placed out-buildings [Fig 119]. This, however, does not correspond with the location of the present house, which is sited towards the upper end of the original property. Moreover, it was not flanked by symmetrical out-buildings, as is evident on Josephus Jones' plan of c1791 [Fig 127].

The earlier drawing [Fig 119] was thus probably depicting the intended layout of the farm, based on the design of Rustenburg. However, as built, the residence at Nieuwland was even more formally sited, being at the upper end of a long avenue leading down to and across the river. Even if not carried out in its entirety, the formality evident in this initial scheme was absent in the 17th century farms of the freeburghers, but not uncommon in those of the later 18th century. This suggests again

that the Company's buildings could have provided the precedent for future developments.

To return to Rustenburg, Mentzel described the "summer-house" at Rondebosch, used "for the pleasure of the Governor and other prominent persons", as being only "of modest design". However, this must be read in the context of Ryk Tulbagh's house at Nieuwland, which Mentzel describes as dating from 1750 and being "a more comfortable and more imposing structure than the one at Rondebosch". Mentzel, who left the Cape in 1741, could not have seen the later house, and must have derived his information from secondary sources [4].

The absence of any contemporary descriptions of the house at Nieuwland is compensated for by the excavations carried out during its rebuilding after the fire of 1981. These revealed the foundations of a row of rooms in front of the present entrance, comprising a central octagonal hall flanked by a narrower rectangular room on either side [Figs 128 & 129].

Visser believes that these date from Ryk Tulbagh's rebuilding of the house in 1751, and that it is this house that was illustrated in Barrow's watercolour of c1797 [Fig 130], thereby suggesting that the Nieuwland gable was the progenitor of the Constantia group of "halsgewels" [5]. Brink, on the other hand, has suggested that the entire house, with its octagonal "voorhuis" and narrow "galdery" behind, was erected by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. She bases her argument on Van der Stel's known association with the octagonal form used in the Cape Town church and in the central court at Vergelegen, and attributes its use to his "fascination for French geometry and European status symbols" [6].

However, there is a third possibility, namely that the house was built incrementally and that parts of it could be attributed to both Governors. Before this possibility is presented, though, it is necessary to investigate the known history of the house and to analyse Visser's and Brink's arguments.

According to Visser, the first house was the "lodge" built by Van der Stel, of which "nothing recognisable remains". This was replaced in 1751 by the gabled house erected by Tulbagh and illustrated by Barrow, c1797 [7]. This house was elaborated with a

portico designed by Thibault in the first decade of the 19th century [Fig 131].

"Newlands House", as it was now called, changed dramatically in the second decade of the 19th century, when an upper storey was added, but the building was severely damaged in a storm on the 12th August 1819. It was rebuilt as a single-storeyed structure, and finally completed in March 1824. The entrance front was now flat-roofed with a dome over the entrance hall, its ends were bowed, and the whole front was surrounded by a veranda [8].

Visser states that the "foundations went down about one metre below ground level and were made of enormous Table Mountain sandstone boulders, some as much as one metre in diameter". He also noted that the "foundations of the original east front... consisted of the same type of material as those of the rest of the house", and that those of "the stonework triangles in the corner of the outer square walls were integrally bonded to the square, in other words part of Tulbagh's original construction. Somerset's dome was therefore a response to a geometry that already existed in the building" [9].

Brink stresses the "oddness" of "the longitudinal design of Newlands House" in comparison with "the traditional transverse Cape Dutch style". She also compares the social background and aspirations of Van der Stel and Tulbagh, and concludes that the earlier Governor was more likely to have been the creator of Nieuwland [10].

There is, however, nothing "odd" about the plan of Nieuwland other than the unusual depth of its "galdery" and the difference in width between this element and the "voorhuis". Brink herself describes Cape Dutch houses as "transverse houses, which are very different to the longitudinal houses typical of Dutch urban architecture. Cape Dutch houses have their front rooms one beside the other with entry into a long side which forms the facade". She then cites Lewcock on the characteristics of the transverse plan: "The central space projecting backwards at right angles to the facade creates a plan generally called the 'transverse' plan, in opposition to a plan whose major development or axis takes place parallel to the long facade of the building", and concludes that "Newlands House is a longitudinal house with a very long passage" [11].

However, Nieuwland did have a transverse plan, with the passage at right angles to the

facade. The longitudinal or "hall house" was entered through the gable end, as in Amsterdam and in some of the earlier houses at the Cape, not under a gable in the centre of a roof ridge which is parallel to the facade. In other words, the passage at Newlands was perpendicular to the principal facade, not parallel to it. This misconception casts doubt on Brink's suggestion that the plan of Nieuwland would have been anachronistic if the house were erected by Tulbagh in the 1750s, particularly given that houses with a similarly narrow U-plan were built on the Peninsula at the end of the 18th century, although without the octagonal "voorhuis".

Brink, though, is probably correct in attributing the octagonal entrance hall to Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. This space and its flanking rooms of equal depth but narrower width is markedly different from the proportions characteristic of the Cape Dutch farmhouses of the later 18th century. The Cape Dutch norm was to have a square "voorhuis" flanked by wider rooms of equal depth.

The front wing of Nieuwland, however, does correspond with the guest house in the gardens above Cape Town, with the front wing of Constantia and, possibly, with the Company's house at Rustenburg, all of which were built prior to 1700. The front wing of Nieuwland was therefore no more than a repetition of an already established plan type, albeit geometrically elaborated with regard to the entrance hall. Neither Brink nor Visser appears to have noticed this proportional anachronism, nor have they mentioned the architectural disunity between the front three rooms and the rest of the building.

Of greater significance, however, are the drawings of Barrow and Thibault [Figs 130 & 131]. These reveal a facade treatment incompatible with the octagonal entrance hall, as the windows are too close to the door. They correspond instead with Sargent's measured drawing of 1939 [Fig 132], redrawn by Hampshire with the "original front" added [Fig 129]. This is of crucial significance as it proves that the building drawn by Barrow and Thibault began at the back wall of the front wing of the earlier building.

The later building illustrated by Barrow and Thibault, however, was unlikely to have been Ryk Tulbagh's house, except in part. Firstly, it is improbable that he would have demolished a pre-existing building and not re-used at least some of its foundations, as was done at Constantia and Vergelegen. If Van der Stel's original front wing had been

built on unstable soil, moreover, it is doubtful whether Tulbagh would have used the foundations of the back wall, and there is no reason why he should have adhered to the width of the original front if he were building a completely new house.

Secondly, the gable of Newlands appears to be much later than a date of the 1750s, forming as it does a member of the Constantia group dating from the 1790s. It is only the drawings which have been used as evidence to suggest that it was the progenitor of this group, despite the fact that the first of these depictions (Barrow, Fig 130) dates from 1797 at the earliest.

This evidence suggests that there were three versions of Nieuwland prior to the alterations of Lord Charles Somerset during the Second British Occupation. The probable sequence of events is as follows:-

1) Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel builds a three-roomed pavilion based on the plan type of the guest house in the Company's garden above Cape Town, but with an octagonal rather than square central room, in the first decade of the 18th century.

2) Ryk Tulbagh adds the "galdery" and flanking rearward wings to the back of the original three-roomed structure. (Tulbagh's plan for the extensions to Nieuwland was thus progressive, rather than retrogressive. Restricted to the width of Wilhem Adriaen's building with its wide central room and narrower flanking ones, he introduced a narrower "galdery" with wider rooms on either side, similar to the narrow entrances in the town houses of the period. Given the prestige of Newlands, this could well have been the precedent for the narrow U-plan Peninsula houses of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, as exemplified by Bergvliet and Nova Constantia).

3) The original front either falls into disrepair or is deemed to be unfashionable [12] and is demolished. A new facade is erected on the front of Tulbagh's additions, as shown in the drawings of Barrow and Thibault (thus corresponding with the proportions of Sargent's plan). The lateral wing at the back of the house probably also dates from this time. (These alterations and additions could well have been commissioned by Governor van der Graaff, who was also responsible for the extensive additions to the Company's guest house in the gardens in Table Valley).

4) Thibault is commissioned in 1806/07 to build a portico. (This could have been because Thibault was the official architect at the time. However, if the facade of Newlands was rebuilt during the 1790s, it could be that Thibault had already been responsible for its design and that of its gable. This would re-open the possibility of his having designed the facade of the third and existing Constantia, together with its gable. Whether the Constantia gable predated that of Newlands or vice versa, as appears now to be accepted on the tenuous evidence of drawings dating from after 1797, cannot yet be determined with certainty).

5) Lord Charles Somerset commissions the building of a second storey, but the building collapses in a storm in August 1819.

6) Estimates for the rebuilding of the house, now to be single-storeyed once more, are approved in September 1819. This was the flat-roofed building with a veranda and bow-ends, and a dome in the centre, depicted by J F Comfield in 1824.

As Visser's drawings reveal, the dome was placed over the octagon of the original front, and the bow-ends were added to the outside of the original outer rooms. This suggests that Lord Charles Somerset wished to alter the Cape Dutch appearance of what was now called "Government House" by adding a new front wing to the existing facade. While excavating, his workmen would have discovered the foundations of the original front with its octagonal foundations, now in fashion again given the influence of Robert Adam. The new wing was therefore built on these old foundations, with the addition of equally fashionable Regency bow-ends, and of the dome which Visser described as responding to a pre-existing geometry.

With regard to Brink's suggestion of French sources for Wilhem Adriaen's architectural "aspirations", at least one of his octagons, that of the Cape Town church, was clearly based on the Dutch precedent of Hendrick de Keyser, and not on French models [13]. While 17th century Dutch buildings, and gardens in particular, were certainly influenced by French fashions, Van der Stel's interest is more likely to have been derived directly from Dutch examples. The gardens at Heemstede in the province of Utrecht, begun in 1680 [Fig 133], contained an octagon leading from the street to the main house, which might have suggested the octagonal orangery at Vergelegen. The

octagon at Nieuwland, moreover, could have been based on the Huis ten Bosch at the Hague, where a ball was held in the central octagonal hall in the 1680s, as depicted in a contemporary illustration [Fig 134]. Wilhem Adriaen could well have visited this hall, and it is not inconceivable that he attended the occasion in question [14].

The Nieuwland octagon could also have been inspired by the "Ganymede grotto" of Hans Willem Bentinck at Sorgvliet, built in c1680 [Figs 135 & 136]. Although this pavilion contained only a single square hall, it had a large octagonal lantern above, and a tripartite subdivision of the facade. Apart from the octagonal shape of the lantern, its exterior volumetric form is remarkably similar to that of the Company's first guest house in the gardens above Cape Town as revealed in contemporary descriptions [15]. The reference to French precedent is therefore unnecessary and inappropriate. Moreover, Brink's examples of French siting layouts only approximate to the octagonal, whereas the Dutch examples quoted here are geometrically regular octagons.

The final question to be answered is why Wilhem Adriaen would have built such a large house at Nieuwland (as proposed by Brink), particularly as his contribution is usually described as a mere "lodge". Since the "galdery" behind the octagonal "voorhuis" was 75 feet long, this building would have been even deeper than Constantia and Vergelegen, although narrower in breadth.

It is extremely unlikely that such a large building would not have been mentioned by Kolbe and Valentyn. Even if they had not seen it, they would have been told of it, and neither of them was averse to relying on hearsay in their accounts of the Cape. Moreover, Van der Stel had no intention of living at Nieuwland on a permanent basis, as he had already begun the construction of his residence at Vergelegen. It is far more likely that he built a structure similar to the guest house in the Company's garden in Table Valley or to the Company's house at Rustenburg.

However, it is unlikely that the double-storeyed Rustenburg would have been compared unfavourably with a single-storeyed Newlands, octagonal hall notwithstanding. It is possible, therefore, that the first Newlands was also double-storeyed. This would have allowed a double-volume octagonal hall with galleries opening on to it from the upper rooms on either side. The roof of the octagon could have been conical or even have had

a segmental dome, thus following the precedent of the Huis Ten Bosch [16].

Tulbagh's contribution could thus have been to remove the upper storey, which might have become unstable over the past half-century, and build the rear hall and flanking rooms to compensate for the accommodation lost, as well as to add substantially to the area of the house. By the time of Van der Graaff, the walls of the front wing were probably also unstable, being ninety years old, and it is likely that he was the person to order the demolition of this wing and build a new facade on the front of Tulbagh's rearward extensions.

It is enigmatic, though, that none of the contemporary visitors to the Cape mentioned even a three-roomed structure at Nieuwland during the period of this thesis, particularly given the striking form of its octagonal "voorhuis". However, it could be that this extravagant structure was a closely guarded secret, reserved only for the use of the Governor.

If the Nieuwland of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel did have an octagonal "voorhuis" flanked by a room on either side, it would have been a further example of an official building with a three-roomed symmetrical plan. As with Rustenburg and the Company's guest house, it could have established a precedent for the freeburghers' adoption of the symmetrical front, but its proportions were likewise not to be repeated, nor was the complexity of its octagonal entrance hall.

8.3.2 NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

A number of non-residential buildings on the Peninsula were built or projected by the Company during the period under review. These also reveal the form and construction methods of VOC buildings in the early years of the settlement.

8.3.2a THE CATTLE KRAALS AT RONDEBOSCH, HOUT BAY AND ELSEWHERE

A proposed cattle kraal at Rondebosch was first mentioned on the 7th February 1657, when Van Riebeeck gave orders for the bushes within the natural circle of the "Ronde Doorn Bosjen" to be cleared away. A hedge eight or ten feet wide was to be left around

the perimeter, closed off with a gate, thereby protecting the cattle at night from theft and attack by wild animals [1].

A "shelter" at Rondebosch was mentioned on the 28th June 1657, when severe flooding of the road to the forest prevented the wagon oxen from returning the Fort. They were therefore kept "under a shelter constructed there", but no description was given of its construction [2]. Nor is it clear whether it was hastily erected for this specific purpose or if it had been built previously. Reference was made on the 21st July 1658 to the "Company's shed" at Rondebosch, where the sheep and draught oxen were sheltered at night [3]. This could have been the "shelter" mentioned above, which might have been at the granary, from which some of the Company's sheep were stolen in September that year [4].

On the 30th November 1658 work was begun on the preparation of the timber for a new and larger kraal at the Company's granary [5]. The erection of this "permanent" kraal, however, had not yet been commenced by the 23rd May 1659, when deteriorating relations with the Khoi led the Company to commission the freeburghers to transport the timber required for the palisade. This would be constructed of 800 "stout poles, 10 feet in length" [6].

The palisaded kraal had been completed by the 19th June. It was described as being located "along one side of the Company's granary", where it would serve as a protection for the latter building as well [7]. The "kraal and sheds" at Rondebosch were mentioned again in Commissioner Andries Frisius' report of the 4th July 1661, when they were described as being close to the granary and recently constructed of "heavy palisades and planks". Evidently the shed mentioned previously had also been replaced with a more permanent structure, albeit of timber and not of masonry [8].

The Company also erected a number of other cattle kraals on the Peninsula. The one at Hout Bay was first mentioned on the 30th January 1668 [9], and sheds for the livestock had been built there by the 2nd July 1672 [10]. A kraal had also been erected behind the Steenbergen by the 11th September 1672 [11], and another at the "Boere-boomen" (at Hout Bay) was mentioned on the 9th July 1676 [12]. There are, however, no descriptions of their architectural form or construction method.

8.3.2b THE GRANARY AT RONDEBOSCH

The first mention of the projected granary at Rondebosch (later to become the "Groote Schuur") was made on the 19th July 1657. This would be used for storing and threshing the wheat produced at the new grain fields, which would then be bagged and sent to the Fort. The structure was to be completed by December, when the first wheat harvest was expected [1].

A site was selected by Van Riebeeck the following day, and that evening he "drew up a plan for the construction of the granary". This is an interesting entry as it reveals that Van Riebeeck was taking the role of architect himself, instead of using one of his surveyors or the sergeant Jan van Harwaerden, later to become the supervisor of VOC building works and fortifications at the Cape [2].

The granary would be "108 feet long and, excluding the projecting parts for loading, 40 Rhineland feet wide, with 10 joists, 12 feet apart". Given the urgency of this project it was resolved that the carpenters would cease their work on the jetty under construction, and concentrate instead on the preparation of the timber required for the granary [3].

Work on the granary was commenced on the 23rd July [4], and it was recorded on the 17th October that all the carpenters were involved in the preparation of the necessary timber [5]. The final site of the granary was marked out by Van Riebeeck on the 20th November [6], and on the 27th the erection of the structure was commenced, about thirty men having been sent to assist with the erection of the "cross-beams" [7]. By the beginning of 1658 the structure of the granary had evidently been completed, as Van Riebeeck reported on the 25th January that he was having difficulty finding reeds for thatching the roof. Those in the vicinity of the granary had all been used on the freeburghers' houses [8].

The Journal describes the construction of the granary in no more detail than it does its planning and exterior form. One notable omission, however, gives a clue as to its structure. No masons are mentioned as having worked on the granary, which suggests that it had a timber framework with walls of planks or wattle-and-daub, like the houses of the freeburghers.

Such an impermanent structure is surprising, given the importance that Van Riebeeck attached to this building, particularly since it had already been decided as early as 1654 that the timber storehouses at the Fort would be rebuilt in masonry. Bricks were in short supply, however, and the urgency of providing a granary in time for the harvest necessitated the use of a quicker method of construction.

Van Riebeeck's brief description of the 20th July 1657 could have suggested that the granary had a rectangular plan, but this is contradicted by the "projecting parts for loading" which extended beyond the width of the main structure. These were probably short wings placed in the middle of the long sides of the major volume, thereby constituting a cross-shape. Indeed, Van Riebeeck later described the building as being "like a small church", in a letter to the Seventeen written on the 5th March 1659 [9]. Moreover, a similar plan is seen in the granary at Vergelegen (see Chapter 9.5), which could well have been derived from the precedent of the earlier building at Rondebosch.

There is no further mention of construction work at the granary until the 1st August 1676, when Governor Bax gave orders for a small kitchen to be built. This was to be located some distance from the dwelling (sic), to prevent the outbreak of fire, which had apparently been narrowly averted during his recent visit of inspection. It appears from this entry that a house had been erected next to the granary, although the reference could have been to the Company's residence at Rustenburg nearby [10].

Of more serious consequence was the "collapse" of the granary, which was "blown down" by strong winds on the 5th July 1698, as communicated to the Seventeen in a letter of the 18th March 1699. This entry is possibly misleading, however, as only the stable for the oxen was mentioned as requiring urgent rebuilding. Since this could well have adjoined the granary, as did the old kraal of palisades, it could be that the "Corenschuijr" itself was not seriously damaged [11]. Indeed, it appears that the granary itself did survive the storm, as it was mentioned nine years later, in another letter to the Seventeen dated the 18th April 1708, that a new building had been erected. This was "to replace the old one, which was entirely rotten" [12], suggesting that the latter was the original granary constructed of timber [13].

There are no architectural descriptions of the granary in the travellers' records, but

Kolbe does mention that there were a number of small houses in its vicinity. These were for the wagon-master and his subordinates, for the wagon driver, and for various other Company's employees and slaves. There were also some other insignificant buildings ("slechte gebouwen") [14].

8.3.2c THE PENINSULA MILLS

The Peninsula mills are of significance as they indicate that industrial activities were introduced to the country districts at an early date. The first mill on the Peninsula was a fulling mill, built to prepare the skins of the animals slaughtered at the Cape for the leather industry at Batavia.

The mechanism had been assembled by Commander Borghorst himself, as recorded on the 12th July 1669. The next day the masons began building a stone sluice for the mill [1], which had been completed by the 6th October, when it was tested and proved to be successful [2]. There was, however, no further mention of this mill. A proposal was also made on the 8th April 1680 for a sawmill to be erected at Hout Bay, but nothing came of this suggestion [3].

The second of the Peninsula mills was a cornmill. It was noted on the 8th September 1693 that the Table Valley mill did not have the capacity to serve the needs of the freeburghers as well as the Company's employees. The former were consequently obliged to travel to Stellenbosch to have their grain milled, a costly and time consuming undertaking. It was therefore decided that another water-mill, together with a miller's house, would be erected on the Liesbeeck River for the use of the freemen living in Table Valley and on the Peninsula [4].

Unfortunately no description was provided of the mill or of its associated house. Its erection, however, was confirmed by Kolbe (1713), who mentioned that it was in working order, but provided no architectural description [5].

8.3.2d BRIDGES ON THE PENINSULA

The earliest bridge on the Peninsula was referred to on the 21st February 1657, in connection with the first land grants to the freeburghers at Rondebosch. This "small

forest bridge" marked the outer extremity of the settlement at Hollandsche Thuijn [1].

On the 30th November 1658 it was resolved that a new road would have to be constructed at Rondebosch, to allow the cattle to be driven from the kraal at the granary to the pastures across the river. This "broad road" was to go past "Herman Remajenne's" house, where a bridge had been constructed [2], and instructions were given on the 23rd May 1659 for this bridge to be widened [3]. A bridge next to the farm of Hans Rasch was also mentioned on the 14th August 1664, but this could have been the one referred to above, following changes in land ownership [4]. The same applies to the bridge next to the cavalry stables, referred to on the 23rd July 1672 [5].

Repairs to the bridges were mentioned on the 30th December 1675, when it was decided that the freeburghers would be taxed in order to defray expenses [6].

It was also noted on the 18th August 1687 that the continual erosion of the banks of the Liesbeeck River had resulted in the bridge between Rustenburg and the house of the freeburgher Herman Gresnig becoming virtually unusable. It was therefore decided that a new bridge would be constructed 100 Rhineland roods upstream. This had the additional advantage that the road used by the wood-cutters and freeburghers would thereby become shorter, safer and less difficult to traverse, and easier to maintain. In order to carry out this new project, the Company was prepared to supply two carpenters, two masons, two wood-cutters and 28 slaves, on condition that the freeburghers supplied a similar number of workmen at their own expense [7].

The list of workmen outlined above suggests a composite structure for the bridge in question. The abutments were almost certainly built of masonry, while the roadway was probably constructed in timber.

Despite the absence of detailed information on these earliest roads and bridges, a clear impression is given of the communication difficulties of the time. These difficulties severely hampered the implementation of construction projects, and characterized the entire VOC period at the Cape. The Company's unwillingness to supply draught animals and to expend any more than the minimum to establish a communications network resulted in a great deal of time being wasted on transport delays and on the maintenance of this fragile infrastructure.

8.3.2e HARBOUR FACILITIES ON THE PENINSULA

Owing to the dangers of the Table Bay anchorage in the winter months, it was necessary for the Company to find alternative harbours along the Peninsula coastline. Hout Bay [1] and False Bay [2] appeared initially to be the most suitable, but neither was used as a permanent winter anchorage during the period of this thesis, although ships did occasionally shelter there in emergencies.

False Bay was also used for ship careening, as mentioned on the 22nd October 1689 [3], but it was only in 1743 that the first permanent harbour facilities were erected, when the Company gave orders for the return fleets to anchor at Simon's Bay during the winter months [4].

8.4 FREEBURGHERS' BUILDINGS ON THE PENINSULA

There is no detailed information on the configuration of the early freeburghers' buildings on the Peninsula, although the contents of the rooms which they contained were sometimes described in the probate inventories. However, their method of construction is revealed in the Journal and the Resolutions, and it was already noted on the 28th April 1655 that the timber and reeds required for such structures were available in the vicinity [1].

The houses of the freemen were first mentioned on the 4th March 1657, when they were visited by Van Riebeeck [2]. Following another inspection on the 14th, he recorded that the farmers of Steven's and Harman's companies were building "moderate houses" for themselves [3]. These appear to have been completed by the 24th, when the Commander and the Visiting Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens spent the night in "the dwelling of the freemen of Harman's Company", while undertaking a survey of the Peninsula [4].

This entry suggests that only one house was built in each colony to begin with, shared by all of the settlers in each party. Such an arrangement would have allowed the first structure to be built more quickly, using the communal efforts of all the burghers. It would then have provided them with initial shelter while they erected their own

individual dwellings.

These first houses were built by the farmers themselves, but on the 1st July 1657 it was mentioned that a potential freeburgher had already commissioned the Company's carpenters to build "a good farmer's homestead" for him during their free time. He was "Hendricq Boom", the Company's first gardener, who was about to take his discharge. This entry also suggests that the house was timber-framed, as will be confirmed later [5]. The freeburghers' out-buildings were first mentioned on the 27th August 1657, when they requested the Company to sell them some timber for the erection of grain lofts ("corensolders") [6].

On the 26th September some of the carpenters from a ship in harbour offered their services "to build houses for the freemen". Their offer was accepted and they were given their discharge, thereby becoming the first independent building contractors at the Cape [7].

The freeburghers were warned on the 6th November not to damage the forests through indiscriminate tree-felling when procuring timber for their houses and barns [8], and on the 30th they were instructed to complete their houses, granaries and kraals before going off on cattle bartering expeditions [9].

It was noted on the 25th January 1658 that all the thatching reeds in the immediate vicinity of Rondebosch had been used up on the freeburghers' dwellings [10]. These were still under construction on the 21st August, when it was recorded that they were "busy building their houses, barns and storehouses for grain" [11]. By the 2nd October, however, these had been largely completed, as it was stated that the freemen were "already well provided with houses, barns, stables etc" [12].

A further indication of the construction of these buildings was provided on the 2nd October 1658, when it was mentioned that their walls were "plaited with the branches of the small bushes on the dunes" [13]. This reference clearly suggests that the walls were constructed of wattle-and-daub, while another of the 23rd December mentions timber being used for the walls of the houses. This would have formed the structural framework, and confirms the supposition mentioned above in connection with the employment of carpenters rather than masons for their construction [14].

The fishermen's house or "hut" at Salt River was first mentioned on the 13th November 1658 [15], and the location of these houses (by now more than one) was described on the 24th May 1660 as being next to the river beyond the Duijnhoop redoubt. Their architectural form, however, was not described [16].

1659 witnessed the onset of serious Khoi attacks on the freemen, and on the 21st May a number of them took refuge in the Fort and the Corenhoop redoubt, for fear that their houses would be set alight. An exception was Hendrick Boom who, to the dismay of the Commander, insisted on holding out as long as possible in order to defend his house and family. This dwelling appears to have been more substantial than most, and was described as "a fine house on which he has expended all his fortune, fully 1700 or 1800 guilders which he has accumulated to his credit, since in his 6 years' service he has not drawn any of his wages". Unfortunately there is no description of the construction or configuration of this building [17].

Hendrick Boom did manage to protect his house from the attacks of the Khoi, but ironically it was burned to the ground six months later on the 16th October 1659, "owing to the careless stoking of an oven" [18]. This was instrumental in the Company's decision of the 7th January 1660 to replace the thatched roofs of all its buildings with tiles, in order to minimize the risk of fire [19].

An entry of the 19th December 1659 is noteworthy in that it reveals that at least one of the freeburghers' houses had addressed the issue of fortification [20]. A fugitive had been spotted by the freeburgher Jacob Cloeten "through the loopholes in the walls of his house" [21]. Given this early use of defensive measures in the design of farmhouses, it is surprising that later examples dispensed with such precautions. This is noticeable not only in the treatment of the outside walls, where timber shutters were their only protection, but particularly in the siting arrangements of farm complexes. Few of these were organized around a defensible court, the largest proportion consisting of an alignment of buildings which offered no possibility of enclosure or protection [22].

Despite the sketchiness of the descriptions given in the Journal and Resolutions, it is possible to form a picture of the early freeburghers' houses on the Peninsula. These all

appear to have been built of impermanent materials, involving a timber framework with an infill of reed or wattle-and-daub, and roofs of thatch. Such a walling system would explain why Hendrick Boom's house was burned to the ground. This construction method would also preclude any but the narrowest of roof spans, thereby determining a plan form only one room deep. It is possible, therefore, that the characteristic plan of the later Cape Dutch houses, comprising a number of one-room-deep wings meeting at right angles, was a continuation of a tradition established by their timber-framed predecessors. Given the evidence of the houses on Robben and Dassen Island it is also probable that these were simple rectangles in plan. They were, however, more substantial than the "kapsteilhuis" type used for the first temporary shed at the Fort, since the use of wattle-and-daub indicates vertical walls.

The use of this construction method for the early houses on the Peninsula has not been given sufficient attention in the standard works on Cape Dutch architecture. It is similar to that used for the first dwellings of the British settlers in the Eastern Cape [23] and reveals a common initial response to the need for shelter in people originating from northern Europe, regardless of their nationality. This is not surprising, given the long tradition of timber construction in a natural region plentifully supplied with forests.

The house of the free sawyers in the forest was first mentioned on the 3rd June 1662. This had been erected by Leendert Cornelisz van Sevenhuijsen, but was now in a state of disrepair [24]. It was also stated on the 16th May 1663, in a letter to the Seventeen, that a workshop for the free blacksmith would be established on the public road near the Company's orchard [25].

Another indication of the configuration of the freeburghers' buildings on the Peninsula was given on the 17th August 1664, when the house and cow shed of Frans Gerritsz were blown down in a storm. These were described as being attached to each other, providing the first recorded example of an "einhaus", where dwelling and stabling were under the same roof, in the early architecture of the Cape [26].

The first contemporary description of a freeburgher's house was provided by Wouter Schouten in 1665, and concerned "the most distant of the farm-houses, right behind the Table Mountain". His party were taken "into the little glassless house, and brought into

the best room, which in this cold night was airy and chilly enough since there was no glass nor any shutters there... Then (at our request) they made our bed or sleeping-place in the cowshed..." [27].

The description of Elias Hesse in 1681 is hardly different: "But otherwise they (the Dutch farmers) live very simply, especially as regards their houses, in which lonely peasant huts windows and glass are not to be found" [28]. Both of these descriptions reveal an uncomfortably primitive architecture, far removed from the Cape Dutch homesteads of the later 18th century.

Moreover, the replacement of the early timber-framed tradition at the Cape by the masonry construction characteristic of Cape Dutch architecture was not an evolutionary development initiated by the freeburghers. It was the result of the Company's prohibition on the use of structural timber for the walls of the freemen's buildings. A resolution was taken on the 12th February 1691 that all houses, barns and kraals were to be built with walls of brick or clay, in order to conserve the limited supply of timber [29]. This resolution is therefore central to the development of the construction method and its consequent aesthetic which formed the basis of the architecture of the 18th century at the Cape. Once again, the change was instigated by the Company's officials, and not by the freeburghers.

A possible indication of the planning arrangements of the larger houses is provided by the inventory of the property of Hendrick Sneewindt in Rondebosch, which was auctioned in 1701 for the particularly high figure of f16 450 [30].

The house was described as follows: "In het Woonhuijs... is bevonden in de voorkamer aan de Linker Zijde... In de kamer aan de linckhand [rechterhand?] bevonden... In 't Voorhuijs bevonden... In 't kinder kamertjen bevonden... In 't Wijn kamertjen bevonden [furnished as a bedroom-cellar]... In 't slaap kamertjen van de Weduwe... op het soldertjen boven het Wijnkamertjen... In de gallerije bevonden... In de Bottelarije bevonden... In de kombuijs bevonden... boven op de solder bevonden... In 't parshuijs bevonden... In 't kleijn huijsjen bevonden... In 't oude Woonhuijs bevonden... In 't beestehock bevonden" [31].

This property is particularly interesting for two reasons. The first is that a second house

had already been built and that the original one had been left standing, and was not demolished or added to. This reveals that even at the beginning of the 18th century the more pretentious houses were sometimes built as completely new structures, thus challenging the evolutionary theory of incremental additions.

The second is that the description of the accommodation suggests that the "dubbelhuis" of the town had already reached the Peninsula. Woodward's reconstruction of the house shows a U-shaped plan with a "galdery" similar to that of Constantia, but relies on the assumption that the inventory was incorrect in describing a second room on the left-hand side, and that this should in fact have been to the right of the "voorhuis".

If the house did have a "dubbelhuis" plan, however, the rooms which are described in the inventory could have been accommodated more conveniently. In the centre, and extending the full depth of the rectangular house are the "Voorhuijs" (entrance hall) and the "gallerije" (rear hall); on the left is the "voorkamer aan de Linker Zijde" (front room on the left-hand side), behind which are the "kamer aan de linckhand" (room on the left) and the "slaap kamertjen van de Weduwe" (small bedroom of the widow); on the right are the "kinder kamertjen" (child's small bedroom), the "Wijn kamertjen" (small bedroom-cellar), the "Bottelarije" (pantry) and the "kombuijs" (kitchen).

This, moreover, is only one of a number of interpretations of the inventory which could correlate with a "dubbelhuis" plan. Of the four possible solutions derived by the present author, this is the one which corresponds most closely with the relative sizes of the rooms described by the assessor. It must be stressed, though, that no dimensions are provided and that the difference between a "kamer" and a "kamertjen" can therefore not be established. In addition, the sequence of the rooms described does not follow any of the possible architectural configurations consistently. This is further illustration that the inventories alone cannot be regarded as any more than an accommodation schedule, although they have been used to "substantiate" a number of different plan types. In this particular case, though, the accommodation described appears to correspond more closely with the "dubbelhuis" type than with the U-plan reconstructed by Woodward and the L-plan suggested by Brink.

Brink criticizes Woodward's reconstruction, but compounds the latter's possible

misinterpretation of the "galdery" (as a portico surrounding an open court) by omitting any reference to the "galdery" at all. Brink believes that the plan was asymmetrical, as in the town houses of Holland, and questions Woodward's interpretation of Valentyn's "double houses", to which the latter makes reference [32]. Woodward was correct, however, in her reading of "dubbelhuisen" as being symmetrical, but inconclusive in her assumption that they were U-shaped in plan.

There is little information on the freeburghers' non-residential buildings, and none of an architectural nature. The first brewery on the Peninsula was mentioned on the 20th September 1659. This belonged to the freeburgher Vassagie (sic) [33], the Company already having considered the possibility of allowing a freeman to establish a brewery on the 7th November 1658 [34].

Land for another freeburgher's brewery was granted to Rutgert Mensingh at Papenboom, between Rondebosch and Newlands, as noted on the 1st August 1696 in a letter to the Seventeen [35]. This had been completed and was ready for production by the 21st, and was described as being situated on the Liesbeeck River [36].

This was the last mention of the freeburghers' buildings on the Peninsula during the period of this thesis. Although there is no visual evidence of these buildings, and contemporary descriptions are uninformative regarding their architectural configuration, it is probable that a considerable level of sophistication had been achieved in at least one of the freeburghers' houses by the beginning of the 18th century.

If the Sneewindt house had been organized on the "dubbelhuis" or transverse plan, as appears likely, it could have promoted the adoption of this type on the Peninsula. The Sneewindt house could have had a U-shaped roof plan (with a flat-roofed "galdery"), despite its rectangular floor plan. If this were the case, it could have been even more influential than Constantia, but the absence of firm evidence denies a conclusive statement in this regard.

Nevertheless, the presence of a house of this size and value does provide conclusive evidence that substantial buildings were already being erected by the freeburghers in the country districts by the beginning of the 18th century.

8.5 CONSTANTIA

Although by far the most extensive of the officials' farms on the Peninsula, and the most impressive with regard to its homestead, Simon van der Stel's establishment at Constantia was not entirely without precedent.

Van Riebeeck's farm at Boscheuvel has already been referred to, and its farmhouse was first mentioned on the 7th May 1659, when news was received that it had burned down [1]. It appears that the house was not rebuilt, however, as "Commissioner Andries Frisius noted that its blackened ruins were still to be seen" in 1661 [2]. Moreover, it does not appear in the official report of the 18th July 1661, when it was agreed that the farm would be purchased by the Company. The "outhouses, barns and shelters", in contrast, were mentioned [3], and it was reported on the 12th September that "one of the out-houses... was burned to the ground" [4].

The fact that the walls of the house were still standing two years after the fire, whereas the "out-house" was "burned to the ground", suggests that the house was of masonry construction. The out-building was probably of wattle-and-daub, like Hendrick Boom's house, which had also been burned to the ground. Although better built than the freeburghers' houses, it is unlikely that Van Riebeeck's house was anything more than a cottage for the overseer, although Cook describes it as "Van Riebeeck's short-lived dwelling" [5]. However, there is no indication in the Journal that Van Riebeeck spent even so much as a night there, in contrast to the lengthy and frequent use by the Van der Stels of their residences at Constantia and Vergelegen.

Zacharias Wagenaer was also granted land in Table Valley, which he sold together with its house and sheep shed to his successor Cornelis van Quaelbergh in 1666 [6]. The third instance concerned the Acting Governor Hendrik Crudop, who was also granted land in Table Valley in 1679. Here, however, there is no mention of any buildings [7]. The impression is given that the farming activities of these officials were not seen as a threat to the livelihood of the freeburghers, with the possible exception of those of Van Riebeeck at Boscheuvel. Moreover, the houses on their lands appear to have been of no architectural significance, as they are not mentioned by contemporary travellers. They were probably erected only for the use of their farm managers, in contrast to the

pretentious residences of the Van der Stels at Constantia and Vergelegen.

The grant of land at Constantia was first requested by Simon van der Stel in 1684, and the Visiting Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens agreed to recommend its approval. Confirmation of a grant of 891 morgen was received the following year from Visiting Commissioner van Rheede, on the 13th July 1685 [8].

Simon van der Stel's farm at Constantia was not mentioned at all in the Resolutions. This is not surprising given the scale of the enterprise, since Simon was probably as guilty as his son Wilhem Adriaen in the misappropriation of Company's resources [9]. However it does appear on a map of the Peninsula dating from c1691 [Fig 114], which shows the extent of the lands but provides no information on the farm buildings. It is therefore necessary to rely on the accounts of travellers for a description of the homestead.

Kolbe mentions that the house was double-storeyed [10], and that "several Stables" had also been built, as well as a "Fish-House near the Chalk-Bay" [11]. The latter was probably at the present Muizenberg [12], whereas Wilhem Adriaen's "Vishoek" was across False Bay at the present Hangklip.

According to Valentyn the lands at Constantia were granted to Simon van der Stel on the 13th July 1685 by Commissioner van Rheede, and "laid out" from 1692 [13]. This statement has led many writers to believe that work on the construction of the residence was commenced only in 1692 [14]. Boeseken, however, brought attention to an interest-free loan of f10 000 made to Simon van der Stel by his son Wilhem Adriaen [15]. This was made in 1684, and Boeseken suggests that it was used for the erection of the homestead at Constantia [16], which would have been commenced in 1685, immediately after the land had been provisionally granted by Van Rheede [17]. Fransen points out, moreover, that it is unlikely that Van der Stel would have waited seven years before commencing building operations [18].

Valentyn visited Constantia on at least two occasions. The first was for Simon van der Stel's 66th birthday on the 14th October 1705 [19]. The second was on the 10th March 1714, after the death of the elder Van der Stel (on the 24th June 1712), when he was taken there in a coach drawn by six horses [20]. On the latter occasion he spent the

night at Constantia, and described a musical evening conducted in the three "galeryen" of the house, where a male and a female voice responded to each other in the dark from different "galeryen" [21]. These three "galeryen" constituted the ambulatory which surrounded the courtyard of the U-shaped building.

According to Valentyn, the house was approached from a forecourt planted with seven or eight avenues of oak trees extending for a distance of 200 paces. It was an "exceedingly handsome" dwelling of two storeys, reached by two or three steps ("2 of 3 trappen") [22]. Inside was a large entrance hall ("voorzaal"), the floor of which was paved with white marble and red stone, with a pentagon in the centre "representing the castle at the Cape". On either side of this hall, which Valentyn estimated at 30 feet square, was an inner hall 25 or 26 feet square, also paved in marble.

Beyond the entrance hall was a large and "airy" ambulatory ("lugte galdery"), four or five paces wide and 80 feet long, which corresponded in length with the facade of the house. This ambulatory (or gallery) was one storey high and open to the courtyard, which it surrounded on three sides, the lateral wings being half the length of the one in the centre. A number of doors opened off the ambulatory, the last two of which were false. The real ones led to a series of well-furnished rooms comprising a total of eighteen, taking the lower and upper floors into account.

Behind the ambulatory, on the axis of the entrance hall, there was a landing ("bordes") leading to a broad staircase of 13 or 14 steps, enclosed within a rectangular wall. Beneath this was a brick gateway which gave access to the rear court ("agterplein"), which was planted with avenues of oaks and other trees. To the left of this was the gardener's or manager's house, and a very large pressing house further to the left [23].

Heydt, writing in 1741, when the centre gable of the house had already been removed (as seen in his engraving), described Constantia as comprising a "Pleasure-House" for the Governor, a "lodging for the Superintendent", and "stables for the cattle", with a "fourfold avenue" extending towards the town [24].

Mentzel, writing after his departure from the Cape in 1741, mentions two farmhouses at Constantia, which had been divided into two properties after 1712, namely Groot and Klein Constantia (the latter subsequently named Hoop op Constantia). He describes the

later of these as being "in better architectural taste" than Simon van der Stel's house [25], which by this time had probably fallen into disrepair.

This is the second occasion on which Mentzel denigrated the earlier buildings of the Company and its officials, and reminds one of his cursory dismissal of Rustenburg as being a "modest" house, despite the complimentary descriptions provided by Kolbe and Valentyn (see Chapter 8.3.1b). Mentzel's opinion is contrary to the evidence on which this thesis is based, and therefore requires explanation. Given that the centre gable at Constantia had already been taken down by 1741, the date of Heydt's engraving and of Mentzel's departure from the Cape, it is possible that the house at "Klein Constantia" had been built with such a feature, following the precedent of its predecessor. This could well have been the reason for Mentzel's criticism of the earlier house.

Another possibility is that Mentzel, writing in the 1780s long after his departure from the Cape, was influenced by the reports of subsequent travellers. By that time the farmhouse with a single centre gable had become the norm, whereas the original Constantia was now devoid of this feature. Moreover, as will be seen, its proportions were significantly different from the houses of the late 18th century, and probably appeared outdated in comparison.

Constantia is shown in detail in E V Stade's view dating from 1710 [Figs 137 & 139]. The buildings depicted are the homestead, an outbuilding and two cottages, together with two other buildings further towards False Bay. The most important of these is the homestead, which is the earliest known example of a private residence on a large scale. Unfortunately the lower part of the facade is obscured by trees, but the upper part is clearly represented.

As seen in Stade's three-quarter view, the house appears to be based on the Dutch Renaissance freestanding house, as exemplified by Jacob van Campen's Mauritshuis in 's-Gravenhage, built from 1633 to 1644 [Figs 141-142]. This has a compact, square plan, with double-storeyed pilastered facades on all four sides and hipped roofs draining inwards as well as outwards. Finials articulate the four corners of the ridges, and the four chimneys are set back from these along the side ridges. The front and rear facades are elaborated with central pediments, while the sides each have two symmetrically

positioned dormer windows [26].

Constantia also had a hipped roof with chimneys now at the four corners, and had a central visual focus in the form of a gable, but flanked by dwarf-gables. A dormer window, moreover, can be seen facing False Bay, although it is not repeated on the other side. The visible fenestration suggests regularity and symmetry, but the articulation of the entrance cannot be seen as the door is obscured by vegetation. The house also appears to have been double-storeyed, judging by the cornice line shown beneath the windows, thus corresponding with the descriptions of contemporary visitors [27].

Simon van der Stel's house, however, was not a direct copy of the Mauritshuis, but the closest approximation to the Renaissance ideal that could be achieved within the constraints of the technology and craftsmanship available at the Cape in the 17th century. The plan is U-shaped rather than square, as the complexities of draining a roof of the Dutch configuration were beyond the capabilities of the local craftsmen. Nevertheless, the U-shaped plan gave the illusion of a Renaissance building more effectively than any of the other plan forms employed in the later Cape Dutch period.

The pediment is replaced by a centre gable raised above the eaves line, with concave sides and a decorative apex. This is flanked by smaller triangular dwarf-gables or pediments [28], which articulate the facade and give visual support to the main gable [29]. All three gables are in the plane of the facade, but all are separated from the lower parts by a cornice corresponding with the eaves line. This cornice, together with that dividing the building into two storeys, creates a horizontal emphasis in the facade, in contrast to the vertical emphasis more prevalent in Holland.

Heydt's engraving of 1741 [Figs 138 & 140] agrees in general outline with Stade's drawing, apart from the differences concerning the out-buildings which will be discussed later. However, there are also six discrepancies regarding the homestead. In comparison with Stade's drawing, Heydt shows four windows instead of two along the right-hand wing (and there were probably more, obscured by the trees); a taller roof; side wings of unequal length; an absence of chimneys at the apexes of the hips (the only chimney shown being on the back of the facade roof); the absence of a central gable;

and the depiction of the visible dwarf-gable as a pedimented dormer.

The difference in the windows is explained by the obliqueness of the side wall in Stade's drawing, allowing room for only two to be depicted. Both, however, agree in showing a window roughly corresponding with the right-hand dwarf-gable or pedimented dormer, and a further two along the facade before the corner is reached. Heydt also clearly depicts these as single casements, as noticed by Kendall, the architect who restored the house in 1926.

The greater height of the roof in the engraving corresponds more closely with Valentyn's description than the lower roof shown by Stade, but Heydt's unequal rear wings are unlikely. Valentyn's account of the courtyard suggests a symmetrical structure, and this appears to be confirmed by Kendall's findings on site [30].

The absence of a centre gable and of the chimneys at the ends of the ridge lines is almost certainly due to the state of disrepair into which the homestead had already fallen by 1741, as referred to above in connection with Mentzel's description.

The difference most commented upon is that Heydt depicts Stade's triangular dwarf-gables (which Stade shows flush with the wall like the centre gable) as pedimented dormer windows with vertical sides, set back slightly from the eaves line. Stade, however, does show a dormer similar to Heydt's, but considerably taller, on the left-hand wing. The care with which he depicts this element (which was probably a loading bay for the loft given its greater height) suggests that the dwarf-gables in front are also shown accurately. These served the different purpose of lighting the loft and contributing to the overall aesthetic of the facade.

It should also be noted that Stade's drawing was not subsequently engraved. Given that engraving facilities were not available at the Cape, Heydt's dormer could have been an error introduced during the engraving process, many months after his visit. On the other hand, it could have been an accurate depiction of later dormers which replaced the dwarf-gables, if these were removed at the same time as the main gable.

Fransen states that Stade's drawing "makes the less accurate impression" in comparison with Heydt's [31]. This is true as far as the location of the buildings is concerned, as

Stade did tend to "adjust" the positions of buildings in order to display their exterior form more clearly. This has already been seen in his two views of the town, and will be noted again in his depiction of the Stellenbosch church. However, the consistency with which this graphic convention was applied suggests that there was little inaccurate in the representation of the facades themselves, which Stade went to such efforts to reveal. Heydt's impression of accuracy, on the other hand, is largely due to the more geometric technique of the engraving process employed, resulting in apparently but not necessarily greater precision.

It is therefore likely that Stade's drawing was accurate in all respects apart from the proportions of the height to width of the roof, and the number of windows on the side facade. Heydt's engraving is probably accurate in these respects, and is explicit in terms of the type of windows used, but inaccurate in the length of the left wing and possibly in the form of the pedimented dormer.

Having presented the extant documentary evidence of the original Constantia, it is necessary to analyse the correspondence between the written and visual sources. This is remarkably consistent, although their correspondence was ignored in the two graphic reconstructions of the "original" homestead produced by Kendall and Fransen. These relied heavily on the "archaeological" evidence of the restoration of the existing house carried out by Kendall in 1926, and assumed contemporary sources to be incorrect when contradictions arose [32].

The "archaeological" evidence discovered by the architect Kendall, when rebuilding the present Constantia erected by Hendrick Cloete after it had burned down in 1925, was of great importance. It revealed for the first time that the existing house was a later structure than the building erected by Simon van der Stel, and that Heydt's engraving was more accurate than had previously been supposed. The evidence of Stade's view, which largely corroborated Heydt, was not yet available, as the drawing was only re-discovered in the 1950s. Kendall's argument in favour of an earlier building is very convincing, apart from a few anomalies which he could not explain, and which will be dealt with later.

The positions and materials of the walls are the most conclusive evidence for his

argument [Figs 143-146]. The facade of the present building has clinkers up to the sill height of the sash windows, and these bricks also extend upwards on either end, at an angle of about 45 degrees, to the head height of the windows. The clinkers continue at this height as far as the back wall of the inner hall on the right-hand side, before dropping down to cellar height. They are continued at this level as far as what Kendall assumed was the end of the earlier building [33].

Although he is not explicit about the left-hand side, and does not show it in elevation, the clinkers probably continued at full height to the end of this wing, as he mentions that there was an extension to the kitchen in a different type of brick. A similar difference in materials was also discovered in the cellars below, which were extended the same distance back from the original end of the house. The bricks beyond this line were "hard blue bricks" which were "larger and more modern" than the clinkers [34].

Similar bricks were used for the upper parts of the facade and for the rear wall of the right-hand wing. Kendall's elevation also suggests that they were used for the side walls of this wing beyond the line of the inner hall, although he does not mention this in his text, and shows them as clinkers on plan. This difference in materials led Kendall to assume (probably correctly) that the blue bricks were of a later date than the clinkers. Moreover, the centre gable was built of an "indiscriminate mixture" of blue bricks and clinkers, proving that it was not part of the earlier structure [35].

The facade wall, therefore, was cut down to sill level in order to introduce the new sash windows, but angled up at the corners to ensure stability during the alterations. The kitchen wing was also extended by ten feet in order to compensate for the "loss" of an equal distance in the wing on the other side.

Kendall shows the cellar of the right-hand wing in elevation as continuing for three bays beyond the present gable width. Two of these bays still contain casements, but the opening in the third is bricked up, and the wall now defines part of the fowl-run. This suggests that the cellar in the right-hand wing was cut back from the end wall by ten feet. However, Kendall does not explain why the bricks above the remaining two bays are blue bricks and not clinkers, given that the "later" rear wall of the inner hall was built entirely of clinkers [36].

The clinker construction of the rear wall, which showed no signs of having been built before the installation of the sash windows, was a matter of concern to Kendall. He had already discovered independent evidence that this wall was of later construction, and yet it was built of materials corresponding with the older part of the house. His speculation was confirmed when it was discovered that the rear wall was chased into the two on either side, proving that it was of later date [37]. However, Kendall was unable to explain why it was built entirely of clinkers.

The independent evidence referred to above, suggesting that the present back wall was of later construction, was the discovery of the remains of another wall beneath the paving of the inner hall, set in some eight feet from its outer edge. This rested on the vaults of the cellars beneath, and had a weathered appearance suggesting that it had been an external wall. Moreover, Kendall also found a "concrete platform" inside the present rear entrance, bearing the impression of tiles since removed. He assumed, therefore, that this was the landing of an earlier staircase leading down to the courtyard [38].

Based on this evidence, Kendall concluded that the earlier house had wings of equal depth, linked by a flat-roofed or lean-to passage [Fig 146]. This would have corresponded with the continuous ridge height clearly shown in Heydt's engraving [39], which was later to be confirmed by Stade's earlier drawing.

Heydt also depicted the house with casement windows extending all the way along the side wing, and Kendall discovered two bricked-up openings under relieving arches at both ends of the front wing. He believed, probably correctly, that these were closed up when the sash windows were installed, to avoid a conflict of window proportions in the end rooms [40].

Kendall's last piece of evidence for the original depth of the front wing derives from the angled tunnel (the so-called "secret passage") which leads from beneath the front of the house to a room in the cellars. The cellar at the end of this tunnel (the purpose of which he does not explain) would have terminated ten feet beyond the house within the courtyard, in his reconstruction of the earlier building, unless the cellar had been built as part of the later additions. This is unlikely, however, as will be seen below [41].

The evidence of this tunnel, moreover, is the first of five anomalies in Kendall's assumption that the earlier building was in fact the Constantia of Simon van der Stel.

The second is that the cellars beneath the earlier back wall continue towards the courtyard without interruption as far as the line of the present back wall. Had they been extended when the rear half of the inner hall was built, there would have been a continuous line of openings along the line of the old wall [42].

The third is that the cross-walls in the front wing do not correspond with the vaults of the cellars beneath, thus requiring large relieving arches to lessen the eccentric loading on these vaults, as noted by Kendall [43]. The vaults along the front of the building, moreover (with the exception of the one in the left-hand corner), are of much heavier construction that those in the side wings, suggesting that the former were built earlier.

The fourth and fifth anomalies are the positions of the old walls in the courtyard. Kendall explains the L-shaped foundation on the right-hand side as the position of an "unsightly excrescence" which was built in the 1850s, according to the Cloete family. This structure was removed during restoration, but its location is of significance with regard to the original Constantia, as will be seen later. The other is the straight wall to the left of the courtyard staircase, set in some nine feet from the kitchen wing, for which Kendall gives no explanation [44].

Kendall also disregards one vital piece of evidence which he quotes in his text, namely that Hendrick Cloete's son stated that the "buildings were all destroyed" and that "his father gave the place a new design" [45]. Fransen mentions these quotations as well, and reveals that they were statements made by Pieter Lourens Cloete at a Commission of Enquiry in 1827, but misses their potential significance [46].

Fransen also mentions a request from Hendrick Cloete discussed by the Council of Policy on the 27th November 1789, which made reference to an earlier request of the 11th March 1784 [47]. The request was for a reduction in his Government levy, on account of the expenditure which had been incurred by his improvements to the "ruinous homestead" and the "depleted vineyards" ("tot Melioratie van de verwoeste en bouwvallige Hofsteede Constantia, en desselve bijna uitgeputte wijngaard"). A new wine-cellar was also required, together with other necessary buildings ("tot opbouw zoo

van een nieuwe kelder, als van andere gebouwen, dien hy ten uiterste nodig heeft") [48].

Fransen is correct in describing this as a "somewhat vague passage", as it is not clear whether the wine-cellar and other out-buildings were included in the earlier request. It is more likely that they were first mentioned in the 1789 request, as the wine-cellar was only completed in 1791. There is, however, no ambiguity about the house having already been improved by 1784, a point acknowledged by Fransen in his statement that "at least some of the alterations (sic) to the homestead had been completed by 1784" [49]. The significance of this statement will be revealed later.

Kendall was unaware of Stade's drawing and of Valentyn's detailed and dimensioned description of Constantia. Both of these, and particularly the verbal account, disagree with the physical evidence which he discovered. Were it not for the documentary sources of which Kendall had no knowledge, his reconstruction would have been largely plausible.

Fransen, however, did have access to the evidence of Valentyn and Stade, and attempted to reconcile this with Kendall's findings. He identified four discrepancies between Valentyn's description and the earlier building revealed by Kendall. These concerned "the second storey, the steps in front, the marble floors and the gallery round three sides of the back courtyard" [50].

Fransen also states that Valentyn's dimensions were exaggerated, based on an analysis of the present entrance hall. This is 19 feet by 21 feet, whereas Valentyn described it as 30 feet square, thus suggesting that Valentyn's feet were only 20cm long [51]. However, this "module" is not consistent throughout the building, as is seen particularly in the width of the facade. This is described as 80 feet by Valentyn, whereas the present building is about 100 feet long. Moreover, if Fransen's 20cm module were applied to this distance, it would be reduced to a mere 53 feet, only slightly more than half the present length.

As far as the Stade drawing is concerned, Fransen states that it showed twelve windows on the facade, corresponding roughly with those in Heydt's engraving. He believes that this number is incorrect, and that there were ten windows in total, assuming "that for

every large sash window there is now, there were once two smaller windows" [52]. However, Stade's drawing does not have twelve windows on the upper level of the facade, but only ten, as the others are obscured by the trees in the foreground. The left-hand side has four windows, one of which is directly under the dwarf-gable, while six are shown on the right-hand side, the one closest to the centre being partially obscured. The remainder form a group of five windows, the central one of which is slightly dislocated from the centre of the dwarf-gable above.

It has been assumed, in the reconstruction which follows, that there were five windows on either side of the main gable (as on the right-hand side) and that the central one of each of these groups correlated with the centre-line of the dwarf-gable (as on the left-hand side). This would have left room for three more windows under the main gable, permitting the central one to be placed directly above the entrance door. It is suggested here, therefore, that there were thirteen windows along the upper facade. This provides a correlation between the evidence of Stade and Valentyn, as there would have been four windows in and above each of the 25-foot rooms, and five in the upper 30-foot central hall, with two on either side of the door to the entrance hall beneath. This correspondence between two independent sources confirms the validity of both.

To return to the four discrepancies identified by Fransen with regard to Valentyn's description, the marble floors and the gallery could have been removed during the gradual dilapidation of the building between 1712 and 1778. However, Fransen has included the gallery in his conjectural reconstructions of 1715 [Fig 147] and 1741 [Fig 148], although he shows it as an enclosed passage instead of open to the court as described by Valentyn.

The difference between Valentyn's two or three steps versus the one step leading to the stoep of the present house hardly seems worthy of mention, as minor level changes would have occurred over time, but Fransen believes that Valentyn was referring to three flights of steps [53]. Fransen acknowledges that Stade's drawing could have been showing an upper storey, since removed. However, he also notes that the back of the house, "especially on the kitchen side", is "still clearly double-storeyed" [54]. This led him to conclude that the present cellar level was the original ground floor, although he questions whether the cellars were "used as rooms, as Valentyn suggests" [55].

He proposes further that the original ground level in front of the house was "possibly as much as 3,50 m" lower than at present, necessitating the three flights of steps referred to above [56] [Fig 148]. He also suggests that it was Cloete who "raised the ground level in front to that of the main floor, with a steep dip towards the back, turning the original ground-floor into a basement" [57]. This is an extremely improbable suggestion, as the contours fall from the right to the left of the house and from the front to the rear. This required the ground on the right-hand side to be cut away in reality, hence the absence of cellars at this corner. Fransen's misconception about the levels could be explained by his apparent unwillingness to accept the accuracy of Valentyn's description, confirmed by Kolbe, that the house was truly double-storeyed, with "elegantly furnished rooms" on both levels.

Kendall's inaccurate depiction of the ground line also confuses the issue. He shows this in the front elevation as sloping downwards from the centre to the right-hand edge of the facade, thereby revealing the entrance to the "secret passage", instead of keeping it level across the house before sloping upwards towards the swimming bath. In the side elevation he assumed that the original ground line followed that of the floor of the "secret passage" [Figs 144-146], but this was below ground level, as will be described later.

Fransen also suggests that the exterior of the house could have been of face-brick, following Sparrman's 1772 description of it as "the old or red Constantia". He justifies this by stating that Van der Stel would not have hidden his walls of imported clinkers "under the cheap plaster that was used here to coat inferior building materials" [58]. This is unlikely, however, as the only references to the colour of the Dutch clinkers described in the Company's inventories of damaged materials are to their being yellow (see Chapter 11.5.1). Red bricks, in contrast, are not mentioned at all.

Moreover, building materials at this time were chosen for practical rather than aesthetic purposes, and buildings in Holland such as the Mauritshuis, which predated Constantia by forty years, were already partially stuccoed. The clinkers at Constantia were more probably used for their strength to support a double-storeyed building with rooms of particularly wide span, than for their appearance. In addition, the building could well have been plastered with imported stucco, which would have been difficult for

subsequent owners to maintain, thus contributing to the gradual dilapidation of the building. Lastly, neither Kolbe nor Valentyn comment on its colour, which they would have done had it been different from the "cierlyk gewit" which they used to describe the buildings in Cape Town, "in accordance with Cape practice". Had Constantia differed from this practice, they would surely have mentioned it [59].

Having discussed the "archaeological" evidence, and the attempts to reconcile it with contemporary documentary material, it is necessary to suggest a reason for all the discrepancies described above. It is therefore proposed here that the earlier building identified by Kendall was not the original Constantia of Simon van der Stel at all. It was instead a second building, erected by Hendrick Cloete when he first assumed ownership, and completed at some time between 1778 and 1784. The present building was the result of enlargements and improvements to Cloete's earlier house, and probably dated from 1792, after the completion of the wine-cellar the previous year. The present building is therefore the third Constantia.

The second Constantia did bear a relationship to Simon van der Stel's building, but only with regard to the cellars of the front wing and the re-use of existing foundations. It is likely, therefore, that the old building was razed down to cellar level along the front wing and demolished entirely on the side wings [60], and that the clinker bricks of its double-storeyed walls were salvaged for the new structure.

This possibility is not as improbable as it might seem [61]. The condition of the building described in Cloete's requests of 1784 and 1789, and in his son's report of 1827, clearly indicates a seriously dilapidated structure. Although the second Constantia falls well beyond the period of this thesis, it is necessary to attempt a reconstruction of its configuration, in order to reveal its relationship with the original homestead.

The accompanying plan [Fig 149], shown in relation to its successor, the third and present Constantia [Fig 150], describes an asymmetrical U-shaped plan set within a rectangular enclosure. The asymmetrical form is derived from Kendall's plan, which shows the courtyard wall behind the right-hand wing as built of similar materials, but of a narrower width. It is unlikely, therefore, that Cloete's first building or, for that matter the first Constantia, was reduced in length on this side [62]. The asymmetry of the

wings was repeated in the third Constantia, but emphasized by the ten-foot extension to the kitchen wing. This could have been because of poor sub-soil conditions behind the end of the right-hand wing, which would have prevented it from being of equal length.

Returning to the second building, the windows of the facade and the passage wall facing the courtyard are depicted as double casements. Those on the passage wall are shown in positions which correspond closely with those of the present sash windows. Those on the facade, however, are placed centrally within each room, thus differing from the positions of the sashes and explaining the removal of the wall down to sill level during the alterations. The windows flanking the door are shown as single casements, and this type is also used for the side walls, as under the side gables of the present building.

It is worth noting that when these double casements were replaced by sash windows in the third house, they were probably salvaged and used elsewhere in the building. The appearance of a double casement in the rearward room of the right-hand wing, rather than two single casements, is of interest in this regard. This supports the argument that the blue bricks of this wing date from the time that these windows were re-used, and raises the possibility that the double casements on the courtyard side of the kitchen wing were also installed when the sash windows were introduced. These walls have therefore been shown with single casements. In addition, the door and staircase on the outer side of the kitchen wing have been aligned with the central window, on the assumption that the present kitchen stair and the dormer above date from the alterations of c1792.

The rooms are all depicted as square in plan, with the exception of the passage, of the right-hand room at the back which is slightly deeper than square, and of the kitchen which has proportions of 2:3. The front rooms are all interconnected by a central axis, as in the present arrangement, and those on either side of the "voorhuis" are also entered from the passage [63]. The two rooms behind have doors against their inner walls, similar to the present house and to many other examples of the period.

The passage has been shown as being reached from the "voorhuis" through a screen of similar dimensions to the present one, and on the other side as leading into the courtyard through a doorway. However, the cellars beneath continued into the courtyard for an almost equidistant depth, a point made already with regard to

Kendall's evidence. The continuation of these cellars, however, was omitted in Kendall's and Fransen's reconstructions, without explanation.

Outside the doorway was the "concrete platform" or landing above the staircase leading down into the courtyard. Kendall gives no indication of its width, but it is possible that it formed part of a continuous paved terrace or stoep, extending as far as the rear wings on either side. The projecting vaults would have needed to be protected from the elements, and it is possible that the centre part was left intact in order to facilitate building operations, but that the paving on either side was removed during the alterations, and perhaps re-used elsewhere.

Finally, the roof has been depicted as a U-shape with wings of equal span, and a flat roof over the passage. This follows contemporary practice, as do the end gables and the centre gable in front.

Having described the possible form of Cloete's earlier building, it is necessary now to attempt a reconstruction of the original Constantia of Simon van der Stel, and to see where it correlates with Cloete's building. This reconstruction was made entirely on the basis of the verbal evidence of Valentyn and the drawings of Stade and Heydt, with reference to buildings in Holland such as the Mauritshuis in 's-Gravenhage and the Trippenhuis in Amsterdam. Positions of internal doors, staircases and fireplaces were derived from contemporary Dutch practice, and not anachronistically from later 18th century houses at the Cape. Only after the reconstruction had been established was it compared with Kendall's ground plan and Fransen's cellar plan. This showed a very close correspondence with some of the present walls and the old foundations: the only alteration required was to move the courtyard wall back by thirteen feet, as will be described later.

The reconstructed plan [Fig 151] has a 30 by 30 foot entrance hall reached by three steps, flanked by two inner halls each 25 by 25 feet, as described by Valentyn [64]. These give an overall length of 80 feet, corresponding with Valentyn's figure for the length of the facade.

Behind the entrance hall is the "airy gallery" opening on to the court. This has been given a depth of ten feet, corresponding closely with Valentyn's five paces which would

have produced about nine feet [65], but the backward wings have been halved in width [66]. The main gallery is 40 feet wide from end to end, and the lateral wings extend backwards by 20 feet. They are thus half as long, and the total length of all three galleries is 80 feet, equal to the length of the facade and corresponding again with Valentyn's account.

The galleries have been interpreted as arcades resting on piers, as in the later hospital commissioned by Simon van der Stel. These would have provided a sounder support for the upper floor than a post and lintol construction [67]. Valentyn also mentioned that the last two doors in the gallery were false. These have been positioned at the ends of each lateral gallery, which would have been closed off to screen them from the service yards below. These false doors therefore correspond with the doors to the lobbies at the other ends of these galleries.

Four other rooms are shown on the ground floor, two on each side. Those behind the smaller halls of the front wing are 20 feet wide by 15 feet deep, and contain the staircases leading to the upper floor. These have been shown as steep single flights of stairs, taking up the 5-foot discrepancy between the depth of the central hall and the flanking halls on either side. They were almost certainly unpretentious, given that Valentyn ignores them but does mention the steps leading down into the courtyard [68].

The two back rooms are both 20 feet square, and each contains a fireplace, as do the flanking rooms in the front wing. These correspond in number with the four chimneys shown by Stade at the apexes of the hipped roof, which would have been cranked along the upper floor walls to reach these positions.

Apart from the gallery and the small square lobbies opening off it, the ground floor comprised seven rooms which diminished in size progressively. The entrance hall was 30 feet square, the lateral halls 25 feet square, the rear rooms 20 feet square, and the stair halls 20 feet by 15 feet (giving a ratio of 4:3). This reveals a modular proportioning system of a sophistication not encountered in Cloete's Constantia or in the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century, where the depth of the rooms was seldom varied.

The upper floor in this reconstruction [Fig 152] is similar to the ground floor in the

provision of a central hall of equal dimensions to the one below. This space could have been used as an upper reception hall when the downstairs hall was used for banqueting. Valentyn described a musical evening at Constantia, and this could also have been a venue for such occasions [69].

Apart from the central hall, the upper floor differs from the one below. The smaller halls have been subdivided, creating four rooms on either side, two facing forwards and two facing backwards. The main wing of the gallery has become an open terrace reached from the central hall and linking the two wings. The lateral galleries have been omitted on the upper level, in accordance with Valentyn's description that they were single-storeyed. This allows the stair halls to be five feet longer than those on the ground floor.

There are thus ten rooms on the upper floor, apart from the upper hall which is 30 feet square. These are the two stair halls with dimensions of 25 by 15 feet (5:3), the four front rooms 25 by 12½ feet (2:1), and the four back rooms 20 by 12½ feet (8:5). On the upper floor, therefore, the proportional relationships are established by subdivision rather than by subtraction as seen on the ground floor.

Taking the stair halls into account, the reconstructed plan shows seven rooms on the ground floor and eleven above. These give a total of eighteen "well-furnished rooms", corresponding again with Valentyn's description. It will be noted that the plan makes no provision for a kitchen. This is intentional, as it is known that the Company's guest house had an outside kitchen, and it is likely that this was also the case at the Stellenbosch drostdy and, perhaps, at Rustenburg and Nieuwland as well. The kitchen at Constantia would therefore have been located either in the cellars or, more probably, in a separate structure outside the main house.

The roof of the house presents more of a problem, as the 25-foot width of the side wings is less than the 30-foot depth of the entrance hall, although the ridge is continuous. This could have been accommodated by using a steeper pitch for the side wings, but this would have resulted in awkwardly angled hips and a centre gable that was disproportionately large.

A less inelegant solution would have been to use a constant pitch for the outer face of

the roof, but to reduce the pitch on the inner face of the front wing in order to span the extra five feet of the upper hall. The geometrical inconsistency of this solution, as shown on the roof plan [Fig 154], would hardly have been noticeable even from the rear of the house. Moreover, it would have avoided the planning problems associated with the other possibilities described below.

Another problem is that a solution involving full-width hips on the back wings does not correspond proportionally with Stade's drawing. This shows the relationship of hip:ridge:hip on the facade as being in the ratio of 1:7:1, whereas full-width hips result in a ratio of 1:4½:1. This could suggest that the hips were only 20 feet wide, with a flat roof or lean-to for the remaining 5 feet, as depicted in Fransen's reconstructions [Figs 147 & 148]. The ratio would then become 1:6:1, introducing the possibility of only a slight error in Stade's drawing. The flat-roofed portions would thus correspond with the back wings of the gallery below, suggesting that they served as passages above. This, however, disagrees with Valentyn's description of the gallery as being only one storey high.

The reduction of the hips to a width of 20 feet, moreover, would have necessitated walls in these positions in order to support the rafters at their junction with the flat roofs. This would have been an even more critical problem in the central hall, with its span of 30 feet. Although the columns of the Cape Town church were also 30 feet apart, the beams between them were only intended to support the timbers of the projected loft or ceiling, and did not carry any eccentric roof loads. It would therefore have been necessary to introduce additional vertical supports within the space of this hall. However, Valentyn makes no reference to internal supports, although he describes them in the church and in the hospital. This suggests that Stade might have underestimated the height of the roof in his drawing, introducing the proportional anomaly. Heydt's engraving shows a much taller roof, but as its furthest corners are both obscured by trees it is not possible to take accurate proportional measurements.

It is therefore likely that the roof plan illustrated is the most probable, despite its structural inelegance. Constantia was an experimental building, erected long before the roof construction characteristic of the Cape Dutch period was developed. Moreover, Simon van der Stel could make use of the Company's master carpenters, who were

quite capable of erecting complex roofing structures, as in the eccentric pitches of the roofs of the Mauritshuis and Trippenhuis in Holland. He also had access to the Company's timber supplies, thereby explaining the 30-foot span of the main hall in comparison with the 18-foot average of the later houses of the freeburghers, who had to make do with local timber.

The precise plan and roof configuration of the first Constantia will never be known unless the original plan is discovered, but the reconstructed "design" outlined above demonstrates that Valentyn's detailed description could have been accurate, and should not be dismissed because of its lack of correspondence with the existing structure.

There is, in fact, a remarkable correspondence between the two, as was discovered when this plan was overlaid on Kendall's ground-floor plan and Fransen's cellar plan [Figs 155 & 156]. Apart from internal subdivisions, Van der Stel's Constantia corresponds very closely with the existing plan except for the fact that its left-hand outer wall formed the foundations for the internal wall of the new kitchen wing. This suggests that Cloete built upon the old foundations, but extended the house on the left-hand side to compensate for the space lost by not building an upper storey. It would also account for the house being sited so close to the steep drop to the left, which would not have been the case in the original building.

Further correspondences in Kendall's plan concern the "unsightly excrescence" built in the 1850s, which matches the extent of the right-hand gallery and was probably built on the old foundations. The unexplained wall between the kitchen wing and the staircase, moreover, corresponds with a continuation of the centre wall of the cellars under the left-hand "inner hall". Its foundations were probably used for a later lean-to addition which had been removed before the fire of 1925, and which extended as far as the inner edge of the kitchen store.

The wall which Kendall believed marked the end of the original house (which was certainly true for the kitchen wing of the second Constantia) was probably built on the foundations of Simon van der Stel's courtyard wall. The reconstructed "design", which had initially assumed that the court was closed by a wall linking the two back wings, was therefore altered to incorporate this wall. This alteration introduced two 13-foot

deep service courts, which would have given access to the cellars, allowing the main court to be kept free of menial activities [70]. It also had the added advantage that the courtyard was now deeper than it was wide, providing more space at the bottom of the staircase.

The correspondence between this plan and the cellars is equally close. It has already been mentioned that those under the lateral wings appear to be later in date, as the walls supporting their vaults are narrower and more regularly spaced than those under the front wing of Van der Stel's Constantia. Although this building would also have had cellars under the right-hand wing, these must have been demolished and rebuilt, as they match the others across the courtyard in the new wing.

It has also been mentioned that the natural contours required the cutting away of the land at the front right-hand corner. This explains the lack of cellars in this position, apart from the very small one on the courtyard side, the purpose of which will be discussed later. This means that there were only four cellars along the front of the original building [Fig 153], as the last one on the left-hand side was added in the second Constantia.

In the present house three of these cellars are symmetrically arranged with regard to the staircase [Fig 147]. These are flanked by another two cellars, one on each side, which are equal in width if markedly unequal in depth. The cellar to the far left, in the new wing, corresponds in width with the remaining solid subsoil to the right. This could suggest that the cellars had originally continued across the entire length of the facade and were filled in later, as stated by Fransen. It is unlikely, however, that Cloete would have dispensed with these cellars, which would have been useful as storage space even if they were devoid of windows.

If the reconstructed plan is superimposed on the cellar plan, it can be seen that the first two original cellars from the left, separated by their extremely thick dividing wall, correspond with the width of Valentyn's 25-foot inner halls. The centre-line of the second of the other two, on the right-hand side, corresponds with the centre-line of the 30-foot entrance hall. The narrower cellar to its left (on axis with the present staircase) supported the left-hand wall of the entrance hall. It was unnecessary to have an

equivalent cellar on the right-hand side, as the contours were now at ground level.

Valentyn's marble floors above were thus supported on two vaults under the 25-foot inner hall, and theoretically on three vaults under the 30-foot entrance hall, the one on the right-hand side having been omitted. The "central" vault beneath the entrance hall was equal in width to those under the inner halls, as a result of the thicker walls under the latter, and the flanking vault in-between, on the present axis of symmetry, was somewhat narrower.

The last anomaly to be discussed here is the "secret passage", the purpose of which Kendall does not explain, although he does expose its mythological nature. This clearly did not extend as far as the courtyard, and the "particularly cold, dark, dank and dreary little apartment" was equally clearly part of Simon van der Stel's original cellars, sunk into the higher level of the site which was otherwise unexcavated [71].

This room was probably a primitive refrigerator, ventilated by the tunnel which terminated in a "square chamber" at the front of the house. This "chamber" was probably a vertical ventilation shaft covered by an iron grille, which would explain why the tunnel emerged below ground level. Kendall's "alteration" of the natural ground level, which appears to have been responsible for Fransen's misconception about the ground floor, was therefore unnecessary and misleading [72].

The reconstruction presented here is doubtless inaccurate in many respects, but it does present an alternative to the reductive or retrospective approach favoured by most authorities with regard to 17th and early 18th century buildings at the Cape.

The proportions of the building, in plan and elevation, might appear disconcerting to those familiar with the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century, as they did to Mentzel who considered it to be of inferior architectural taste. The use of an entrance hall which was wider than the wings on either side is also in conflict with later practice at the Cape. However, the description of Valentyn corresponds with Kolbe's account of the Company's guest house, which had a similar arrangement. Both writers, significantly, had slept in the buildings in question, and therefore had more than a fleeting knowledge of them.

Simon van der Stel's Constantia is of critical importance to the development of domestic architecture at the Cape for two reasons. The first is that it was the earliest building at the Cape to adapt the characteristics of a Dutch aristocratic residence to a new environment, with its concomitant constraints [73]. The precedent that it created was followed in Henning Hüsing's town house and at Vergelegen, both of which had triple-gabled facades. The characteristic single-gabled farmhouses of the later 18th century were simplified versions of these more complex exemplars which the freeburghers were attempting to emulate, and were not evolutionary developments from vernacular cottages.

The second is that Constantia was probably the earliest symmetrically planned U-shaped residential building at the Cape [74]. Although of different proportions, the U-plan became characteristic of the Peninsula, but was less common inland. Attempts have been made to explain this phenomenon as a climatic response [75] and as a result of the precedent established by the U-shaped town house [76]. It is more likely, however, that the plan form of the most prestigious of the early farmhouses on the Peninsula was followed on a smaller scale, as was its facade in a simplified form.

The out-buildings at Constantia are also of interest. Kolbe merely wrote that "several Stables" had been built [77], which Valentyn did not mention. However, Valentyn did state that there was a gardener's or manager's house to the left of the "agterplein" behind the homestead, and a very large pressing-house further to the left [78].

The rear court or "agterplein" was planted with avenues of trees and was probably as wide as the house, extending as far as the present wine-cellar. However, the land falls away steeply to the left of this area, leaving no room for a manager's house, let alone a large pressing-house. It is likely, therefore, that these buildings were further down the stream in the position of those of the present Hoop op Constantia [79] shown on Fransen's site plan [Fig 157]. Here they would have been at a convenient remove from the homestead and its more "polite" activities.

This supposition is confirmed by Stade's drawing [Fig 137], which shows two buildings in a position corresponding roughly with two of those on the present Hoop op Constantia [80]. Although depicted far in the distance (probably excessively far and too

high up the hill-side) [81], and therefore shown only in general outline, they appear to be two rectangular buildings with gabled ends, possibly aligned with each other.

The use of end gables on these minor buildings in comparison with the hips on the homestead is worthy of note. It is a phenomenon that has already been observed in Cape Town in 1710, where hipped roofs were now reserved only for the largest and most pretentious of houses. This was probably because the plans of the latter were too deep or complex to be gable-ended, whereas smaller buildings had no such constraints. On the other hand, the gable-ended type is in the distinct minority in Stade's drawings of Stellenbosch and Drakenstein. It is possible, therefore, that the farm manager's house at Constantia created a precedent for the freeburghers to replace the earlier hips with gables, as had become the norm by the mid-18th century. However, this influence had not yet penetrated to the inland districts by 1710.

Stade also shows an out-building in the foreground, to the right of the homestead [Fig 139]. Although depicted too far forward and too far to the right, this building was almost certainly on the site of the present "jonkershuis", as confirmed by Heydt's engraving. Stade's "inaccuracy" with regard to its siting was probably intentional, however, as an accurate location would have obscured the facade of the main house, as is the case with Heydt's depiction [82] [Fig 140].

This building was hipped with a central triangular gable, but the plan appears to have been square or rectangular as the ridge continues around all four sides. Presumably there was a central court to drain the rainwater from the inward-sloping roofs, as was the case in the slave lodge and in the later Company's stables next to the gardens. The visible facade repeats the inconsistencies seen in Jan van Harwaerden's house on the 1660 plan of Cape Town [Fig 56]. Despite the almost central triangular gable and its virtual correspondence with the window below, the facade is anything but symmetrical. A small window followed by a single door are shown to the left of the gable, with a large double door to the right. This double door, together with the informality of the facade, suggests that the building was the coach-house and stable. Its hipped roof, as opposed to the gable ends on the other out-buildings, would have been required by its more complex plan. It could well be that this building suggested the courtyard type for the Company's stables, although the latter are on a much larger scale.

Heydt sites this building more accurately in relation to the homestead, but depicts it as a U-shaped building with a chimney at the end of the closer wing, and with different fenestration on the side facade. It is similar to Stade's depiction only in general proportions and in the use of a hipped roof [Fig 140]. Fransen states that "Stade shows its shape unclearly" and that "Heydt is once again more precise and shows a clear U-shape" [83]. However, Heydt was not depicting the stable but "the lodging for the superintendent of the estate" [84]. This had by now been lost to Hoop op Constantia, following the subdivision of the estate.

The old stable had therefore been converted into a farm manager's house, and its courtyard plan is confirmed by that of the dwelling, which simply removed one side of the court to create a U-shaped plan. The new rectangular stable, to the left of the house and aligned with it, was built to replace the loss of the old one.

The contrast between the formality of the homestead and the almost perverse informality of the stable is accentuated by the symmetrical nature of the two cottages to the right. These appear on Stade's drawing [Fig 139] but are absent from Heydt's engraving, which suggests that they had been demolished by 1741. These cottages were probably the lodgings for the domestic slaves, hence their proximity to the homestead [85]. One of them is partially obscured by the other, suggesting that they were aligned along their sides. Both are small rectangular buildings with pitched roofs and gabled ends. Those on the left-hand side appear to be parapet gables with chimneys at their apexes. The cottage in the foreground, moreover, has a central doorway with almost symmetrically placed windows on either side.

This might well have been a precedent for the "basic three-roomed cell", the only previous example of which was possibly the gardener's house in Van Riebeeck's period, long since demolished. While the facade of the utilitarian stable and coach-house responded to functional requirements, the workers' houses were given a facade that was a simplified and miniaturised version of the Governor's residence.

The fact that Valentyn made no mention of the stable and the two cottages could be because he did not consider them worthy of note. However, it could also be that he was unaware of them, as they were obscured from the approach by the multiple avenues of

trees. These buildings are scattered as depicted by Stade, whereas by Heydt's time the minor structures were beginning to be more formally organized.

The lack of geometrical correspondence between the buildings at Constantia is in marked contrast to the formality of the octagonal arrangement later to be seen at Vergelegen. It is likely, therefore, that the avenues of trees were planted not only to provide an axial approach to the homestead, but also to screen this route from the imbalance between the randomly positioned out-buildings on the right-hand side and the retaining wall to the left [86].

It is ironic that in many of the axially and cross-axially ordered farm layouts of the later 18th century, the architectural relationships are often obscured by the trees planted in front of the buildings [87]. This could well have been a misunderstanding of the purpose of the avenues of trees in front of and behind the homestead of Constantia.

The influence of Van der Stel's estate on later developments, in terms of the U-shaped plan of the homestead, the form of the out-buildings and the axial approach is speculative, and precedent could have been derived from other sources. Nevertheless, it was the most impressive non-military building yet seen at the Cape.

What is clear, however, is that it was significantly different from the present building, and designed in a far more academic manner than even the most elaborate of Cape Dutch houses until the arrival of Thibault in the late 18th century. This was an architecture still derived directly from Holland, predating the emergence of the autochthonous Cape Dutch style.

8.6 THE "POSTHUIJS" AT MUIZENBERG

The Company's "Posthuijs" at Muizenberg restored in the early 1980s is discussed here, separately from the Peninsula defences (Chapter 8.2). This is because it is unlikely either that it was used as a Company's post prior to 1743 or that it dated from as early as 1673. It is more probable that it was the "Fish-House near the Chalk-Bay" of Simon van der Stel, mentioned by Kolbe and erected in c1700 [1].

Boeseken suggests that Simon van der Stel's "vishuis agter de Steenbergen" was at Kalk Bay [2], rather than near to it. This contention is partially supported by a Journal entry describing a survey of False Bay undertaken in June 1683, when Kalk Bay was said to offer good fishing opportunities [3]. However, the conflict of interests between lime-burning and fishing activities suggests that these occurred at two different locations, and that the "Fish-House" of Van der Stel was situated elsewhere. This could not have been at the present Fish Hoek, where the Company's fishing post was located, and from which its name was probably derived.

All the contemporary maps show the Company's post at Fish Hoek, to the south of Kalk Bay [4] [Figs 118, 123 & 124]. In addition, Simon van der Stel's lease of the lands to the south of the Steenbergen expired on his dismissal as Governor in 1699, so Kalk Bay would not have been available to him [5]. A fishing station at Muizenberg, moreover, would not have been visible from Constantia, explaining its description as "agter de Steenbergen".

Robertson, however, believes that this building was a VOC outpost established in 1673 [6], despite the topographical records to the contrary, which are consistent in showing its location at Fish Hoek.

Her dating of 1673 is extremely tenuous, based initially on the Journal entry of the 5th December 1671, describing an expedition to survey the land at Hottentots-Holland and "to look for a suitable roadstead in False Bay, where we might take possession of the ground before any other nation" [7]. The report on False Bay was presented on the 19th, and stated that although a safe roadstead had been discovered, the water on the shore was brackish and the ground was unsuitable for agriculture [8].

A further written report submitted on the 30th December stated that the harbour in question was at IJsselstein Bay. This was separated by a mountain range from another bay to the south, "much more spacious" and more protected from the winds, but with the disadvantage of "a certain blind rock lying right in the middle of the bay" [9]. A site had also been found for "a little watch house" on top of the mountain range, "on which a flag might be hoisted on the arrival of any vessels" [10].

False Bay was not mentioned again until the 31st August 1672, when two

"Commissioners" were sent there and to Hout Bay "to arrange a system of signalling from the high mountains at those places, to notify the approach of strange ships" [11]. They reported on the 1st September that they "had found and examined various spots at those places for signalling purposes", but no immediate action appears to have been taken [12].

Another survey of False Bay was conducted in 1673, but makes no reference to the erection of a building or even to the selection of a site [13]. All that appears to have been erected was a flagstaff, as revealed by Robertson's quotation of the Journal entry of the 6th February, which she cites as evidence for the construction of "De Post Huys". The entry reads as follows:-

"One of the horsemen sent to False Bay to look for the signal station to be selected by the officers of the Goutvinck sent thither a few days ago for the purpose, returns with the information that a station had been selected, and brings the following letter to the governor dated 5 February 1673:-

"...we searched about the same evening for a suitable spot on the downs, near the beach, on which to erect our flag-staff, and bring together some fuel, as well as a place that would be suitable for the letter-carriers..." [14].

This "station" probably consisted of no more than a flagstaff and a designated location for the collection of letters, as suggested by the following Journal entry, which Robertson does not quote:-

"February 9th - Letter received overland via Hottentots Holland, from the officers of the Goudtvinck, dated 7th February, 1673, as follows: 'After the despatch of our first letter, we landed and sent one of our officers and two men well armed to the mountains, stretching towards the South of the Bay, in order to find a suitable spot for a "look out", from which to watch for the return ships towards the East. Returning in the evening they reported that there was no place within ten or twelve hours (? walk) from where they were, suitable for the purpose, as having crossed several mountains, they had found still higher mountains towards the east, which blocked the prospect, so that it would be impossible when occasion required it, to be at hand for the purpose'" [15].

The evidence suggests, therefore, that no Company's post was erected at False Bay during 1673, and Boeseken's reference of June 1683 to the suitability of Kalk Bay as a fishing harbour (see Note 3) makes no mention of any buildings in the vicinity, suggesting that the Company's fishing post at Fish Hoek was built only later [16].

Archaeological excavation of the building at Muizenberg revealed that "three successive layers of clay flooring were found", indicating "that the inside of the building had been exposed to the elements for a period of about 25-30 years" [17]. It also revealed that the building was restored between 1738 and 1743, and was being used as a military post "again" by 1744, following the establishment of the Company's harbour facilities at Simon's Bay in 1743 [18].

Robertson suggests, by subtracting the 30 years of abandonment from the date of 1743, that this was caused by the smallpox epidemic of 1713 [19]. This is improbable, as the epidemic resulted in the deaths of as much as a quarter of the Dutch population. A significantly reduced garrison and burgher militia would surely have increased rather than diminished the requirement for a look-out post in False Bay, had such a structure existed.

Robertson also states that Simon van der Stel "obtained a lease over Steenberg ground extending right to the sea-shore", after he had "retired" as Governor, which would have "included De Post Huys". She points out correctly that he no longer had access to the fish provided by the Company, and suggests that he used the "Posthuijs" for his own fishermen. However, she does not give an explanation for the Company's relinquishing an important military post to a private citizen, apart from the fact that there was no longer an immediate threat of war, casting further doubt on its attribution as a VOC look-out post [20]. Moreover, she points out that the "amount of fish remains suggest that De Post Huys was used by fishermen predominantly and that they possessed a boat", as these remains included snoek, which "can only be caught from a boat" [21].

The instructions issued on the 14th February 1743 by the Visiting Commissioner van Imhoff, concerning the harbour facilities to be established at Simon's Bay, are also instructive in this regard. These included the erection of another hut ("hutje") at Gustaaf Willems Baaij (the present Fish Hoek), where the Company's fishermen had

their lodgings ("bij de plaats alwaar de visschers der E.Comp. nu huijshouden"). This was to be used for the storage of vegetables and other supplies prior to shipment to Simon's Bay, as the overland route was too difficult and dangerous [22].

The Company's buildings at Muizenberg do not appear on contemporary maps until 1787, when they were shown on M1/1075 [Fig 125] as comprising two buildings next to each other with a third and smaller one on the beach, and the square barracks (or stables, as described by Stavorinus [23]) some distance away towards Cape Town. This suggests that Van Imhoff's instructions were reconsidered, and that it was decided to build the additional accommodation at Muizenberg instead. This could well have been because the building already standing there was in better condition than the fishermen's house at Fish Hoek, although other factors could have come into consideration.

If there had been a pre-existing building at Muizenberg and if it was as old as the present "Posthuijs" appears to be, it is necessary to establish by whom it was built, since the evidence points away from a 17th century VOC attribution. It could well be that this was the private "Visch-huis" of Simon van der Stel, built after his dismissal as Governor in 1699, when he no longer had access to the Company's fishing post at Fish Hoek. This could explain the formality of the plan of such a utilitarian building at this time, in comparison with the asymmetry of the recently excavated Company's post at Saldanha Bay [24].

If the "Posthuijs" were Simon van der Stel's private fishing station, the thirty-year hiatus between 1713 and 1743 would be explained not by the smallpox epidemic but by the death of Simon van der Stel himself in 1712. The remains of fish would have dated from prior to his death when the house was used as a fishing station, and the building was probably abandoned when Constantia was subdivided. Having been built so solidly, however, it could have been renovated by the Company in 1743 with little effort except for the re-thatching of the roof.

Having established the probable purpose and date of erection of the so-called "Posthuijs", it is necessary now to describe its form as revealed in the archaeological excavations and in the present restored reality [Figs 159-160].

The plan was originally a symmetrically designed rectangle with a central "voorhuis"

and wider rooms on either side. The extension to the rear, which accounts for its depiction as a T-plan house in the 1790 plan [Fig 158], was apparently a later addition. There was no chimney, but there is evidence that open fires were made on a regular basis at the rear of the "voorhuis", the smoke escaping through the thatched roof [25].

The building also had a full-width stoep, which was "bonded into the main structure, indicating that it was an original part of it". This is the the earliest known example of this feature, which was absent at Constantia and Vergelegen and in Hüsing's house in town. Robertson also notes that it was "unknown in Dutch domestic architecture", but that it was "customary for 17th-century watch-houses", and could have provided the precedent for the "wide stoeps" characteristic of the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century [26].

According to Visser, the walls of the "Posthuijs" were 900mm thick, in comparison with the 750mm walls of "Newlands" and the "Tuynhuys" [27]. This, however, was probably because they were built of locally found stone, plastered on the outside and the inside, rather than of brick.

He also noted that the original window frames had no central mullion, and that there were no internal hinges for casements, but that there were external hinges for shutters, suggesting an early building without glazed windows [28]. These frames were constructed of "a mixture of imported oak and pine and teak" and "indentations on them suggested that catches had once been used to secure frames covered with oiled cloth, the accepted substitute at the period for window glass" [29]. The rooms on either side of the entrance hall were each lit by a single double-width window, while the "voorhuis" itself was lit by a single-width window on either side of the door, similar to the arrangement at Vergelegen.

The roof was hipped and thatched, with exposed iron anchors for the roof beams [30]. These were found to be "round oak saplings, grown (as could be seen from the type of rings) in South Africa". Visser noted "that Jan van Riebeeck had planted oaks for timber some 18 years before De Post Huys was built" [31], and Robertson assumes that it was these timbers that were used for the roofing of the "Posthuijs" [32]. However, these beams do not appear to have been dated, and could therefore have been taken

from eighteen-year-old oaks planted during the Van der Stel period. This is an extremely important point, as they are presented as the firmest evidence for the dating of the so-called "Posthuijs" [33].

Robertson also mentions that the foundations of another building adjoining the "Posthuijs" were revealed during the excavations. These were "bonded into those of De Post Huys but... there was no evidence at all of any structure having been built on the foundations and bonded into De Post Huys walls on that side". She mentions a theory (without reference) stating that "originally, a platform on which a gun or guns could be mounted was erected in 1673", but doubts that this was the case [34]. She suggests that "the building on the 1780s map was a storehouse, possibly erected in 1738-44", without giving any explanation for the pre-existing foundations [35]. Given that these foundation walls were bonded into those of the main house, there are two other possibilities: first, that they were for a yard for fish curing; and second, that they supported the timber walls of a boat shed. However, without access to the archaeological evidence no firm conclusion can be drawn.

The evidence suggests, therefore, that the so-called "Posthuijs" actually was the fishing post built by Simon van der Stel. This is important for two reasons. It would constitute the only surviving building erected by this ex-Governor, apart from his earlier structures in the Castle. Moreover, it would have provided a more likely precedent for future developments than a mere Company's look-out post, given the evident prestige attached to the architectural works of the Van der Stels.

This is the earliest known example of a house with a full-width stoep and, with the possible exceptions of the Stellenbosch drostdy and Vergelegen, the first with a "voorhuis" narrower than the rooms on either side. Moreover, it is the earliest surviving example to have a central doorway flanked by half-width windows, an arrangement seen elsewhere only at Vergelegen. None of these characteristics appear to have been generally adopted elsewhere prior to the earliest extant Cape Dutch farmhouses dating from the 1750s. It is possible, therefore, that this building had an influence greater than might have been expected from its size and function.

Its symmetrical facade is similar to those of the cottages in Stade's view of Constantia,

although these had gabled ends, while the "Posthuijs" had a hipped roof following the precedent of the main house at Constantia. The full-width stoep could even have been built as a surface for the drying of fish. If this is true, it is ironic that one of the most characteristic features of 18th century Cape Dutch "homesteads" should have had such humble and utilitarian origins.

Finally, the "Posthuijs" was not designed as a military look-out post. Its site was too close to the beach to serve the purpose, and it was not an elevated structure like the Peninsula watch-houses. Its form, its date and its use suggest more persuasively that it was Simon van der Stel's "Visch-huijs", later to be converted into a Company's post with the addition of a vegetable store next to it. If this is the case it can no longer be described as "South Africa's oldest existing inhabited building", as it would have been predated by the Castle.

9. THE INLAND DISTRICTS

9.1 GROWTH OF THE INLAND DISTRICTS

For the first twenty years of VOC occupation of the Cape, the settlement did not extend beyond the Peninsula. The Company's outpost at Hottentots-Holland was established only in 1672, and the first freeburghers' lands beyond the Cape Flats were granted as late as 1679, shortly before the arrival of Commander Simon van der Stel. This event, however, marked the beginning of a rapid expansion into the interior. Lands for the freeburghers were granted at Stellenbosch from 1679, at Drakenstein from 1687, in the Wagenmakers Vallei from 1698, and in the Land of Waveren from 1700.

A number of inland expeditions had been undertaken during Van Riebeeck's period in office, but none of them resulted in the establishment of any inland settlements. One of these had involved the erection of an inland trading post for bartering cattle with the Khoi, as was resolved on the 31st March 1657 [1]. An expedition was sent for the purpose on the 19th October 1657, accompanied by the surveyor Pieter Potter. He had instructions to erect a strong kraal or shelter similar to those of the Khoi [2], for protecting the men and animals against wild beasts. He was also to investigate the possibility of erecting a redoubt built of local stone and timber, but nothing came of this project [3].

Hottentots-Holland was first discovered by the freeburghers while on an unofficial trading expedition which returned on the 6th June 1657. This area was given its name because the 500 to 600 Khoi encamped there described it as "their Holland or Fatherland", on account of the fertility of the land and the quality of the pasturage. Hottentots-Holland would soon be used as a VOC cattle post and later as a district for the settlement of freeburghers, as well as being the location of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel's farm Vergelegen. It was not, however, exploited during the Van Riebeeck period [4].

Hottentots-Holland was first inspected by the Company's officials on the 24th October 1668 [5], and a favourable report on its agricultural potential was presented two days later [6]. The Visiting Commissioner Mattheus van den Broeck also suggested on the 25th February 1670 that farming should be undertaken at Hottentots-Holland. More

than 2000 morgen of fertile land were available, which could produce enough grain for the Cape to become self-sufficient. It was therefore proposed that twenty men should be sent to establish an outpost there, with draught oxen and agricultural equipment [7]. This proposal was confirmed on the 4th March 1670, when it was also suggested that the lands should eventually be granted to the freeburghers [8].

Another inspection was made of Hottentots-Holland on the 11th February 1671 [9], and the local yacht was sent on the 23rd March to find a suitable landing place in False Bay from which to transport the agricultural produce back to the Cape [10]. On the 1st December the surveyor Joan Wittebol was instructed to produce a chart of the area [11], and a written report was presented to the Council on the 30th December 1671. Although again very favourable in terms of agriculture, it did mention that hardly any timber was available for the building of farmhouses [12], and that four or five redoubts should be erected at the mountain passes for protection against the Khoi [13].

It was finally decided on the 16th October 1672, following instructions from the Seventeen, that a Company's post would be established at Hottentots-Holland, signalling the first permanent occupation by the VOC of lands beyond the Cape Peninsula [14].

Another proposal was made on the 4th March 1676 that lands at Hottentots-Holland should be granted to the freeburghers [15]. Although it was resolved on the 31st January 1678 to lease the post to two of the freeburghers, thereby saving the Company the expense of the 24 "hirelings" working there [16], the first two land grants recorded in the inland districts were only made on the 5th August 1679. One of these was at the Eerste River, where the free butcher "Hemming Huijsen" and his partner were given grazing and agricultural rights. The other was at the "Tijgerberg", where the freeburghers Pieter Visagie and Jan Mostaert were granted lands for agriculture [17].

These hesitant beginnings of the colonization of the interior were contrasted by the establishment of the Stellenbosch colony in 1679, following the arrival of Simon van der Stel. During his twenty years in control at the Cape, the Company's initial intentions to circumscribe the settlement as closely as possible were irrevocably thwarted.

However, although Commissioner van Rheede was opposed to colonization [18], the Council of Seventeen resolved on the 3rd October 1685 to support the expansion of the colony, despite their previous stance in this regard. Immigration would be increased by sending out French refugees and Dutch orphan girls, and all efforts to expand the colony would be encouraged [19].

Stellenbosch was first discovered during an inspection of Hottentots-Holland undertaken by Simon van der Stel between the 3rd and 8th November 1679. It was described as a valley containing "several thousand morgen" of land suitable for agriculture and pasturage, watered by a river lined with trees suitable for timber and firewood. The name "Stellenbosch" was first applied only to the island in the Eerste River where the Commander had spent the night. This would be used as the site for the future drostdy [20]. Having returned to the Castle, Van der Stel announced at once that land for prospective freeburghers was available in the Eerste River valley. The first farmer had already been settled by December 1679, and he was followed by eight more in 1680 and another fifteen or sixteen in 1682 [21].

The freeburghers at Stellenbosch were already involved in land disputes by the 8th May 1680, necessitating all the farms there to be charted by the land-surveyor Wittebol [22]. As this action did not resolve the issue, four "heemraeden" were appointed on the 31st August 1682 to deal with disputes involving farm boundaries and the position of the public wagon road [23].

Further farmlands were granted at the "Tijgerberg" on the 25th April 1686, owing to the increase in population [24], and the freeburghers' occupation of Drakenstein was first mentioned in the Resolutions on the 25th December 1687 [25]. This expansion was consolidated by the arrival of the Huguenots, who were settled amongst the Dutch farmers at Stellenbosch and Drakenstein, as noted on the 8th November 1688 [26].

By 1691 the freeburghers had already settled beyond the official limits defined by the Company, as stated in an edict dated the 19th October. This threatened them with the confiscation of their lands and the demolition of their buildings if they did not return to their original farms within the confines of the Cape, Stellenbosch and Drakenstein districts [27].

The expansion of the settlement is illustrated in M1/17, a map probably dating from 1691 [28] [Fig 161]. The Company's posts at "Rietvaleij", "Barmenshoek" (Bommelshoek?) and "Vissershoek" appear in the vicinity of the wreck of the Haerlem. Beyond these a road extends northwards along the west coast to the Company's cattle post at "Groene Klooff" (mentioned for the first time here), beyond the limits of the map. Freeburghers' lands had been granted as far north as the Paarl Mountain, as far south as Hottentots-Holland, and as far east as Fransch Hoek.

The farmlands to the north, in the vicinity of Klapmuts and the Paarl, were relatively isolated and randomly located. Those leading towards Stellenbosch (the church and drostdy of which are indicated), were more regularly spaced on either side of the Eerste River, with further Company's grain fields to the north. Beyond Stellenbosch the freeburghers' lands continued on either side of the river until the mountains. These were traversed by a pass, after which the farmlands continued regularly along the road to Fransch Hoek ("France quartier of Drakestein"). An unidentified building is depicted here, which was either the water-mill, which corresponds with the location, or the temporary church, a building more worthy of depiction [29].

The lands at Hottentots-Holland were still owned by the Company and consisted of a long continuous strip of plots along the Tweede River, comprising 1000 morgen. A redoubt and a line of houses are shown diagrammatically across the river. These probably represented the buildings on the Company's lands, although it is unlikely that such a large number of houses had been built by this early date.

Five Khoi encampments are also shown, all of them beyond the limits of the settlement, revealing the extent to which their grazing lands had been encroached upon.

A larger version of this map is M1/1181 [Fig 162], which extends as far north as Saldanha Bay. Here the redoubt at Hottentots-Holland is annotated as a "schans", and one of the line of buildings as "de Kombuijs". This suggests that the "buildings" depicted might have been an intended military encampment, with the mess as the focus.

The expansion of the colony was continued on the 26th October 1698, with the granting of lands to thirty freeburghers at the Wagenmakers Vallei, following an inspection of the inland districts by Simon van der Stel [30]. His successor Wilhem Adriaen van der

Stel extended the boundaries yet further, by granting farms in the Land of Waveren, which he had discovered and named on his first inspection of the colony in 1699 [31]. The first freeburghers were to be escorted there on the 31st July 1700, and followed by their wives and children once they had established themselves [32]. However, as a result of the recalcitrance of the Drakenstein burghers in the provision of wagons, it was not until the 17th October that the first of them set out for their new lands [33].

Despite their previous opposition to the expansion of the Cape settlement, a letter was received from Amsterdam on the 23rd June 1700 expressing the Directors' approval of current developments. Indeed, it stated that "You are recommended to spare no effort, but do what you can for the further advancement and extension of the settlement..." [34].

The enlargement of the colony is shown in M1/1162, a map of the whole settlement dating from the beginning of the 18th century [35] [Fig 163]. Individual structures which appear on this map are the church and drostdy at Stellenbosch, and the church and water-mill at Drakenstein. The latter church is not annotated, but is similar in form to that at Stellenbosch, which is labelled. The surrounding buildings are smaller in scale and were probably farmhouses. Evidently a graphic shorthand was used to distinguish public and private buildings. The water-mill is annotated but not depicted, and corresponds with the position of the church-like building shown in M1/17 [Fig 161]. The church, in fact, was on the western, rather than the eastern side of the village [36].

The most important of the new structures appearing on this map is Vergelegen, Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel's farm at Hottentots-Holland. This is shown with an octagonal outline, suggesting that the main complex of buildings was being shown, and not the farm as a whole.

Apart from individual buildings, the settlement had continued to expand. A greater concentration of farms is seen between the Peninsula and Stellenbosch, and new farms have appeared along the road leading from "Babylons Tooren" to "Riebeeks Casteel" along the Berg River, opening up further agricultural areas to the north. The settlement had also been subdivided into a number of smaller geographical districts. These included the "Moddergat", the "Bottelary" and the "Wagenmakers Valey", in addition

to Stellenbosch, Drakenstein and Hottentots-Holland. At this time, however, the administrative districts comprised only the Cape and Stellenbosch.

Three other maps illustrated by Kolbe (M1/1163, 1158 and 1159) depict the "Colonies" of the Cape, Stellenbosch, and Drakenstein and Waveren individually. The first [Fig 117] has already been described [37], and the second [Fig 164] differs from M1/1163 only in that the drostdy at Stellenbosch is shown graphically and is not merely annotated. The third map, M1/1159 [Fig 165], titled "Caarte Van de beyde Afgelegenste Colonien Drakensteen en Waveren" extends further to the north, including "'t Land van Waveren", and as far east as the "Baay van S. Catharina", beyond "Visch Baay". No farms are indicated in either of these districts, but a hot spring is shown in each. That in the Land of Waveren is in the vicinity of "De 24 Rivieren", while the eastern one is next to "De Swarte Berg". The latter is the site of the land granted in 1710 to Ferdinandus Appel for the erection of a house to accommodate visitors [38].

The water-mill and church at "Drakensteen" are shown again, the latter annotated as well as depicted, suggesting that the first church was not in the vicinity of "De Babiloonsche Tooren", but was some distance to the south-east.

As the settlement expanded, so the Khoi grazing lands were continually encroached upon. The closest were those of the "Obiquas", immediately to the east of the farms along the Berg River. The "Gonnemase Hottentots" were to the north-east of Drakenstein, with the "Koopmans Natie" to the east, between this district and "Visch Baay". Finally the "Caboequas" were found to the north-east of the Land of Waveren, beyond a mountain range.

The Company's lands at Hottentots-Holland are shown again on M1/1182 [Fig 166], a French map of the settlement extending as far north as Saldanha Bay. Here the redoubt at Hottentots-Holland is described as a fort, but the buildings across the river from the continuous strip of farmlands are omitted. Vergelegen, moreover, is depicted further to the south, and the perspective from Willem Adriaen van der Stel's defence is included next to the title of the map, together with a view of Table Bay and of a Khoi encampment. This suggests that the map in question is a composite of earlier drawings

and more recent developments, dating probably from about 1708 [39].

Two further maps, M1/1176 and M1/1177, together constitute an accurate survey of the coast from False Bay to Saldanha Bay. New farms are shown in the vicinity of the "Koebergen", and a Company's post at the "Groene kloofs Bergen" appears for the first time. It is possible, however, that this was not the cattle post "Groenecloof" which was later to become the mission station Mamre in the early 19th century. It is shown closer to the shore and its purpose is described as being to protect the salt collected from the pans in the vicinity. Four freeburghers' farms are also shown along the inland side of "De Groene kloofs Bergen". These are described as having little water in the summer, but as being good grazing lands. Evidently they were used predominantly for pasturage.

Kolbe (1713) mentions that the settlement was divided into four colonies. These were the "Cape", the "Hellenbogish", the "Drakenston" and the "Waverish Colony" [40]. The latter two, however, were still administered from the Stellenbosch drostdy. This information was repeated in greater detail by Valentyn (1714). The first district was the "Town or Village", which had the "Tygerbergen", the "Koeberg", the "Blauwe Berg" and the "Mosselbank" under its jurisdiction. The second was "Stellenbosch", comprising also the "Moddergat", "Hottentots-Holland" and the "Bottelary". The third was "Draakestein", including the "Wagenmaaker's Valey", "Riebeeks Kasteel, the Twenty-four Rivers, the Honig- and the Piquet-Bergen". The fourth was the "Land of Waveren", which had no subdivisions [41].

The expansion of the settlement after 1672, when the first outpost was established across the Cape Flats, created a momentum which was unstoppable. Once the Company had agreed to the granting of lands beyond the Peninsula in 1679, the continued colonization of the interior could not be halted.

9.2 COMPANY'S POSTS AND FREEBURGHERS' FARMS

9.2.1 COMPANY'S BUILDINGS

The first of the Company's inland posts was at Hottentots-Holland, the decision having been made on the 16th October 1672 to take possession of the territory for use as cattle pasturage, and in future as agricultural land for the freeburghers.

Instructions were given for the necessary dwelling house and stables to be erected, and Sergeant Cruythoff left for the purpose on the 18th, with "12 or 14 men" [1]. Word was received on the 10th November that work on the buildings had already been commenced. The kraal would be "128 yards by 50 yards", and the house 56 feet by 20 feet, the timber for both structures having been cut along the banks of the river [2].

Further progress was reported on the 20th November. The kraal had already been erected, and the house was complete apart from the thatching of its roof [3]. This had been done by the 23rd December, and enough timber had also been collected for building a large sheep shed. Nails for the shed were sent the next day [4], and again on the 1st March 1673, together with two hinges, presumably for the door [5]. These buildings had evidently been improperly thatched, as word was received on the 9th June that the men were busy "bringing under substantial roofs the dwelling house, sheep shed, and stables", following heavy rains which had caused the death of a number of sheep [6].

The encampment of a number of Khoi in the vicinity prompted the decision on the 22nd July 1673 to build a fortification to protect the Company's post at Hottentots-Holland. This would consist of a stockade with a breastwork of earth, the erection of which would be supervised by the surveyor Wittebol [7]. Word was received from the surveyor on the 26th July, however, that it was too difficult to bring timber for the stockade from the forest. This would therefore be omitted, and the breastworks would be constructed of sods found in the neighbourhood. He also mentioned that the kraal, where five sheep had recently been killed by a leopard, was open to marauders along the river, but that the sheep shed was "enclosed on all sides and well secured" [8].

The following day it was reported that the breastworks had been marked off and were

under construction. Although the original intention had been to erect a star-shaped redoubt, this was apparently impracticable, and the Council approved the plans for an amended design sent by the surveyor [9]. Instructions were also sent for the kraal to be properly enclosed [10]. A letter was received from the surveyor on the 31st July 1673, stating that the breastworks would be finished within five days, but that work on the kraal would be postponed until the strengthening of the house had been completed. Materials were also required for roofing the kitchen, which appears to have been a separate building [11].

The surveyor Jan Wittebol returned from Hottentots-Holland on the 7th August, and reported in greater detail on the fortification under construction. Although his instructions had been to erect a star-shaped rampart around the Company's house there, the shape of the latter precluded this possibility. The house was twice as long as it was wide, thereby preventing the use of a regular geometric configuration. He had therefore marked out the redoubt as shown on his plan, and estimated that it would be completed in another twenty days [12].

Instructions were given on the 5th September that the kraal was to be properly secured at once, as a number of livestock were soon to be sent over. This was being taken in hand by the 10th, the animals already having arrived [13]. Despite the surveyor's estimate, the breastwork was still only "nearly completed" on the 31st October 1673, when this earthen fortification was mentioned for the last time [14].

Instructions were sent on the 14th January 1674 that the house at Hottentots-Holland was to be provided with "a small compartment" for the storage of corn seed [15], and it was proposed on the 1st September that a granary and a threshing floor should be built. Timber for the purpose was to be cut in the forest nearby, but construction was not to be commenced until the Governor had personally selected a suitable site for the building [16]. The timber had already been cut and thatching reeds were being collected by the 13th October, but there is no further mention of the granary [17].

Further instructions were sent on the 12th December 1674 that a dwelling house of stone was to be built at Hottentots-Holland [18], and orders were given on the 2nd June 1676 for the kraal and sheep shed to be strengthened, following another incursion by

wild animals resulting in the loss of 120 sheep [19].

The land-surveyor Johan Wittebol was sent to Hottentots-Holland again on the 6th July 1676, this time to select a suitable site for a redoubt to be built of stone [20]. He agreed with the superintendent's decision to locate it on an elevated site, overlooking the Company's lands and the sea shore, as noted on the 11th July. However, he pointed out that the foundations would have to be sunk four or five feet deep to protect the structure from collapse during the heavy rains often encountered there. Stone for the redoubt was available nearby, some of which had already been quarried, but suitable timber for the roof was too difficult to obtain in the vicinity [21].

Repairs to the kraal at Hottentots-Holland were ordered again on the 17th September, following an inspection by the Governor, and instructions were also given on the 19th for a (new?) kitchen to be built [22]. It was also mentioned on the 26th October 1676 that the Governor had given orders for the kraal to be enlarged [23]. There is only one further reference to building activities at the outpost, which was leased to the freeburghers in 1678, following a resolution of the 31st January, confirmed on the 25th February [24]. This reference was made on the 28th November 1684, when it was decided that sheep pens would be erected at all the Company's outposts. The one at Hottentots-Holland was to be large enough to hold 2000 sheep [25].

By 1684 the Hottentots-Holland post was no longer leased to the freeburghers, but had been repossessed for the Company by Simon van der Stel [26]. He believed that this would ensure that, together with "Bommelshoek" (on the present Diep River) and the "Boereboomen" (at Hout Bay), there would be enough sheds ("hocken") and enclosures ("coraelen") for the livestock. However, so many lambs died at the beginning of the rainy season that he decided, with the approval of Visiting Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens Jr, to erect further sheds ("hokken") at "Clapmuts", "Rietvallei" and "De Cuijlen" [27].

The Company's outposts were inspected by Commissioner van Rheede in 1685. He was particularly disappointed by the post at Hottentots-Holland, which did not live up to previously raised expectations. He described the house as a miserable and dilapidated hut, with a narrow entrance hall and a small room to the side ("een smal voorhuijs en

een kleijn zijkamertjen"), under a thatched roof. The animal shed was somewhat better, but the slaves lived in hovels. He therefore gave orders for new barns, sheds and dwellings to be erected. These should be sited slightly further up, towards the mountains, and built around a square to give protection from wild animals. Sufficient stone for these buildings was available in the vicinity [28].

He stated, moreover, that the houses, kraals and stables on most of the outposts were scattered about in a disorderly manner. In future the Company was to surround the buildings of its outposts with a brick wall and a ditch ("gracht"), in order to protect the animals from wild beasts. The buildings within were no longer to be constructed with timber frames ("houte stutten en binten"), but their walls were to be built of brickwork and their roofs secured with strong beams to protect them against the south-east winds. These Company's outposts were to serve as models for the freeburghers to emulate, and also as strongholds in the event of war [29].

This is an extremely important entry, as it provides contemporary evidence for the central argument of this thesis. Later outposts were built in accordance with Van Rheede's orders, as exemplified by Groene Kloof (which survives as the present Mamre mission station), the yard of which was surrounded by a wall although only one side of the rectangle was lined with buildings. Moreover, Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel was to formalize the idea of enclosure in his octagon at Vergelegen. While Vergelegen itself was never emulated, the largest proportion of the freeburghers' farms of the later 18th century had buildings arranged orthogonally, and almost ten percent of the surviving examples were arranged around a rectangular court [30].

To return to Hottentots-Holland, Hugo states that Simon van der Stel gave orders for a second Company's house to be built on the banks of the Lourens River, one mile to the east of the first post. This was probably as a result of Van Rheede's instructions to erect new buildings further up the hill [31]. The Hottentots-Holland post remained in the Company's possession until the end of the period under review, as revealed in the "Contra-Deductie" of 1712 [32]. The earthen fort, however, had disappeared by the time of Kolbe (1713), who also makes no mention of the later stone redoubt [33].

Apart from the dimensions of the house and kraal provided in the Journal, the only

description of the house at Hottentots-Holland is the one provided by Commissioner van Rheede. However, the almost 3:1 proportion specified for the plan of the house was contradicted by the 2:1 ratio mentioned in Wittebol's report on the fortification.

The first buildings were almost certainly timber-framed and thatched, as no other building materials were mentioned. This assumption is confirmed by the decision late in 1674 to build a new house of stone, the first dwelling having evidently been of a temporary nature. The fortification was also rebuilt in stone in 1676, when a new kitchen was erected as well. The latter was probably also of masonry, replacing the earlier timber structure, and thereby following the precedent of increasingly permanent buildings already established on the Peninsula.

It is possible, though, that the house was not rebuilt in stone prior to 1685, given Van Rheede's order that the timber-framed walls of the buildings at the Company's outposts were to be replaced with masonry construction. However, Van Rheede could have been referring either to other structures on the site or to outposts other than the one at Hottentots-Holland.

The Company's post at "De Kuilen" was first mentioned on the 3rd January 1676, when the new Governor Joan Bax spent the night there on his way to the Cape, his ship having been compelled to land at False Bay [34]. It was subsequently used as a half-way house on journeys between Hottentots-Holland and the Cape [35].

However, it was only on the 8th January 1680 that a decision was made to establish a permanent outpost at "de Cuijlen", as was confirmed on the 23rd March. The post was half-way between the Cape and Hottentots-Holland, and the oxen needed to be rested there as they could not complete the journey in a single day. It was therefore decided that a house would be erected to serve as an inn for travellers. The necessary materials would be sent from the Cape in the empty wagons making their way back to Hottentots-Holland [36].

Bricks for the purpose were transported there on the 2nd August 1680 [37], when orders were also given for a lime-kiln to be made to expedite the construction of the house. Boeseken states that the house at De Cuijlen had already been commenced by the 27th April 1680, when it was inspected by Simon van der Stel [38]. A three-month

delay between commencement and delivery of bricks is unlikely, though, suggesting that the April inspection involved the selection of a site and, at most, the pegging out of the foundations.

It was further decided on the 28th November 1684 that sheep pens would be erected at all the Company's outposts, following an increase in numbers due to successful breeding. The one at "de Cuijlen" was to hold 1000 sheep, and was to be roofed in order to protect the ewes and lambs from the weather [39].

In 1685 Commissioner van Rheede described the accommodation at De Cuijlen as comprising a barn, with a room of brick or clay in which the post-holder was housed. He gave instructions that the buildings and the barns should be built around a square, in order to provide protection from wild animals. Further protection was also to be provided by a palisade, and a ditch planted with thorn trees [40].

The outpost at "de kuijlen" is first shown on M1/3308 [Fig 123], a map of the Peninsula and False Bay probably dating from 1687 [41], next to a tributary of the Eerste River. It appears again, together with the post at Hottentots-Holland, on M1/975, another map of 1687 [Fig 167]. Here, however, "De kuijle" is shown too close to the shore of False Bay, and both outposts are represented imaginatively rather than accurately.

The Company's post at the "Kuyl" was sold on the 15th June 1700, together with the post at "Elsjes Kraal" (which was mentioned for the first time). The former brought in f1300, and the latter f3400 [42]. The "Kuylen" was described in a letter to Holland dated the 14th March 1701 as comprising "an old homestead, two fairly good sheds, and an earthen kraal", while "Elsjes Coraal" had "a good large shed" [43]. Kolbe (1713), mentions that there was a stone bridge over the river at De Cuijlen. He described it as "a fine estate" now owned by Olof Bergh, captain of the garrison [44]. The bridge was also mentioned by Valentyn (1714) [45].

The Company's post at Bommelshoek was first mentioned on the 9th July 1676 in connection with an inventory of livestock [46]. It was resolved on the 6th December 1683, however, that the by now dilapidated sheep kraal "at Bommelshock, near the Steenberg," would be sold to a freeburgher [47]. Another Company's post "behind the

Steenberg" was also mentioned for the first time in the inventory of the 9th July 1676 [48], and an entry of the 18th December revealed that the two men guarding the cattle were living in a tarred tent [49]. There is no reference to its further development, however, and it was mentioned for the last time on the 23rd February 1689 in connection with precautions taken against a possible attack by the French [50].

Another Company's post to be mentioned for the first time in the inventory of the 9th July 1676 was "Riet Valley" [51], referred to again on the 25th November 1676, in connection with the threat of an attack from the Khoi. It was described as being four hours inland of the Cape, and a corporal and eight soldiers were sent for its protection [52]. The post at "Rietvaleij" was mentioned again on the 28th November 1684, when it was decided that a sheep pen would be built, large enough to hold 1000 animals [53].

The Company's post at "Clapmuts" was first mentioned on the 28th November 1684, when it was decided that a sheep pen holding 2000 animals would be erected there [54]. The new post at Clapmuts was inspected in 1685 by Commissioner van Rheede, who described the granary as being well built, but too stretched out ("al te lang uijtgereckt"). The animal shed, however, was not strong enough to afford protection from wild beasts. Van der Stel was therefore urged to use stone and high-quality clay ("ijserkleij") in the construction of the walls, as at Hottentots-Holland and De Cuijlen, instead of using timber framing which was wasteful of scarce resources. These masonry walls were to be plastered with lime on the outside, and the roofs were to be tied with cross-beams ("door dwarsbalken aen een gebonden") to afford protection against the strong winds [55].

Van Rheede thus appears to have been a central figure in the development of the construction method and resultant aesthetic of buildings at the Cape, as well as with regard to the siting arrangements discussed above. His instructions to the Company's officials, to abandon timber construction in favour of lime-plastered walls with roofs braced by cross-beams, were soon to be translated into an edict forbidding timber framing in the walls of the houses of the freeburghers. The emergence of the technology and aesthetic that characterized the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century could thus well be attributed to Commissioner van Rheede.

On the 11th May 1706 it was resolved that the post at "Klapmuts", comprising a farmhouse and a dilapidated shed, would be sold. The outpost at "Vissershok" was also mentioned (for the first time) in the same resolution, in connection with the sale of Company's livestock [56]. The post at "Clapmuts" realized a price of 300 rixdollars, as mentioned in a letter to Amsterdam dated the 24th June 1706 [57]. The buildings at "Klapmuts" were described by Mentzel (who left the Cape in 1741) as "a homestead with the stables, coach-houses and barns". These were, "according to the custom of the country, somewhat scattered" [58], suggesting that Van Rheede's orders concerning siting were not carried out in this instance.

It was decided on the 4th December 1686 that an inspection would be made of the Company's outposts as far as the "Tijgerberg" [59]. This is the first reference to the post at "de Tygerberg", next mentioned on the 23rd February 1689, in connection with the possibility of a French attack [60]. No further references were made to the post until Valentyn (1714) stated that a Company's cattle post had been established "across the Salt River towards the Tygerbergen, which lie about 3 (Dutch) miles from the Fort" [61].

A Company's building of a different order was the house erected for Sheikh Joseph, an Imam from Macassar who had been exiled by the Dutch authorities. It was resolved on the 14th June 1694 that he would be banished to the mouth of the Eerste River, together with his entourage [62]. The Sheikh died in 1699 and, following the release of his followers, the Company decided on the 7th February 1707 to sell off the building, which was now in a dilapidated condition [63].

Valentyn mentions that "the renowned Sjeich Joesef" was buried at Zandvliet, the farm of the minister Petrus Kalden at the mouth of the Eerste River, in the district presently known as Macassar. He described it as "an ornamental Moslem tomb, built up very high of stones". The tomb, still in existence, continues to attract annual pilgrimages [64].

The expansion of the settlement resulted in a concomitant drain on the Company's resources. This is illustrated in a resolution of the 13th December 1695, when it was decided that three of the outposts would have to be manned with soldiers to control the

freeburghers' illicit trade in cattle. Unfortunately the names of the posts in question were not disclosed [65].

Of more serious importance to the Company were renewed Khoi raids on its cattle posts in the inland districts. Word was received on the 13th March 1701 that they had already attacked the post of the freeburgher Gerrit Cloeten at "Riebeeck's Casteel". Apparently their strategy was first to impoverish the freemen, and then to confront the Company's post there, mentioned here for the first time [66]. Another report was received on the 26th May that further cattle raids had been made by the Khoi on the Company's outposts at "Waveren" and the "Bergh River", both mentioned for the first time. It was therefore resolved that they would each be reinforced with twelve soldiers, and that a third outpost would be established in the vicinity [67].

Instructions were therefore given on the 16th June that a site for the new outpost was to be selected between "Riebeeck's Kasteel" and the "Honingbergen". The three stations would thereby create a triangle "above, alongside and below the great Berg river" [68]. The new post was near the "Vogel Vallei", as mentioned in a letter to Holland dated the 20th March 1702 [69].

Another outpost was established at "Groene Kloof" on the 8th November 1701, following a Khoi attack on the cattle of the meat contractor, "Henning Huysing". This would be garrisoned with a sergeant and ten soldiers [70]. This cattle post was also referred to by Valentyn, who mentioned that only four of the freeburghers were permitted to make use of the grazing lands, in accordance with a five-year contract. The garrison had the additional task of curbing the freeburghers' illicit cattle trade, as well as guarding the salt-pans in the vicinity [71].

The Company's post at "Elandskloof" was first mentioned on the 26th March 1703 [72], and that at "Sonquas Drift" on the 28th February 1704 [73]. Two other Company's posts were also mentioned in the journal of Johannes Starrenburgh's cattle-trading expedition of 1705. One was behind the "Hasenberg", and the other at "Vissershoeck" [74].

Some of these posts had been abandoned by the 31st March 1706, following a cessation of hostilities with the Khoi, as revealed in a letter to Holland. Unfortunately the names

of the stations in question were not disclosed [75]. However, Valentyn provides a complete list of the Company's outposts and the numbers of their garrisons in his description of the Cape written after his last visit in 1714. They were the "Grasveld" (with a garrison of six), "Sonquas-drift" (eight), "Elands-kloof" (seven), "Riebeeks-Kasteel" (nine), "Vogel-valey" (nine), "Groene Kloof" (five), the "Land of Waveren" (six), "Rietveld" (three), "Visschershoek" (two), "Klapmuts" (three), "Hottentots-Holland" (six), the "Rood Zand" (number not disclosed) and "Saldanha Bay" (five) [76].

There are no architectural descriptions of these early Company's outposts, apart from Van Rheede's accounts of the buildings at Hottentots-Holland and Clapmuts, and Mentzel's reference to the random siting of the buildings at Clapmuts. Kolbe did mention that there was a handsome ("fraai") house at "Vissershok", as well as other buildings for enclosing the cattle and threshing the grain. However, he was not specific as to their architectural configuration [77].

Kolbe and Mentzel were both critical of the lack of bridges in the inland districts. The only two which they mentioned were those at Stellenbosch and at Hottentots-Holland [78]. The bridge over the Eerste or "Stellenbosch" River was first mentioned in 1701. Although timber for the purpose had already been cut in the Company's forest at "Paradys" on the Peninsula, and instructions were given on the 17th March for it to be transported at once [79], only three half-loads had been collected by the 21st April, and another ten loads were still awaiting transportation [80].

This entry reveals that the bridge was constructed of timber, in contrast to the stone bridge at De Cuijlen. It is also indicative of the increasingly strained relations between the freeburghers of Stellenbosch and the Company's authorities. However, this bridge was dangerously narrow and had caused a number of accidents. It was therefore replaced by a "large and stately bridge" erected by Johann Grimpen, a freeburgher who owned the adjoining property, despite the fact that his neighbours were not prepared to contribute to the cost, and that he was not allowed to levy any toll on travellers. He was, however, exempted from all other communal duties as long as he kept the bridge in good repair [81].

The bridge at Hottentots-Holland was erected by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel ("with the Company's Materials, and at the Company's Expence") to provide access to his farm Vergelegen. Kolbe and Mentzel both state that it had fallen into disrepair after his departure from the Cape [82], but it was mentioned on the 4th February 1710 that two of the Company's carpenters had been sent to repair it [83]. This bridge, therefore, also appears to have been constructed of timber. Kolbe, however, states that the early bridges were constructed of stone masonry, but that the only one worthy of mention was that over the Stellenbosch River, next to the farm of Adam Tas [84].

According to Kolbe and Valentyn, the most serious absence of a bridge was over the Berg River at Drakenstein, which prevented the inhabitants from reaching the church and the mill when the river was full. Many of them had been drowned in attempting the crossing on horseback, and it was suggested that a bridge should be erected near the farm of Francois du Toit, at the entrance to the Wagenmakers Vallei [85]. Their criticisms reveal the difficulties of communication in the early years of the settlement, when the necessary infrastructure had not yet been established.

9.2.2 BUILDINGS OF THE COMPANY'S OFFICIALS

Although the Company's officials were not permitted to engage in agriculture, a number of them did have farms in the Stellenbosch district during the Governorship of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. This was a central factor in the dispute with the freeburghers which led to his dismissal in 1707. The officials in question were the Governor himself, the Secunde Samuel Elzevier, the Independent Fiscal Joan Blesius, the Minister Petrus Kalden and the Landdrost Johannes Starrenburgh.

Johannes Mulder, the first Landdrost of Stellenbosch, also had a farm of his own. This, however, was not illegitimately held, as he had retired in 1691 but was recalled as Acting Landdrost from 1711 to 1712, following the fire that had destroyed most of the village in 1710 [1].

Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel had a large number of cattle posts, besides his farm at Vergelegen. These were described in a freeburghers' attestation dated the 12th March 1711, which was transcribed by Valentyn. They were "the Bot River, Rustenburg, the

Boontjeskraal, the Faisantenkraal, the Warmwaterkraal, the Swarte River, the Sergeants River, the Quartels River, the Ziekenhuis, the Vleermuis, the Hartebeestenkraal, the Leeuwenkraal, the Tygers Hoek, the Groote Vlakte, Welgelegen and Wytgelegen, which last lay fully 60 miles from the Cape or the Castle". He did point out, however, that "this was asserted by his enemies, and therefore deserves no full credence" [2].

He also had a grain farm called "De Kleine Hoogte", at the "Rivier zonder ent" [3]. This was probably the farm referred to by Valentyn at the "Terra di Natal", thirty Dutch miles from Vergelegen [4]. In addition, the Governor had a fishing post at False Bay, near Hangklip [Fig 163]. This "Visch Hoek" was first mentioned in the "Korte Deductie" (1708), where it was claimed that it was used only to provide a supply of fish for the Companys' slaves [5]. Another "Visch-plaets aen de strant", belonging to Wilhem Adriaen's brother Frans, was also mentioned in the same document [6].

However, the reality of the situation (according to the complaints of the freeburghers), was that the Governor and his brother used these facilities only for their own personal gain, thereby excluding the burghers from their legitimate fishing rights in the bay [7]. Indeed, it was stated in the "Contra-Deductie" that Wilhem Adriaen had "two houses and three or four kraals at the Vishoek" [8], and Kolbe mentions that Wilhem Adriaen had built himself "een groot en pragtig vischhuis" there [9].

The farm of the Vice-Governor Samuel Elsevier was described in the letter of complaints from the freeburghers, dated c1706. This establishment, called Elsenburg, included a water-mill, a smithy and a wagon-maker's workshop. All of these were "to the prejudice of the burgher and craftsman", as stated by the Fiscal in a letter to the Council of Seventeen [10]. It was also mentioned in the "Korte Deductie" and the "Contra-Deductie" that he had erected a large house on the property [11].

Kolbe (1713) agreed that Elsevier had a handsome house and wine-cellar on his farm, together with other necessary buildings [12], and noted that he had made a considerable profit from the water-mill [13]. Valentyn (1714) concurred that the farm had "an unusually fine and commodious dwelling". He also revealed that the sale of the property provided Elsevier with 3000 guilders a year, after his recall to Holland following his implication in the Van der Stel controversy [14].

Fagan notes that the original Elsenburg (as described in an inventory of 1722) had a large "voorhuis", a room to the right and a room to the left, as well as a kitchen, and deduces that it must have been T-shaped in plan. If the first house was incorporated in the foundations of the present U-plan building, though, an L-plan would have been more likely, as in the houses of Cape Town, with the kitchen behind one of the side rooms. Moreover, it should be noted that there is no firm evidence of T-plans outside Cape Town at this date. Without confirmatory archaeological evidence, however, the plan of the original Elsenburg can remain only speculative [15].

Despite his comments about the Secunde's establishment at Elsenburg, the Fiscal Blesius also had his own farm, at Simonsvlei in the Drakenstein district. Kolbe relates that he erected a stately ("treffelyk") house, a mill and a wine-cellar, as well as the other necessary out-buildings. However, in accordance with the instructions of the Council of Seventeen, he was obliged to sell the property in 1707, which he did for the sum of 24 000 guilders. The recipient was his previous farm manager, who would pay off the outstanding amount at a rate of 2000 guilders a year [16].

The minister Petrus Kalden had a large farm at the Eerste River, called Zandvliet, for which he received 20 500 guilders when compelled to sell it off on instructions from the Council of Seventeen [17].

Onrust, the house of the Landdrost Johannes Starrenburgh at the "Tijgerberg" [18], was not mentioned by any of the visitors to the Cape. However, it was described in an inventory dating from 1709. The farm buildings comprised a "Woonhuijs"; a "paerdestal", a "Coeije hok" and a "Wagenhuijs", all under one roof; a "Coorenhuijs" 30 feet long and 13 wide; a "Wijn kelder"; and a "Slaven huijsje" [19].

Woodward does not provide a room-by-room list of contents, but describes the house as modest. This would correspond with the low sum of 5250 guilders received when the property was auctioned, in comparison with figures four times as high for Elsenburg and Simonsvlei, and would explain its absence from the travellers' accounts. Moreover, it is likely that the house was not used by Starrenburgh himself but by his farm manager, as the furniture comprised only four chairs and a broken bed.

Kolbe was highly complimentary about Zorgvliet, the farm of the first Landdrost of

Stellenbosch, Johannes Mulder, at the "Bange Hoeck". He was writing from personal experience, having visited it on a number of occasions while serving as secretary of the Stellenbosch District. He described the house as being quite low, on account of its construction method and the strong winds prevalent in the area. It was surrounded by tall oaks and could therefore not be seen from a distance. The out-buildings, however, were more scattered ("staan meest vry"), and could be seen as one approached the "Bangehoek".

Behind the house was the most delightful ("vermakelykste") garden, a vineyard and an orchard. In the middle of the garden was an artificial fishpond, surrounded by trees trimmed to the shape of pyramids, and interspersed with flowers and aloes. Beyond the fishpond, a pleasure-house ("Lusthuijsje") of juniper trees ("jeneverbomen") formed the termination of the central axis of the garden. Above this was an artificial hill containing a grotto, built of a variety of differently coloured stones, and containing a number of porcelain figures [20].

Valentyn agreed with Kolbe that this was the most impressive of the farms in the Drakenstein district, and added a few details of his own. His description of the porcelain figures, animals and castles must have been derived from hearsay, however, as there is no record of his ever having visited the property [21].

Mentzel, on the other hand, was sceptical about these claims: "Finally, whatever Kolbe may tell about the excellent farmsteads... may have been right in his time; but now, when their owners are more concerned with their usefulness than their beauty, all grottoes, cascades, fish-ponds with strange fish (whence these originate I cannot imagine) and all caves and dens filled with finest porcelain figures and ornaments have disappeared." [22].

Nevertheless, it is interesting that Johannes Mulder should have named his farm Zorgvliet, if Kolbe's and Valentyn's descriptions of its grottoes and porcelain figures are correct. He might have seen or heard of the Bentinck garden at Sorgvliet in Holland (the "Ganymede grotto" of which is illustrated in Figs 135 & 136), and attempted to emulate it [23].

It is disappointing that the descriptions of the buildings of the Company's officials give

so little indication of their architectural configuration. It is interesting, though, that the gardens of Zorgvliet merit more notice than its house. This is perhaps an indication of the simplicity of the buildings in the inland districts at this time, in comparison with the relative sophistication of those encountered in Cape Town.

9.2.3 FREEBURGHERS' BUILDINGS

Many references were made to the properties of the farmers in the inland districts, but they were seldom described in more than the most generalized of terms. Therefore only the most noteworthy of these descriptions will be mentioned here. The first of them was not complimentary, as the freeburghers in these districts needed to be instructed on the 29th August 1704 to enclose their lands with hedges or ditches in order to protect them from damage caused by stray livestock. In this respect they were no more enterprising than the farmers on the Peninsula, who had been ordered to do likewise in the time of Van Riebeeck [1].

The first inland tavern, at "Tijgervalleij", was mentioned on the 27th July 1706, in connection with the auctioning of the wine lease [2]. It was not stated whether an inn was attached, but this is unlikely, as travellers' accounts record no lodging houses in the inland districts other than those at De Cuijlen [3] and at the Warm Baths.

Hot springs had been discovered beyond the Hottentots-Holland mountains, and permission was granted on the 17th February 1710 for the burgher Ferdinandus Appel to build a house for the accommodation of persons visiting the Warm Baths. Twelve morgen of land were granted for this purpose on the 10th March [4]. The house was described by Kolbe, who had visited the hot spring himself, as being unpretentious ("onaanzienlyk"), but no further indication was given of its architectural configuration [5].

Mentzel described the accommodation at the Warm Baths, as he knew them prior to his departure from the Cape in 1741, in greater detail: "Lately a solid building has indeed been erected there, consisting of a vestibule, two large rooms, a kitchen and a small room for the use of the caretaker. This building, however, is generally too small for the many visitors who come there in summer. Those who arrive too late to find a place in

the two rooms, have to make themselves at home in the vestibule or on the ground or camp in a tent... The building which is situated on the slope of a mountain suffers much damage from the penetrating water and one room in particular is very damp and musty... The bath is about 100 yards from the dwelling-house. It is about 4 fathoms long and 1½ fathoms broad; two sides are sunk into the ground, the other two being walled. The water is run into it through a gable by means of furrows, and has an outlet from the bath... Two other nearby springs are provided with huts only and roofed with brushwood; these are intended for slaves and Hottentots" [6].

Mentzel's description could suggest an entrance hall flanked by the two large rooms, with the kitchen and the caretaker's room behind. However, these could also have been beyond the larger rooms, in a longhouse configuration. Moreover, it is possible that this was not Ferdinand Appel's original house, as Mentzel noted that it had been "lately" erected [7].

The only freeburgher's farm to be described by contemporary writers was Meerlust, the property on the Eerste River owned by the burgher councillor Henning Hüsing. Valentyn states that he was "the owner of several such farmsteads including one especially fine one called Meirlust" [8], and Kolbe mentions that a tower was built next to the house, permitting a view of the roadstead in Table Bay [9].

The tower was presumably erected to give Hüsing, who was the meat contractor, early warning of the arrival of ships in harbour, in order to transport his livestock to the town. Interestingly, Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel had also intended to build a pavilion on the Schapenberg, with a view of the harbour. This would have given him sufficient notice of the arrival of a fleet for a prompt return from Vergelegen to the Castle, but the project was prevented by his dismissal from office [10]. Further discussion of the house at Meerlust will be found in Chapter 9.2.4, where the development of the present building is addressed.

In the more distant regions, houses of extremely poor quality were erected. This was particularly the case in the districts of the "24 Rivieren" and the "Land of Waveren", where grazing lands were granted only on a six-monthly basis, and the dwellings were "no better than Shepherds huts" [11]. These were probably constructed of timber and

reeds, with roofs extending down to the ground, like the vernacular "kapsteilhuis" of the trekboers of the later 18th and early 19th centuries.

One of them, however, that of the widow Anna Maria Pieters de Leeuw at "Vierentwintig Rivieren", was described in a declaration contained in the "Contra-Deductie" as being 33 feet long with clay walls six feet high [12]. These appear to be substantial dimensions for a mere shepherd's hut, and suggest that some of the farmers in the outlying districts were not prepared to live in primitive conditions.

Leguat also mentioned in 1698 that "one of the Refugees, nam'd Taillefer... has a garden which may very well pass for fine. Nothing there is wanting, and all is in so good order, and so neat, that it may very well pass for Charming" [13]. Leguat, however, had nothing to say about the house, suggesting as did Kolbe's description of Zorgvliet [14] that it was of little significance.

Although none of the buildings of these early freeburghers have survived, there are two sources of visual evidence. One comprises the sketches on their title-deeds drawn up by the first Landdrost of Stellenbosch, Johannes Mulder, and the other is E V Stade's depiction of a farm beneath the Paarl Mountain.

Johannes Mulder was the surveyor as well as the Landdrost of the district of Stellenbosch, and was the owner of the farm Zorgvliet described in Chapter 9.2.2. Given the glowing description of this property by his secretary, Pieter Kolbe, it is likely that he was visually literate, and that his sketches were accurate representations of the farmhouses in question.

Eight of these sketches are reproduced in Smuts, three others appear in Walton, and another in Vos [15]. One of them, however, is too small for any firm conclusions to be drawn from it. This was Vredenburg [16] [Fig 169], which comprised a house with a chimney at one end, and a separate out-building, but the positions of the openings cannot be determined from the drawing.

Of the other eleven houses, ten were depicted as rectangular with gabled ends, and seven of them were entered from the ends, in other words on the longitudinal rather than the transverse axis.

Chronologically, the first of these was Spier [17] [Fig 170], which was granted in 1683 [18]. Its gable end was elaborated by a cross at the apex and by a cornice at eaves level, separating the entrance door from the loft window above. The gable at the far end contained a chimney, and two windows are visible on the long facade, which suggests a plan subdivided into two rooms.

The second was Vredenburg at Vlottenburg [19] [Fig 171], granted in 1686 [20], where the end gable above the door was also elaborated by a horizontal cornice at eaves level. The long facade contained four unevenly-spaced windows, and the house was depicted without a chimney. Walton drew attention to the two rectangular livestock enclosures, and to "a small rectangular structure which may have been a 'Norse' mill or a bridge", which was located "across a diversion of the Eerste River" [21].

The third was Welgevallen [22] [Fig 172], granted in 1689, where the door was surmounted by a loft window, but the cornice was omitted. Here the chimney was in the centre of the house, with two windows to one side of it, and another doorway located at the end of the asymmetrical long facade.

The fourth was Libertas [23] [Fig 173], also granted in 1689, which was similar to Welgevallen in respect of its end-gabled entrance with a loft window above, but differed in that it had three evenly spaced windows along its length, and a chimney in the other gable end, as seen at Spier.

The fifth was Oude Molen [24] [Fig 174], granted to Barend Brink in 1689. This was "a rectangular building with a pitched roof, having an entrance in one end, a tall chimney at the other and two windows along one side". Here the entrance end was also gabled, but without a loft window above the door.

The sixth was Blaauwklip [25] [Fig 175], granted to Gerrit J Visser in 1690. This also had an entrance in the gable end and three windows along the side wall, with a chimney in the opposite gable end, as at Spier and Libertas.

The seventh and last example of the end-entry type is Kromme Rivier [26] [Fig 176], granted in 1692. This was similar to Spier in the use of a cross above the entrance gable, in the location of the chimney in the gable at the opposite end, and in the

provision of two windows along its length. However, these could well have been doors, given the indistinctness of this particular sketch which precludes the possibility of any firm conclusions being be drawn from it [27].

Of the three houses entered on the transverse axis, the earliest dated example is Coetsenburg [28] [Fig 177], granted in 1693 [29]. Here the entrance door, although flanked by a window on either side, is shifted to the left of the axis of symmetry to accommodate the centrally placed chimney, thereby suggesting an internal subdivision into two rooms [30]. The end gable, which had no openings, was again articulated with a cornice at eaves level.

The second was Stellengift (now Simonsvlei) [31] [Fig 178], the date of which does not appear on the title-deed [32], and the attribution of which has been questioned [33]. It was similar to Coetsenburg except that there were chimneys on both gable ends. Despite the fact that a central fireplace was not present, the entrance door flanked by a window on either side was displaced from the central axis, again indicative of an asymmetrical plan consisting only of two rooms [34]. The sketch also depicts a rectangular outbuilding with hipped ends, entered from the shorter side.

Walton points out that this farm, with its two buildings surrounded by a boundary wall, and its two adjoining animal enclosures, was more developed than the other farms depicted by Johannes Mulder. This he attributes to the financial resources of the Fiscal Blesius and the energy of his partner Diemer, who were the joint owners of the property [35]. However, although it might be tempting to consider the Fiscal's house at Simonsvlei as a possible precedent for the development of the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century, this is not supported by the evidence. The buildings are randomly sited within a large enclosure, to which other enclosures have been added with little sense of overall coherence apart from an adherence to the right angle. The house only approximates to the symmetrical and was probably two-roomed in reality, and cannot therefore be seen as precedent for the symmetrical three-roomed plan in the country districts.

A third example of a house entered on the transverse axis is Oude Molen, as depicted on a regrant in 1701 [36] [Fig 179]. Although Vos' reproduction is unclear, it suggests

a roughly symmetrical facade with a central door flanked by a window on either side. The tall hipped roof might have contained a loft lit by what appears to be a central recessed dormer above the door. The kitchen is moved to the right-hand side of the main volume of the house, allowing the chimney to emerge beyond the eaves of the thatched roof, and this outward extension is balanced by a lean-to on the other side.

This drawing, which is not in Mulder's style, also shows double vertical lines at the ends of the main volume of the house. These are suggestive of pilasters, but the date is too early and the house too unpretentious to support such an interpretation. They are more likely to have been forward projecting nib walls for buttressing purposes, but no similar feature appears on any of the other contemporary sketches. As with Coetsenburg and Stellengift, though, the door is displaced to the left of the facade, the centre of which corresponds with the right hand edge of the door. This again suggests a two-roomed rather than a three-roomed plan, with a larger room to the left and a smaller room to the right.

The complete lack of correspondence between this drawing of Oude Molen and the gable-ended building illustrated by Walton [Fig 174] suggests that the house on the 1689 grant had been demolished and replaced by 1701. The replacement of gabled ends with hipped ends is a phenomenon also observed in Cape Town (see Chapter 7.2.1), and probably correlates with the change from timber-framed to masonry construction. If the original house at Oude Molen had been of timber and wattle-and-daub, its replacement with a masonry building would have necessitated its complete demolition.

This would have permitted the new house to dispense with the end entry plan and follow the more recent transverse entry of the drosty and the "colonieshuisen" in Stellenbosch. Although the plan of the second Oude Molen was asymmetrical with two rooms of different widths, there was an approximation to symmetry in the facade. Significantly, the almost symmetrical facade predated the symmetrical three-roomed plan. This was probably the first stage of the abandonment of older vernacular types in an attempt to emulate the more formal buildings erected by the Company, its senior officials and the wealthier burghers in Cape Town.

Apart from the fact that the majority of these farmhouses were entered longitudinally,

none of those with a transverse entrance appear to have been symmetrically planned with a central doorway leading to a centrally placed "voorhuis". This evidence suggests again that the "symmetrical three-roomed cell" was not the inspiration for an evolutionary development leading to the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century. The symmetrical three-roomed plan was derived rather from buildings such as Vergelegen and Henning Hüsing's house in Cape Town, which created a precedent later to be followed in the H-plan houses of the freeburghers.

The last house depicted by Johannes Mulder, unfortunately undated and unidentified [37] [Fig 180], is markedly different from the others. It has a hipped roof with two chimneys at the apex of the hips, and a gabled wing projecting asymmetrically from the main volume. This wing is narrower than the rest of the house, its ridge being considerably lower, and appears to have a doorway on the side.

It is probable that this was a forward-facing entrance lobby rather than the rearward projecting wing suggested by Fransen. The projection is very slight, affording room for nothing more than the door, and a cross is placed at the apex of the gable, similar to those above the doors in the end gables of Spier and Kromme Rivier. It is unlikely, therefore, that this is an early example of the Cape Dutch T-shaped plan.

The variety of architectural experiments during this period is also illustrated by a site plan of Welmoed, dating from 1690 [38] [Fig 181]. Here the arrangement of the farm buildings is worthy of note. One of the out-buildings is aligned with the front of the L-shaped farmhouse, and another is set behind these two, aligned with their inner sides. A fourth, placed at right angles to the first three, corresponds in width almost with the distance between the back of the house and the front of the out-building to the rear [39]. A rectangular walled enclosure surrounds the complex on three sides, the fourth being formed by the Eerste River. The buildings correspond orthogonally with this perimeter wall, and the farmhouse is entered axially by a path at right angles to its facade.

Another 17th century farm layout appears on the grant of Geduld, dating from 1699 [40] [Fig 182]. Here the irregular boundaries of the property are contrasted by a rearward rectangular extension which provides the setting for the four farm buildings. The farmhouse is set back in the left-rear corner and corresponds in width with the first

of two aligned smaller buildings located in front of it. The fourth building is a large barn taking up the far side of the rectangle, and orientated at right angles to the other three buildings.

Although a random sample of only two siting arrangements, and therefore not necessarily representative, the farmyard layouts of Welmoed and Geduld are interesting in two respects. The first is their use of orthogonal alignment as a planning principle: this was to become the most common of the later siting arrangements at the Cape. The second is that the four buildings are not linked in either example, but are set as independent pavilions within the space created by their enclosing walls. This characteristic is also found in the majority of surviving 18th and 19th century farm complexes at the Cape [41].

The most revealing depiction of early rural buildings in the inland districts is E V Stade's 1710 drawing of a farm beneath the Paarl Mountain [Fig 183]. Seven buildings are shown, together with two circular threshing floors. All but one of these have hipped roofs, the other having a gabled end. This building is located at right angles to two others which are extremely close to it, a siting arrangement not found in surviving examples at the Cape [42]. It was probably an out-building as it had no chimneys, in contrast to the houses on either side, one of which had a chimney in the middle of the ridge and the other a chimney at the apex of the outer hip.

This complex is yet another example of the tentative and experimental nature of the proto-Cape Dutch buildings erected in the inland districts, and of the unlikelihood that it was from these beginnings that Cape Dutch architecture was to develop. Without an exemplar to emulate, these isolated farmers could not have created the formal architecture characteristic of the later 18th century.

9.2.4 THE ABSENCE OF FIRM EVIDENCE FOR EARLY T-PLAN HOUSES

It has generally been assumed, by writers subscribing to the evolutionary theory of the development of Cape Dutch architecture, that the T-plan house predated the H-plan house. The widely accepted sequence of development begins with a symmetrical three-roomed front wing; this was extended by adding another room (or more) behind the

central "voorhuis", creating the T-plan; and lateral extensions to the rear of this "agterhuis" converted it into the H-plan.

However, the evidence presented in this thesis suggests rather that the H-plan was derived from the "dubbelhuisen" of Cape Town, a number of which already existed before 1710 [1], and that the type had already been used in the country districts in the residence and farm manager's house at Vergelegen [Fig 229]. On the other hand, there is no firm evidence for the existence of the T-plan prior to 1710, apart from a solitary asymmetrical example on Wittebol's c1679 plan of Cape Town [Fig 48].

The existence of the "dubbelhuis" prior to 1710 suggests therefore that the T-plan, rather than being the progenitor of the H-plan, was merely an incomplete version of it. It is thus more likely that it emerged as a result of financial constraints than that it "evolved" into the more formal H-plan. However, a number of writers in the field, who make no reference to the presence of the "dubbelhuis", and underestimate the influence of the buildings at Vergelegen, have attempted to attach unreasonably early dates to buildings with a T-plan configuration.

These dates are speculative, however, and result from the retrospective approach of stripping off "later additions" to reveal the "original" structure. As has been demonstrated at Constantia, and will be demonstrated again at Vergelegen, the earliest surviving remains are not necessarily those of the original structure. Early inventories have likewise been interpreted within the premise of the existence of the T-plan house during the proto-Cape Dutch period.

Three houses of this type, supposedly dating from prior to 1710, will be discussed below. They are Meerlust, Saxenburg and Nooitgedacht, all in the Stellenbosch district. These will be contrasted with Onrust, a house with a plan arrangement possibly more representative of the period.

Valentyn's complimentary description of Meerlust [2] must be seen in the light of what is known about the house as a result of its restoration. The present front wing dates only from 1776, when it was added by Johannes Mijburg, who had bought the property in 1757. Henning Hüsing's house could therefore have consisted of no more than the asymmetrical T-plan comprising the rear of the present house [3] [Fig 184]. Such a

house would not have rivalled the scale or sophistication of Vergelegen, as claimed by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel in his "Korte Deductie". Moreover, if Meerlust was considered to be the most impressive of the freeburghers' farmhouses, the others could have borne no comparison with those of the Company's officials. Again, the inference that the Cape Dutch style was evolved incrementally by the freeburghers is denied by the evidence.

Obholzer agrees that the original Meerlust had a T-plan, and adds "confirmatory" evidence: "The present 'agterhuis' (size 5900 x 9950) of Meerlust, formerly the 'voorhuis' of Henning Hüsing's T-shaped house built c.1693. The glazed screen supercedes (sic) a panelled three-leaved predecessor and occupies the position of the original front door, whilst the wall-cupboards are built into the openings of the facade windows. These double casements, each consisting of five rows of four panes, were moved out to the corners of the room" [4].

This is another example of the reductive approach to architectural history: removing what is known to be a later addition (the front wing and deep "voorhuis") and assuming that what remained was the original building. Similar examples of the reductive approach are disputed in this thesis with regard to Constantia and Vergelegen, but in these two cases there is sufficient evidence, written and visual, to suggest that there was an intermediate stage between the demolished original buildings and their final form in the late 18th century.

In the case of Meerlust there are no travellers' descriptions of the house, although the farmlands were admired. This suggests that the house was of little significance [5]. The assumption has always been made that it was Meerlust which Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel claimed was "higher, finer and grander" than his own Vergelegen. However, it is much more likely that it was Hüsing's triple-gabled and double-storeyed town house on the Keizersgracht, facing the Parade in Cape Town, to which he was referring [6].

The very existence of this house appears to have been ignored by most writers on the period of this thesis. Likewise, it is more probable that it was the Fiscal Blesius' town house to which Van der Stel was making reference, rather than his garden house at Leeuwenhof or his farm at Stellengift (Simonsvlei). This farm, as has been noted, had

relatively insignificant buildings (see Chapter 9.2.2).

Having addressed this fundamental misconception, a return can be made to the architectural configuration of the original Meerlust. This probably had a farmhouse no larger than that at Stellengift, as Hüsing would have spent most of his time in his palatial town house, while his farm manager supervised affairs at Meerlust. It is possible that Hüsing built it as a symmetrical three-roomed structure, similar to the so-called "Posthuijs" at Muizenberg [7]. However, the "voorhuis" was wider than the rooms on either side, suggesting an influence from buildings such as Constantia and the guest house in the Company's garden [8], although their square format was not followed at Meerlust. This is probably explained by Hüsing's lack of access, as a freeburgher, to the Company's supplies of sufficiently long roofing beams.

Even if the wing of the present house comprising the "living room" and the rooms on either side does indeed date from the time of Henning Hüsing, it is extremely unlikely that the asymmetrical kitchen wing to the rear was also contemporary. This destroys the internal symmetry of the "voorhuis" and, moreover, is of a narrower span than the "original" front wing. It is improbable that the owner of such a pretentious house in Cape Town would have built such a discordant arrangement from the outset, suggesting emphatically that it was a later addition.

If any of the present Meerlust does date from Hüsing's time, it is likely that it comprised only a wide "voorhuis" with a narrower room on either side. This would be in keeping with the Company's buildings of the 17th and early 18th centuries, which Hüsing was probably attempting to emulate. The kitchen to the rear, which converted this rectangular building into an asymmetrical T-plan, was thus almost certainly a later addition.

Obholzer attributes the rear part of Meerlust to Hüsing's ownership on the basis of an analysis of its details. He suggests that the "oldest top-and-bottom front door is to be found at the back of Meerlust (subsequently moved to its present position)... It possesses no transom window and has a decorated top panel, shaped in the rare form of a 'curtain' arch surrounded by an octagonal field... This design is found on no other Cape front door..." [9]. "The curtain arch motif also occurs on the doors of the

centrally-positioned (sic) living room fireplace which may, therefore, also date back to the 17th century" [10].

He supports this contention by suggesting that "fuel was still relatively abundant" in the early years, but that by the mid-18th century it was in such short supply that it could be used only for cooking purposes, hence the absence of fireplaces other than in the kitchen [11]. This argument, however, is inconclusive. The verbal and visual evidence of the period of this thesis reveals not only that firewood was always in short supply, but also gives no indication that a decorative pair of doors screening a fireplace would have existed at this time. It is more likely that Johannes Mijburg added both the entrance door and the fireplace doors after 1757 when he assumed ownership of the farm. He was probably also the owner responsible for the addition of the kitchen wing which converted the previously rectangular building into one with an asymmetrical T-plan, prior to the further additions of the 1770s.

Obholzer then contradicts himself when he states: "Stylistically, the oldest decorated doors are those of Saxenburg (early eighteenth century?). At the top and bottom of the cushion are double curved, or 'ogee' arches. These may, perhaps, be considered to be the stylistic antecedents of the 'curtain' arch found on the panels of the fire-cupboard and first front door of Meerlust" [12]. This suggests that Saxenburg predated Meerlust, although Obholzer gives a date of 1693 for Meerlust and 1701 for Saxenburg [13].

Saxenburg [Fig 185] was a large T-plan house built on a sloping site, necessitating a tall staircase to allow access to the front door. Obholzer comments on the facts that the rear wing had a "lower roof ridge running backwards from a still very small centre gable", and that the stoep did not extend the full width of the facade, corresponding instead with the width of the "voorhuis". These facts he presents as "evidence" of an early date for the building. He suggests, moreover, that "in general" the house "resembles the image we can form of Simon van der Stel's dwelling at Constantia", except that "an advancement over the decades seems to have been made" in the provision of double casements (outward opening and without shutters), whereas Constantia had only single casements [14].

This observation is presumably based on the raising of the house above cellars and the

necessity for reaching it by a tall flight of stairs, as suggested by Fransen's reconstruction of Van der Stel's Constantia, since there are no other similarities. Fransen's reconstruction is incorrect, however, as discussed earlier [15]. Constantia was level with the ground along the facade, the terrain falling away from the front of the house towards the back. The opposite was the case at Saxenburg, hence the need for the substructures under the front wing and for the tall staircase. The narrow landing above could therefore only have been extended as a full-width stoep at great expense. In other words, the "similarity" is a matter of function and not of date.

Of greater significance are the lower ridge and eaves heights of the rear wing in comparison with those of the front wing. The structural complexities introduced by this arrangement, which is also aesthetically awkward when viewed from the rear, firmly suggest that the front and rear wings were not built simultaneously. Moreover, the symmetrical front wing with a square "voorhuis" narrower than its flanking rooms [16], facilitating a rearward extension of equal width, is not known with certainty at the Cape before 1710 except in the case of the so-called "Posthuijs" at Muizenberg. It is therefore unlikely that even the front wing of the house at Saxenburg which was demolished in 1945 was the original building erected in 1701.

It is also notable that none of the travellers mention Saxenburg, which would have been one of the most outstanding houses if built with a T-plan in 1701. Nor does Michiel Sax, its first owner, appear to have been a burgher of any particular importance, given his absence from mention in the Resolutions and the declarations signed in the Van der Stel affair. It is therefore almost certain that this house dates from considerably later, probably from the 1740s or 1750s. It therefore cannot be cited as firm evidence for the existence of the T-plan prior to 1710.

The third example is Nooitgedacht, which certainly was built by 1710 as there are two inventories of its contents, one dating from 1710 and another from 1712. The question here is whether the present H-plan house did in fact have a T-shaped plan at the time of the inventories.

The second inventory is the more descriptive, but is similar to the first with regard to the listing of the major rooms. It reads as follows: "In 't voorhuijs... In de Groote

Camer aen de Regterhand... In 't afdakje... In de Voorste kamer aen de Linkerhand... In de agterste Camer aen de Linkerhand... In de Combuijs... In 't afdakje aen de Regterhand... In 't afdak aen de Linkerhand... In de bottelarij onder de Trap... Op de Solder...". The only differences in the first inventory are that the rooms to the left of the "Voorhuijs" were grouped together as "de twee Clijne Camers aen de Linkerhant...", and the lean-to's, the pantry and the loft were omitted [17].

Woodward has interpreted the accommodation schedule as describing a T-plan house [Fig 186]. However, this has necessitated the two small rooms on the left-hand side being placed next to each other instead of one behind the other as described in the inventory of 1712. Moreover, the "voorhuijs" is depicted as deeper than the rooms on either side, an unusual arrangement in terms of later 18th century practice.

As mentioned previously, a plan derived from an inventory alone, without confirmatory archaeological evidence, is not conclusive. The rooms described could equally well have been accommodated within three different planning arrangements: an L-plan [18], an asymmetrical U-plan and a transverse plan based on the "dubbelhuis" type.

The L-plan could have comprised a "voorhuis" flanked by a wide room to the right and a narrower room to the left, followed behind by another room and the kitchen, reached from outside. The asymmetrical U-plan could have been similar except that the kitchen was behind the large room, across a court from the rearward room on the left-hand side. The transverse "dubbelhuis" plan, stimulated perhaps by the more impressive houses in Cape Town, could have been symmetrical with regard to its facade. Here a central "voorhuis" could have been flanked by rooms of equal width, the two smaller ones to the left being located one behind the other, whereas the larger room to the right continued uninterrupted for the full depth of the house. The kitchen in such an arrangement could have been located behind the "voorhuis".

Given that there is no contemporary visual evidence of the house as it was in 1710 or 1712, there are thus at least four possible interpretations of the inventory description. Woodward has chosen the reconstruction which corresponds most closely with the Cape Dutch conventions of the mid-18th century, thereby perpetuating the evolutionary theory. This example demonstrates that without archaeological evidence of the house in

question, the inventories cannot be interpreted with any certainty. Nooitgedacht, therefore, also provides no firm evidence for the existence of the T-plan house during the proto-Cape Dutch period.

The Schreuder house in Stellenbosch has also been cited as a pre-1710 example of the T-plan [19]. This, however, was converted from a rectangular plan (with merely a lean-to store-room to the rear) into a T-plan only after the period of this thesis. Another Stellenbosch house (the Van den Berg house, as identified by Stander) has been described as T-shaped on the basis of Stade's drawing of the village, but this was almost certainly the L-shaped "Colonieshuis 1", abutted by the secretary's house next door [20]. The farm of Oude Molen is also shown in the plan reconstructed from this drawing as a T-plan, although Stade clearly depicts it as a rectangular house without any rearward extension [21].

A house which is possibly a more representative example of the ordinary dwellings of this period is Onrust, since converted into an out-building on the farm now known as Morgenhof, about ten kilometres to the north of Stellenbosch [22]. No inventory is available for Onrust, preventing a firm dating, but Brink has suggested that it was built in the early 18th century [23].

The building was of the "longhouse" type, but no longer with end entry, and was sited across rather than along the contours [Fig 187]. This resulted in a marked inclination of the floor across the length of the building. The roof was also inclined, but to a lesser degree, and the facade was markedly asymmetrical. The correspondingly asymmetrical plan consisted of three rooms with no interleading doors, all of them reached only from the outside. The largest, Room A, which was entered towards one side [24], is thought to have been a living room. Room B, next to it, is thought to have been a wagon room or stable. Room C, at the end, is thought to have been either a store-room or another living area [25].

The small room at the end (Room C) is unlikely to have been used as a living area unless for hired farmhands ("knechten"), given its lack of communication with the main living space. The attribution of the middle room (Room B) is probably correct, however, on account of its wider arched doorway, a point noted by Hall. If the

attribution of living space to the large room (Room A) is correct, the whole family must have used this as their entire dwelling space. This is not that unlikely, as Brink suggests that the room might have been partitioned [26], and reed partitioning which might not have left any archaeological trace is known to have separated Van Riebeeck's first hospital from the stable behind the Fort [27].

This plan type would have been a continuation of the "einhaus" plan first recorded in 1664 in the case of the adjoining house and cow shed of Frans Gerritsz on the Peninsula [28]. As noted by Hall, "it falls squarely within the broad tradition of European farm buildings, in which living areas, barns, wagon rooms and storerooms are sheltered beneath the same roof" [29].

It is likely that many of the early farmhouses had plans of this type, as noted also by Walton in recent years [30]. While the transverse plan certainly existed prior to 1710 in the town houses of Cape Town and the buildings at Vergelegen, it would have taken time for its influence to have spread to the farmhouses of the ordinary burghers. However, this influence was pervasive, and very few houses incorporating the service spaces usually accommodated in out-buildings are to be found in surviving Cape Dutch farm complexes [31].

Brink suggests that "substantial seventeenth and early eighteenth century dwellings were most often longitudinal houses resembling Dutch town house types". She continues by stating: "Through the second and third decades of the eighteenth century, more and more dwellings were turned through ninety degrees, thus becoming vestigial Cape Dutch houses" [32]. The unlikelihood of the more substantial houses having had an end entry, as in the town houses of Holland, has already been argued [33]. However, the idea of "turning a house through ninety degrees" does suggest another possibility for the sequence of building in individual houses. Once the precedent for a symmetrical front wing had been established, it is possible that some of the "longhouses" were converted by adding rooms on either side of one of the ends [34].

If the original Saxenburg had been similar to Onrust, with a rectangular building sited across the contours, and sloping downwards in a similar manner, it would explain the necessity for the elevation of the front wing on cellars. This new wing, comprising a

room on either side of the end of the original "longhouse", would have had to be raised in order to permit a level floor within, which would have been required by the greater formality of the new plan. The lower roof ridge of the rear wing could also be explained by a miscalculation during such a conversion. There is no more evidence for such a development than there is for the evolutionary development of the T-plan as a rearward extension of a symmetrical three-roomed cell, or for the existence of the T-plan prior to 1710. It is a possibility, however, given the documentary evidence of the transverse plan in the first decade of the 18th century, which could have provided the stimulus for enlargements of this nature.

While the sequence of construction within individual houses is of interest, it is not conclusive with regard to the development of Cape Dutch architecture in general. Whether the T- and H-plan houses began with a three-roomed symmetrical front wing, or with a rear wing which was subsequently added to on either side, is not material to the development of the type.

What is material is why the symmetrical front should have been chosen. This question has not been addressed by architectural historians or by historical archaeologists, neither of whom make reference to the importance of the precedent created by the "dubbelhuisen" of Cape Town. This precedent was adopted in the country residences of the Company's officials and the wealthiest burghers, as exemplified by Vergelegen and probably by the Sneewindt house. These buildings were the most likely progenitors of the transverse plan which characterized the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century.

9.3 THE VILLAGE OF STELLENBOSCH

The analysis of Stellenbosch and its buildings presented in this chapter differs substantially from previous descriptions of the village in secondary sources. Most of these descriptions have internal contradictions which have not been acknowledged. The present reassessment does not claim to be definitive, but attempts to reconcile these contradictions where possible. This has resulted in a markedly different village plan, and in different interpretations of the available evidence regarding individual buildings.

The only representation of the village of Stellenbosch during the period of this thesis is E V Stade's perspective dating from the 15th February 1710 [Fig 188]. The earliest surviving survey plan of the village, drawn by Hertzog in 1817 [Fig 189], dates from more than a century later. Because of the importance of Stade's drawing and its possible misinterpretation in previous publications, it has been analysed in detail in Chapter 9.3.2. This reinterpretation of Stade's perspective has been used to establish the positions of the buildings discussed in Chapters 9.3.1, 9.3.3 and 9.3.4. These revised identifications are listed in Chapter 9.3.2 (pp474-476), and are shown on Figure 198.

Before addressing the visual evidence, though, it is necessary to present the written evidence derived from the Company's records and the accounts of contemporary visitors to the Cape, and to see whether this evidence correlates with its interpretation in the secondary sources.

9.3.1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE VILLAGE

Although the decision to establish a village at Stellenbosch was made only in 1685, the Council of Policy had already resolved on the 28th September 1683 to establish a school in the new district, following a request from the thirty families who had already settled there.

The Company's masons and carpenters would assist in the erection of the school-master's house, where lessons would be given and a sermon preached on Sundays. The Company would also provide the nails for the building (there being as yet no smithy in the district), but all other materials would have to be supplied by the community [1].

A "church" was also mentioned on the 13th December 1684, when it was stated that a "kerckje" had been built ("aengetimmert"), which had already been visited on a number of occasions by the minister at the Cape, Joannes Overnij [2]. This "kerckje" was probably attached to the school-house itself, described above as having a space which doubled as a classroom and a chapel, as the first church in Stellenbosch itself was begun only in 1687 [3].

According to Smuts, A M Hugo "argues convincingly" that the school building could

have been on the site of the present town hall, where four small buildings are shown in Stade's drawing of 1710 [Figs 188 & 190]. This site was purchased in 1687 by the schoolmaster and sick-comforter Mancadan, shortly after having been married.

However, the evidence suggests the opposite, as there is no reason why Mancadan should have paid for a house already provided for his use by the Company and the freeburghers. It is more likely that the original school was located outside the village, which had not yet been established when the school was built in 1683, and that Mancadan now required another more convenient property within the village itself for himself and his new wife. Moreover, the four buildings on the property could have been built by the previous owner, Abraham Pyl, for his wagon-making business. One of these could have served as the schoolroom, which would have explained Mancadan's choice of this particular property [4].

Boeseken mentions that in 1685 Commissioner van Rheede instructed the freeburghers to build a school-house ("in haeste een bequaem school op te maken") [5], suggesting that a new building in the village was intended. In the light of the delays that will be described below concerning the church and the drostdy, it is not improbable that this project was never begun. Mancadan may well have lost patience and solved the problem himself, particularly given that the date of his purchase of the site coincides with the year of completion of both church and drostdy.

Vos, on the other hand, suggests that the church-schoolroom built in 1683 was a "rudimentary wooden building" on the churchyard site itself [6]. This, he believes, was used as a temporary church until the "permanent" church was erected in 1687 (see below). He suggests further that the reason for the "first church service", held on the 13th October 1686 (see below), having been conducted in a freeburgher's house was that the church-schoolroom was too small for the enlarged congregation [7]. However, it is unlikely that a farmhouse or a barn, filled with agricultural implements and produce, would have afforded more space for worship than a room built specifically for the purpose. It is more probable that the sick-comforter's house was too distant for the convenience of the Commander and his retinue on this occasion.

The decision to establish a village at Stellenbosch was made by Commander Simon van

der Stel and Commissioner Hendrick Adriaen van Rheede in May 1685 [8]. By this time ninety families had been granted land in the district, necessitating the erection of a church and a drostdy [9].

It is possible that some of the villagers' houses had already been erected at Stellenbosch, as Boeseken describes Van Rheede as having visited the "new village" on the 21st May 1685. He stayed in one of the freeburghers' houses, which he described as being very neatly and properly built. However, he was critical about the layout of the village. The plots were placed too far apart, and no provision had been made for any roads. He therefore noted in his Journal on the 23rd May that the village needed to be properly planned, with a public square and a site for the projected church [10].

Van Rheede stated further in his instructions of the 16th July 1685 that a court-house ("gerechtshuijs") or drostdy, which would also serve as the Landdrost's dwelling, was to be built on the island in the river, which had been named Stellenbosch [11]. One of its rooms was to be reserved for the meetings of the Landdrost and Heemraden ("een kamer tot de bijeenkomst der Heemraden voormeldt") [12].

The projected church, however, was to be postponed until other far more necessary works had been undertaken ("de veelvuldige nodiger wercken"). Worship would take place in the interim in a temporary shed ("opgeslage loots"). This instruction suggests that the "church" depicted in Stade's drawing was never intended as the final building, but was merely a temporary structure [13].

Vos' suggestion that this temporary church was in fact the church-schoolroom erected in 1683 [14] is unconvincing, assuming as it does that Van Rheede's instructions were that an existing "opgeslage loots" should be used for the purpose. The wording of the instruction, however, does not support this interpretation. A building containing at least one room for the sick-comforter as well as the room used as a classroom and for church services would hardly have been described as a shed ("loots"). Moreover, had this building served the purpose, it would have been described as the "sick-comforter's house" or the "school-house", and not as a "flung-together shed" ("opgeslage loots").

A more probable interpretation of Van Rheede's words is that a temporary shed was to be built for use as an interim church until circumstances permitted the erection of a

permanent structure. That this is apparently what was done is attested by the simplicity of the temporary church and the speed of its erection, once it had finally been commenced in 1687 (see below). The siting of the permanent church at the end of the present Church Street had probably already been determined, explaining the lack of development along Drostdy Street prior to its erection between 1719 and 1723 (see below), as seen in the absence of buildings here in Stade's perspective of 1710 [Fig 188].

Van Rheede specified further that no more farmland was to be given out between the church and the river, as this area was to be reserved for those persons who were not in possession of farms. These were the minister, the schoolmaster, the sexton, the smith, the wheelwright and the pedlar, and any others who might later be needed for the convenience of the community. Their houses were to be built next to each other, facing the river, thereby creating a neat village street, and leaving enough room behind for private vegetable gardens [15]. Two buildings facing towards the river with their gardens behind are shown in the middle block on Stade's 1710 drawing [Fig 188], but by this time the lower side of the present Dorp Street had been more continuously built upon than the upper, with rear gardens extending down to the river [Fig 190].

Van Rheede was clearly referring to the site of the temporary church here, but his instructions made no reference to whether a site for the permanent structure was also selected in 1685. However, the location of the present church and its relationship with the drostdy [Fig 189] accords more closely with the orderliness demanded by the Visiting Commissioner than the informal siting of the temporary church. It is therefore not improbable that the site of the present church was reserved from the outset on Van Rheede's instructions [16].

Boeseken suggests that Simon van der Stel complied with Van Rheede's instructions regarding the church by waiting "a couple of years" before commencing its construction [17]. However, the drostdy was similarly postponed, suggesting rather that the delay was caused by Van der Stel's procrastination [18], and that the "church" which he erected was in fact the temporary "opgeslage loots". It was actually only a year later that Van der Stel next visited Stellenbosch, when he finally gave orders on the 29th July 1686 for the erection of the church and drostdy ("tot den opbouw van Gods- en

Compagnies huijsen") [19]. A supervisor of the churchyard was also appointed, suggesting that its extent had already been determined and that burials were performed prior to the erection of the church itself, as was the case in Cape Town [20].

Permission was also given in an edict of the 5th August 1686 for the inhabitants of Stellenbosch to hold an annual fair ("vrijen jaar-merckt"). This would commence on the 1st October every year and continue for two weeks, during which period they would be permitted to erect their tents and stalls in the village [21].

Before the end of August a company of craftsmen and labourers was sent to Stellenbosch to begin the construction of the church and the drostdy. These comprised five German labourers ("Duitse knegs"), two Company's brick-makers and fourteen slaves, all under the command of the Company's chief carpenter, Adriaan van Brakel [22]. Three weeks passed without any word of progress being received from Stellenbosch, prompting a firm letter of reprimand to Van Brakel [23]. Van der Stel followed this letter with a visit of inspection on the 12th October 1686, prior to the celebration of his birthday on the 14th.

He was met half-way at De Cuijlen by Van Brakel, full of excuses ("oorlopende van ekskuse") [24], and then proceeded to Stellenbosch where he inspected the brick-kiln and the carpenters' shop. These he found in a state of total confusion ("leggende alles over hoop en in confusie"), and virtually nothing had been achieved. The unburnt bricks were exposed to the weather, and the carpenters had completed only five window frames [25].

On the following day, Sunday the 13th October, the "first church service" was held by the minister "Overney" in one of the freeburghers' houses [26]. Monday the 14th was taken up with Van der Stel's birthday festivities, but on Tuesday the 15th he laid out the plots surrounding the church of the incipient village. He also inspected the works again, and his secretary claimed that as a result of his visit more had been achieved in the two days of his presence than in the previous six weeks [27]. As an example, only five window frames had been completed prior to his arrival, whereas now there were ten [28].

Progress continued, and Johannes Mulder, who had been appointed Landdrost in July

1685, informed Van der Stel in writing that the foundation stone of the drostdy had already been laid by the 22nd October 1686 [29]. However, the shortage of workmen and the poor productivity of the brick-maker continued to delay the works, as outlined in a letter of the 21st December from Mulder to Van der Stel. The Commander replied on Christmas Eve that some of the slaves under the control of the Landdrost should be used to assist with the masonry work and the loading of wagons [30].

Van der Stel visited Stellenbosch again on the 3rd January 1687, together with the minister "Overneij", in order to inaugurate the new members of the church council. Other matters, however, were of greater concern to him. The brick-maker had apparently sold 4000 bricks to a private burgher, and was consequently put in chains until his work for the Company had been completed. The masons would have fared no better, had they not been able to blame the negligence of the Landdrost for the unavailibility of the necessary building materials, stating also that he had visited the drostdy site on two occasions only.

The Landdrost was reprimanded again by Van der Stel, but the most serious lack of progress concerned the carpenters. These had been assisting the freeburghers in the erection of their houses instead of preparing timber for the church and the drostdy. The Commander's response was to place the chief carpenter under house arrest [31]. The wood-cutters were also subjected to cross-examination, and Lieutenant Olof Bergh was appointed as their overseer. Within a week all the timber for the drostdy had been brought from the forest at Jonkershoek, and wood-cutting for the church was begun in the forests at Hottentots-Holland.

Van der Stel remained at Stellenbosch for a week in order to supervise the firing of the two brick-kilns, which were large enough to provide bricks for both the church and the drostdy. By the end of the week the walls of the drostdy had been raised sufficiently high for the beams above the first floor ("boven d'eerste verdieping") to be placed in position. According to the secretary, more progress had been made in these six days than in the previous six months [32].

Good progress continued to be made on the drostdy, and the roof beams ("bovenste balken") were installed fourteen days later. By the middle of April 1687 the building

had been completed, as noted by Van der Stel in a letter to Amsterdam [33].

The construction of the church, however, progressed more slowly. Difficulties were encountered in transporting the heavy roof beams from Hottentots-Holland, a task undertaken by the freeburghers' wagons alone until Olof Bergh was given permission by the Commander to use the Company's wagons as well [34].

Nevertheless, the foundation stone was to be laid on the 14th February 1687, as mentioned the previous day in a letter to the Commander from the chief mason Douwe Steyn, who was supervisor of works on the church. This ceremony appears to have gone unnoticed and unrecorded: Hugo notes that it was attended by none of the members of the Council of Policy, and suggests that even the Landdrost might have been absent [35].

According to Hugo there is no further record of the construction of the church, apart from in the letter to Amsterdam written by Van der Stel in mid-April, when it was mentioned together with the drostdy as having been completed. Hugo questions whether it could have been completed in a mere two months, and suggests that it was still under construction at the time that the letter was written [36]. However, given the speed with which the drostdy was built, and the fact that this "church" was merely an "opgeslage loots", it is not improbable that it was already finished.

Both the church and the drostdy had certainly been completed by the 13th October 1687, when Van der Stel arrived at Stellenbosch for his birthday celebrations the following day [37]. He was entertained in the new drostdy that evening [38], and the next morning he inspected the church. This was described as being 40 feet long and 22 feet wide, and Van der Stel gave instructions for a small belltower to be erected on the roof. This is the turret visible in Stade's drawing [Fig 202] [39].

The first service was held in the church on the 19th October. Here it is described as "nieuwgeboude", suggesting that it had only recently been completed [40]. This supports Hugo's contention that it was not yet finished by mid-April, and it is also unlikely that it would have stood unused for the previous six months. It is possible, though, that services were held by the sick-comforter prior to the official consecration.

By this time a village mill had also been erected [41]. The first mill at Stellenbosch had been built outside the village by the freeburgher Douwe Steyn, on the property first referred to in 1697 as the "Oude Molen" [42]. This mill, however, had already become unusable by 1687, with the result that the Stellenbosch farmers had to travel all the way to Cape Town to have their grain ground. Permission was therefore granted on the 4th August for a new water-mill to be erected, on condition that it would be financed by the community [43]. The newly erected mill was inspected by Simon van der Stel on the 14th October 1687. It was across the river from the drostdy and slightly upstream, and did not conform to the orthogonal grid, as revealed in Stade's drawing [Fig 203] [44].

Apart from the church, the drostdy and the mill outlined above, three "colonieshuisen" were built in Stellenbosch prior to 1710, the first two in 1693 and the third in 1694. According to Hugo, these houses were erected by the Landdrost and Heemraden and were intended to be rented out for the benefit of the colony. All three, however, were also used at times for the accommodation of the colony's officials, when alternative lodgings were not available [45].

The first of them to be used for this purpose ("Colonieshuis 3") appears to have been the last to be built, as it was the one erected in 1694. It was occupied as a parsonage in 1700 by Hercules van Loon, the first permanent minister at Stellenbosch, who was appointed in March of that year. The house was on the north-eastern corner of the present Dorp and Ryneveld Streets [Fig 198, No 7], conveniently located between the church and the drostdy [46].

Van Loon probably continued to live in this "colonieshuis" until his death in 1704, as his suicide was committed on the way back to Stellenbosch from his farm behind the Joostenberg, according to Kolbe [47]. After his death the house was let out to a freeburgher, but was repossessed for the use of the Landdrost in September 1707, following the partial collapse of the drostdy [48]. It was subsequently used for the next 120 years as the official residence of the secretary of the Heemraden [49].

The second of the "colonieshuisen" to be mentioned ("Colonieshuis 2") was built in 1693, and was on the south-western corner of Church and Ryneveld streets [Fig 198, No 8]. This house served as the parsonage for Henrikus Beck, who had been the

minister at Drakenstein but took over the ministry of Stellenbosch after the death of Van Loon. The house survived the fire of 1710 (see below) without damage, and was inhabited by Beck for sixteen years until he returned to Cape Town [50].

The suicide of Van Loon could explain the vacation of the first parsonage, but the second parsonage was also much closer to the temporary church. Facing each other across Church street, this arrangement would have been more convenient for the minister and his parishioners.

The third of the "colonieshuisen" to be mentioned ("Colonieshuis 1") was also built in 1693, and was used by the sick-comforter Jan Swart before it was occupied by his successor Jan Mahieu, who also acted as secretary to the Heemraaden. According to Hugo, he occupied this house from 1702, although the minister Van Loon had already approached the Council of Policy for permission for him to do so on the 29th March 1701 (see Note 47, above).

Hugo is convinced that this house was on the north-western corner of Dorp and Ryneveld streets, as it was described as being "regt over 't Colonies huijs bewoond bij den predicant Hercules van Loon" [51]. Moreover, he attributes the absence of any building on this plot in Stade's drawing to an oversight on the part of the artist, stating that the siting of Mahieu's house which he describes is firmly established [52].

However, his certainty is questionable, particularly with regard to Stade's so-called omission of the house. The words "regt over" did not necessarily mean that the two buildings faced each other directly. Valentyn used the words "regt tegen over" to describe the diagonal relationship between the Company's stable and the entrance to the guest house in the gardens above Cape Town, and Kolbe described the similarly diagonal relationship between the Cape Town church and parsonage as "tegen de Kerk over staat" [53].

If a similar use of contemporary Dutch were being followed here, it would indicate that the "colonieshuis" in question was on the south-western rather than the north-western corner of the intersection between Dorp and Ryneveld streets. It would thus have been diagonally opposite the parsonage, and have corresponded with the building adjoining the most prominent house shown on Stade's drawing [Fig 203 and Fig 198, No 9] [54].

In May 1704 Mahieu purchased the site from the Company for 900 Cape guilders and proceeded to renovate the house and enlarge it ("geheel en al te vernuwe en te vergroot") [55]. These building works were still under construction in December 1705, as related by Adam Tas. His description is worth quoting in full: "Am also told that with the heavy rains Mr. Mahieu, the sick-discomforter (sic), hath a deal of damage done to his new house, and do put the same at a round f.1000, wherein I vow he do not lessen it. They say there is a chimney or two, besides an oven, fallen in. Who knows how much more this new house, that already is so long a-building, is like to cost ere it be finished? As tedious it is in the manner of its building as the man do have it built is tedious in all his concernments, even unto the fashion of his speech" [56].

To return to Stade's drawing [Fig 203], a taller and gable-ended rectangular building is depicted abutting the lower L-shaped "colonieshuis" on the corner, but both are shown with individual entrances. This suggests that Mahieu did not rebuild the house he bought from the Company, as otherwise he would have had nowhere to live, but built another one adjoining it.

This would correspond not only with Stade's depiction of these two buildings, in comparison with the absence of any building across the road, but also with the damage described by Tas in his diary. It is not improbable that the small building with a chimney, parallel to the front wing of the house and aligned with the back of the rearward wing of the older house, was an outside kitchen. This could well have been the oven which was so severely damaged in December 1705 [57].

One of these two adjoining buildings must have been the house referred to on the 17th September 1707, when instructions were given for the meetings of the Landdrost and Heemraden to be held "at the house of Jan Mahieu, the secretary" until the partially collapsed drostdy had been repaired [58].

Mahieu seems to have been relieved of his duties as schoolmaster, a post that was not re-occupied until 1708. By this time the old school building was no longer available [59], suggesting that classes had previously been held in one of Mahieu's two adjoining houses. Permission was therefore granted on the 6th June 1708 for lessons to be held in the "porch" of the church [60].

There was also a gaol at Stellenbosch, as was mentioned on the 15th March 1704. Following the escape of two imprisoned slaves, the constable in command blamed this incident on the absence of locks (sic) in the building, which he claimed was also defective in other unspecified respects [61]. Unfortunately there was no indication of the site of the gaol, but Kolbe mentioned that it was next to the drostdy [62].

The only other building mentioned in the Resolutions of the Council of Policy was the Colony's stable, which was burned down in the fire of 1710 (see below). According to Hugo this building, erected by Matthys Diederik in the summer of 1698/1699, was 70 feet long and 21 feet wide [63], but there does not appear to be any contemporary information on its precise location [64].

The last aspect of Stellenbosch which needs to be addressed here is the planting of oaks along its streets, particularly given the absence of any such trees in Stade's drawing [Fig 188] [65]. The planting of the oaks at Stellenbosch is usually attributed to Simon van der Stel. However, it was only after he had been succeeded as Governor by his son Wilhem Adriaen that this was first mentioned in the Company's records consulted in the compilation of this thesis.

This was on the 13th July 1701, when a wagon was sent from the Cape with a load of oak saplings to be planted along the "public ways" or streets of the village [66]. These, however, were vandalised by some of the inhabitants, and orders were given on the 11th August 1702 that future offenders would be severely punished [67]. A further request for trees to be planted to "adorn the ways" of the village was received from the Landdrost of Stellenbosch on the 4th February 1710. His request was approved on the 10th, on condition that he and his Council undertook the work of planting the trees [68].

This entry is particularly interesting for two reasons. First, it suggests that the Stellenbosch oaks date only from after the Van der Stel period. Second, it reveals that the oak trees were already being appreciated more for their appearance than for their usefulness. While the oaks along the streets of Stellenbosch were certainly not planted as a source of timber, they did serve the practical purpose of providing shade for the buildings which lined these streets. This aspect, however, was not mentioned.

Although the village contained a total of only 22 buildings at the time of Stade's visit in February 1710, it already displayed a clear sense of architectural ordering, suggesting that it was planned from the outset. This would have been in accordance with the instructions of Commissioner van Rheede outlined above, and carried out by its founder Simon van der Stel. Whereas later country towns of the 18th century such as Swellendam and Tulbagh grew in a linear manner along their main streets, the buildings of Stellenbosch were already conforming to an orthogonal grid before Dorp Street had been continuously built up. Stellenbosch thus followed the precedent established in Cape Town of a geometrically rather than an organically ordered plan.

The Stellenbosch depicted in Stade's drawing was largely destroyed in a fire on the 17th December 1710. This fire, which began in the drostdy, burned down the stables, twelve houses and the church, as was related to the Council of Policy the following day [69]. It could have been this disaster that stimulated the markedly different developments that characterized the architecture of the later 18th century in the inland districts. However, the analysis of this possibility is beyond the chronology of the present thesis, which terminates fourteen days after the fire.

9.3.2 AN ANALYSIS OF E V STADE'S PERSPECTIVE OF THE VILLAGE

The perspective of Stellenbosch drawn by E V Stade and dated the 15th February 1710 [Fig 188] is the only visual representation of the village during the proto-Cape Dutch period, and therefore of central importance as contemporary evidence. However, its accuracy has been questioned both with regard to the form of the individual buildings and to their relationships with each other, as outlined below. The purpose of the present analysis is to re-assess the accuracy of Stade's drawing, and to find explanations for its minor inaccuracies.

This perspective formed the basis of a plan drawn by the architect M C Stander [Fig 190] which was first illustrated in Hugo and Van der Bijl's "Die Kerk van Stellenbosch" [1]. It was given added credibility by its inclusion in Smuts' "Stellenbosch Three Centuries" [2], where it was accepted by Fransen [Fig 192] with only minor alterations [3]. It was also acknowledged by Vos, who had reservations about the positions of the mill and the stable [4], but used it as the basis for his

archaeological excavations of the houses identified on the plan [Fig 193].

The identification of the earliest buildings in Stellenbosch was first undertaken by Cruse in 1937 [5]. His attributions were made entirely on the basis of title-deeds, without reference to Stade's perspective which had not yet been discovered. Cruse's research was augmented in 1963 by Van der Bijl [6], who attempted to attach title-deeds to the houses depicted by Stade, as shown on Stander's plan [Fig 190]. This plan, however, appears to have been constructed retrospectively from the present street layout of Stellenbosch, as it does not correspond with the relationships between the buildings depicted by Stade. Moreover, some of the buildings shown are absent from Stade's drawing, and others have been given more complex plans than can be deduced from it.

This lack of correlation was acknowledged by Hugo and Van der Bijl, who attributed it to inaccuracy on the part of the contemporary artist. They therefore commissioned Stander to produce a "corrected" version of Stade's perspective [Fig 191]. Stander's drawing, which also "corrects" Stade's hipped roofs to gabled and half-hipped ends, was taken from a different viewpoint and thus obscures its lack of correspondence with the positions of the buildings on Stade's perspective. The "corrected" perspective has since been discredited [7], but the accuracy of the plan off which it was constructed has not been questioned except in matters of detail. No acknowledgement has been made of the evident discrepancies between Stander's plan and Stade's perspective, and no attempt has been made to reconcile the contradictions.

It is the contention of this thesis that Stade was drawing to the best of his ability what he saw with his own eyes. The corollary of this statement is that the buildings "omitted" by Stade were not yet in existence by February 1710. A detailed analysis of the relationships between the buildings depicted by Stade suggests that the original block sizes were hardly more than half the depth of those of the present street plan, thus approximating more closely to the precedent of the square blocks already established in Cape Town [Fig 198].

This analysis was based first on a scrutiny of the correspondence between the buildings and the ground lines depicted on the Stade perspective [Fig 194]. These horizontal lines parallel to the principal picture plane were identified on Stade's drawing and converted

into a hypothetical plan [Fig 195]. This plan was then superimposed on Hertzog's 1817 survey, a process which suggested certain amendments to Stade's ground lines, as his perspective was distorted with regard to the relationships between some of the buildings and plot boundaries, as described below.

The amended hypothetical plan [Fig 196], adjusted in detail but not in principle, has a closer correspondence with Stade's perspective than that shown on Stander's plan. The only major discrepancies are that two of the houses on the southern side of Dorp Street extend too far forward, that one of the buildings on its northern side is set too far back, and that the church is overscaled in width and depth. These "inaccuracies" are indicated in the diagrammatic plan of the ground lines derived from Stade's perspective [Fig 197].

The discrepancies are explained by an analysis of the geometrical construction of Stade's perspective, which corresponds with his method as seen in his other five depictions of the Cape in 1710. He began by drawing the landscape from a position too distant from the village for any detail to be seen. From this position he also located the corners of the village blocks. He then moved closer to the village, and drew its buildings from at least three different viewpoints, each with its own vanishing point. This explains the extended length of the houses south of Dorp Street and the "misorientation" of the church with regard to the principal vanishing point. He also exaggerated the size of the church to emphasize its importance, as has already been seen in his depiction of the Cape Town church.

In order to compare Stander's reconstructed plan [Fig 190] with the revised plan proposed by the present author [Fig 198], two further perspectives have been constructed from the principal viewpoint identified in Stade's 1710 perspective. These two diagrammatic perspectives show only the buildings for which ground lines can be established from Stade's drawing, and omit all those to the east of Ryneveld Street, including the drostdy.

The buildings to the east of Ryneveld Street are not in dispute here. However, the two perspectives reveal that the buildings depicted to the west of this street in Stade's drawing [Fig 200] correlate less closely in the perspective projected off Stander's plan

[Fig 199] than in the perspective projected off the present author's reinterpreted plan [Fig 201]. Apart from Stander's disacknowledgement of the continuation of Ryneveld Street, which will be addressed below, the most noticeable discrepancy in the perspective constructed from his plan concerns the block in the foreground between Dorp Street and Church Street. In addition to the mislocation of the buildings discussed below and in Chapter 9.3.5, the distance between the two houses facing Church Street is too great to be reconciled with the evidence of Stade's perspective.

The reinterpreted plan thus challenges not only the extent of the original village blocks of Stellenbosch, but also relocates the "original church" identified by Hugo and accepted by Vos [8]. The archaeological correspondence with the buildings depicted by Stade, of which firm evidence exists only in the case of two buildings ("Colonieshuis 3" and the Schreuder house), and the site histories of the buildings identified, will be discussed in Chapters 9.3.3, 9.3.4 and 9.3.5. Here, though, a more detailed analysis is required of the relationships between the buildings shown in Stade's perspective.

For clarity, these have been given alternative attributions where necessary, followed by question marks. Previous identifications of these buildings appear in brackets, and those buildings which do not correspond with Stade's perspective have been noted. The derivation of the revised attributions will be explained in Chapters 9.3.3, 9.3.4 and 9.3.5. The buildings have been numbered on the reinterpreted plan [Fig 198] as follows:-

1 Drostdy (agrees with Stander and Vos as regards siting).
2 Gaol and kitchen?
3 Unidentified?
4 Mill? - (Scheffer house, according to Stander and Vos; also annotated by Vos as Conterman house).
5 Colony's stables?
6 Church? (mislocated by Stander and Vos).
7 "Colonieshuis 3" (agreeing with Stander and Vos).
8 "Colonieshuis 2", or Parsonage (agreeing with Stander and Vos).
9 "Colonieshuis 1"? - (Pietersz house, according to Stander and Vos).
10 Mahieu's house? - (vacant according to Stander; Couchet house, according to Vos).

11 Pietersz house? - (vacant according to Stander; Colony's stables according to Vos).

12 Linnes' cellar (agreeing with Stander; Linnes' house according to Vos).

13 Schreuder house (agreeing with Stander and Vos).

14 Conterman's house? - (vacant according to Stander and Vos).

15 Conterman's forge? - (vacant according to Stander and Vos).

16 Conterman's charcoal store? - (vacant according to Stander and Vos).

17 Van Tonderen's buildings? - (vacant according to Stander and Vos).

18 Sax house (according to Stander); Saxenhof (according to Vos) - built after Stade's visit but before the 1710 fire?

19 Van den Berg house (according to Stander and Vos) - built after Stade's visit but before the 1710 fire?

20 Coopman house (according to Stander and Vos) - built after Stade's visit but before the 1710 fire?

21 Van Wijk house (according to Stander); Diederik house (according to Vos) - built after Stade's visit but before the 1710 fire?

22 Swart house (according to Stander and Vos) - built after Stade's visit but before the 1710 fire?

23 Emmenes house (according to Stander and Vos) - built after Stade's visit but before the 1710 fire?

24 Mahieu's house and "Colonieshuis 1" (according to Stander and Vos) - mislocated: absent on Stade's perspective.

25 Couchet's house? (mislocated by Vos at No 10) - probably built after the 1710 fire: absent on Stade's perspective.

26 Unidentified (Vos) - absent on Stade's perspective.

27 Unidentified (Vos) - absent on Stade's perspective.

28 Conterman house (according to Stander); Linnes' cellar (according to Vos) - absent on Stade's perspective.

29 Callebassen Craal (Vos) - absent on Stade's perspective.

30 Van Tonderen's buildings (according to Stander and Vos) - mislocated with regard to Stade's perspective.

The different categories of buildings have been represented on the revised plan [Fig 198] in the following graphic convention:-

A. Buildings located in terms of the ground lines on Stade's perspective: hatched with solid outlines.
B. Buildings on Stade's perspective where ground lines cannot be established: hatched with dotted outlines.
C. Buildings dating from after Stade's visit but probably erected before the 1710 fire: unhatched with solid outlines.
D. Buildings for which there is no evidence prior to 1710, and those which have previously been mislocated: unhatched with dotted outlines.

Having clarified the positions on the revised plan [Fig 198] of the buildings depicted on Stade's perspective [Fig 188], the accuracy of his drawing can be addressed in detail. With regard to the village as a whole, the plan reconstructed by Stander [Fig 190] contradicts Stade's evidence in four respects. These concern the width of the streets, the depth of the blocks, the location of the buildings on the southern side of Dorp Street, and the buildings "omitted" by Stade.

Stander's plan depicts Dorp Street and Church Street as roughly equal in width, with Plein Street being about a third wider. Stade's perspective, however, shows Plein and Church Streets as approximately equal in width, with Dorp Street two and a half times wider. Stander's plan appears at first sight to correspond with the street widths depicted on Hertzog's survey plan of 1817 [Fig 189], but a closer analysis of this 1817 plan reveals that Stade's widths could well have been accurate.

Hertzog shows a T-plan house on Dorp Street directly to the west of the prison which closed off the pre-1710 extension of Ryneveld Street. This house, which differs in plan from its rectangular neighbours, is set back from Dorp Street to the extent of the width of the present street. It is unlikely that only one house in the entire street frontage should have been sited so far from the street edge, suggesting that it predated the rectangular houses built alongside. If this is the case, it is possible that Dorp Street was halved in width after the 1803 fire, accounting for the positions of the rectangular houses, but that this T-plan house survived the fire and continued to demarcate the line of the original street edge. Hertzog's evidence suggests, therefore, that the L-shaped "Colonieshuis 1" was rebuilt after the fire of 1710 as a T-plan structure, but that the other houses shown by Stade ceased to exist after the fire of 1803 [9].

In the case of Plein Street, the evidence of Hertzog suggests that the street was widened rather than narrowed. Assuming that "Van Tonderen's" buildings were destroyed in the 1710 fire and that they were not rebuilt [10], such a widening would not have been impracticable. Here the original street width is probably indicated by the position of the mill-stream as it appears to the east of Ryneveld Street, corresponding roughly as it does with the width of Church Street, as shown in Stade's perspective. In terms of street widths, therefore, Stade's evidence can be vindicated in the light of Hertzog's survey plan.

The depth of the village blocks was derived from an analysis of the relationships between the ground lines of the buildings depicted by Stade. These are shown only to the foreground of Ryneveld Street, and are difficult to establish with accuracy when the corners of the buildings are obscured by shrubbery. Nevertheless, an attempt has been made to approximate these relationships [Figs 194 & 198] and to reconcile them with the plot boundaries shown on Hertzog's survey plan of 1817 [Figs 196 & 197].

Beginning in the foreground, Stade shows "Conterman's house" (No 14) slightly to the west of his "forge" (No 15) and the two western buildings of "Van Tonderen" (No 17). The eastern ends of these two buildings align with the eastern end of "Conterman's house", but his "forge" is displaced slightly further eastwards. The back of the "forge" is also shown as aligning with the western side of "Mahieu's house" (No 10), which is aligned with the closer side of its out-buildings.

The church (No 6) projects slightly further westwards than the fronts of the rearward range of "Van Tonderen's" buildings, which align with the eastern ends of the out-buildings of "Mahieu". The eastern sides of "Van Tonderen's" rearward range of buildings are approximately in line with the centre of the church.

Slightly beyond this line is the front of "Conterman's charcoal store" (No 16), which is aligned with the junction between "Mahieu's house" (No 10) and "Colonieshuis 1" (No 9). The rear of this storehouse is shown by Stade as corresponding with the eastern end of the church.

The precise location of the parsonage ("Colonieshuis 2" - No 8) is difficult to establish, given the vegetation which obscures its ground line. Nevertheless, it appears to have

been sited further to the east than the eastern ends of the church and "Conterman's charcoal store", as supported by Hertzog's plan.

Across Ryneveld Street, Stade's ground lines suggest that the "Pietersz" house (No 11), on the south-eastern corner of Dorp Street, encroached upon the street in question. This concurs with Hertzog's survey plan of 1817, which shows the prison narrower than the rest of the street which it closed off, providing further evidence of Stade's accuracy with respect to linear relationships.

However, Stade's perspective is clearly inaccurate with regard to the relationships between the buildings on either side of Dorp Street, and to the enlargement and displacement of the church. The reasons for these distortions have been outlined above, but it is necessary here to reconcile them with the evidence provided by Hertzog's survey plan.

If "Conterman's charcoal store" were located westwards to correspond with the plot subdivision indicated by Hertzog, and if the church were reduced to the dimensions recorded in documentary sources, the two structures would correspond not only in depth, but also with Hertzog's plot boundaries [Fig 196]. However, the discrepancies between the locations of the buildings on either side of Dorp Street are irreconcilable, and can be explained only through the analysis of Stade's method presented above.

Stander attempted to reconcile his reconstructed plan [Fig 190] with Stade's perspective [Fig 188] by relocating the houses on the southern side of Dorp Street two plots further to the west. This resulted in a vacant plot between the houses of "Pietersz" (No 9 as shown on Stander's plan) and Sax (No 18), which ought to have corresponded with the width of Ryneveld Street.

This is the crucial error in Stander's plan, as Stade clearly shows a street between these two houses. The "Pietersz" house (No 11 in reality) was therefore located on the south-eastern corner of Dorp and Ryneveld Streets, where Vos locates the stables. These, however, are more likely to have been the large building (No 5) at the southern end of Ryneveld Street which, together with its associated pound (see Chapter 9.3.3), would have closed off the street. The building shown by Stade on the south-western corner of this intersection was thus "Colonieshuis 1" (No 9), with "Mahieu:s additions" (No 10)

next door, on the plot shown as vacant on Stander's plan. The houses of Sax (No 18) and Van den Berg (No 19) on the following two plots were probably correctly identified, but erected only after Stade's visit.

The present author's revised plan of the village [Fig 198] reveals that five other previously identified houses on the block between Dorp, Church and Ryneveld Streets are likewise not shown on Stade's drawing. These are the Coopman house (No 20, tentatively located by Vos), the Van Wijk/Diederik house (No 21), the Swart house (No 22), the Emmenes house (No 23) and "Mahieu's house" (No 24). With the exception of "Mahieu's house", which will be addressed below, these four plots together with those of Sax and Van den Berg were all granted in 1704 [11]. It is intriguing, therefore, that they had not yet been built upon by February 1710 when Stade made his visit, particularly since all lands granted in Stellenbosch had to be built upon within three years [12].

However, given that the original title-deeds of these properties were probably kept in the houses in question, and that copies of them were probably lodged in the drostdy, it is not unlikely that all of them were destroyed in the fire. If this were the case, it would have been necessary to produce replacement title-deeds. It is possible that an error was introduced at this stage, and that the date of 1704 given to all six properties should have been 1709. It could also be that whoever drew up these replacement title-deeds (probably Johannes Mulder, recalled from retirement to serve as Landdrost) wrote his "9" so similarly to a "4" that Van der Bijl misread the evidence [13]. Without having seen the deeds in question, however, this can be no more than speculation.

Nevertheless, a date of 1709 for a significant expansion of the village is more likely than 1704, as the political uncertainty of the last years of the Van der Stel regime had been followed by the evident stability of the governorship of Van Assenburgh. If these six properties were granted in 1709 rather than five years earlier, construction could have commenced after Stade's visit in February 1710 and have been completed by December, when the village was largely destroyed by fire.

Significantly, the report on the fire outlined in the Journal [14] states that twelve houses were destroyed. However, only ten houses corresponding with Stade's perspective are

shown on Stander's plan, and four of these survived the fire without damage. These were Mahieu's house (No 10, mislocated on Stander's plan), "Colonieshuis 3" (No 7), the Schreuder house (No 13) and the parsonage or "Colonieshuis 2" (No 8), as well as the non-residential cellar (No 12) which was later to serve as a church. Subtracting these four houses gives a total of only six which could have been burned down, providing further circumstantial evidence that the extra six houses (not shown by Stade) must have been built between February and December 1710. If these were all destroyed in the fire, they would account for the total number of twelve houses recorded in the official report.

The other house on the plot between Dorp, Church and Ryneveld Streets, shown by Stander despite its absence in Stade's drawing, is that previously attributed to the sick-comforter Jan Mahieu. Given that this seems to have been the most pretentious house in the village [15], it is inconceivable that Stade would have overlooked it. Moreover, the orientation of this additional house as shown on Stander's plan does not correspond with its description as being "regt over" from "Colonieshuis 3". Facing Dorp Street rather than Ryneveld Street, its facade would not have been visible from that of "Colonieshuis 3".

This house has thus almost certainly been mislocated on Stander's plan, directly across from "Colonieshuis 3" (and facing away from it) instead of diagonally across [16]. The latter site corresponds with the L-shaped house identified here as "Colonieshuis 1" (No 9), which was extended by Mahieu's gable-ended addition (No 10). Stade, therefore, did not "omit" these two houses, but located them as he had seen them in February 1710.

The buildings of "Van Tonderen" (No 17) on the northern side of Plein Street do appear on Stade's perspective, but not in the position located by Stander (No 30). Moreover, Hertzog's 1817 survey plan depicts a T-shaped house on the property shown on Stander's plan, and an out-building aligned at right angles with the back of its rear wing [Fig 189]. This building, which was later to become the Wesleyan parsonage, did not follow the line of the street, as did those in Stade's drawing, but was angled to the extent of some eighteen degrees.

Its lack of alignment with Plein street suggests, therefore, that it was built outside the limits of the orthogonal village plots already proclaimed. This evidence is emphatically persuasive that the four buildings shown on this drawing in a strict geometrical alignment were set further to the east than as depicted in the plans of Stander, Fransen and Vos, and that the churchyard was not as extensive as they have shown.

The other buildings "omitted" by Stade are the Couchet house (No 25), the two unidentified buildings to the rear of the block between Dorp and Church Streets to the east of Ryneveld Street (Nos 26 and 27), the "Conterman house" as described by Stander or the "Linnes cellar" as annotated by Vos (No 28), and Callebassen Craal (29). It is unlikely, however, that any of these buildings existed prior to Stade's visit in February 1710, as will be discussed in Chapter 9.3.5.

Having attempted to reconcile the discrepancies between the visual evidence of Stade's perspective and the plan of Stander derived from the present block subdivisions, it is necessary to address a possible contradiction revealed by the documentary evidence. This concerns two pre-1710 inventories of the contents of houses not shown on Stade's drawing. One was of Callebassen Craal, drawn up in 1698, and the other was of the Diederik house, dating from 1709. It is argued in Chapter 9.3.5, however, that the owners of these two properties had not yet built houses on the sites in question, and that the inventories referred to the contents of houses located elsewhere.

The sites of the drostdy (No 1), the gaol and kitchen (No 2), the unidentified building aligned with it in the distance (No 3), the mill (No 4) and the stables (No 5) have not been discussed here, as their ground lines cannot be established from Stade's perspective. They have, however, been given tentative positions indicated by dotted lines on the reinterpreted plan [Fig 198], and will be discussed in Chapter 9.3.3.

The last building to be addressed here is the charnel house erected in 1783 to preserve the unidentified bones exhumed from the old churchyard. This was not centrally located over the ruins of the original church (as suggested by Hugo, who believed that the charnel house, identified more recently by Vos, was in fact the first church) [17], but straddled the western boundary of the original churchyard [Fig 196]. This block had probably been extended by 1783 to correspond with Andringa Street on the western

boundaries of the Diederik and Swart houses, as shown by Vos in his plan of Stellenbosch in 1780 [18].

The lack of correspondence of this plot with those to the north of Plein Street and the south of Church Street is explained by its location as a narrower plot (than those on either side) in the centre of the symmetrically subdivided block. The extension of this block and its subdivision date from seventy years after Stade's visit, and the plot sizes would not necessarily have followed those established by Van Rheede in 1685, almost a century earlier. The plan presented here [Fig 198], derived from a reinterpretation of Stade's perspective, thus proposes that the charnel house of 1783 was not built on the site of the original temporary church [19].

The evidence derived from this re-evaluation of Stade's drawing differs substantially from the reconstructed plans of Stander, Fransen and Vos. Only the two blocks in the middle foreground are shown by Stade in their entirety, and these appear to be only slightly longer than they are wide. One contains the church, and the other the houses numbered 8, and 14 to 16. The two blocks behind them, containing houses 7 and 12, and 13 respectively, would have been about half as long as those in front, but there is no evidence in the drawing that the present Drostdy Street had already been established.

The trees shown behind houses 7 and 12 have been depicted in Stander's plan as a formally planted grove, giving an axial approach to the drostdy [20]. This corresponds in part with Valentyn's description [21], except that he stated that the building was "surrounded by" and not reached from "a fine grove". It is possible, therefore, that this street had not yet been laid out, and that the drostdy was reached only from Dorp Street [22].

The only cross-street shown with certainty on Stade's drawing is the present Ryneveld Street, behind the front two village blocks. Stander's plan shows it extending into the country behind "Van Tonderen's" buildings (No 17) to the left of the church, but this extension is not visible on the 1710 drawing. Stade, however, does show this street continuing across Dorp Street towards the river (and probably closed off by the stables). This continuation is omitted on Stander's reconstructed plan, and the fact that Stade shows Dorp Street at least twice as wide as the other two streets is also ignored.

Moreover, there are explanations for the other inconsistencies between the evidence outlined above and the layout of the present town, from which Stander's reconstructed plan [Fig 190] appears to have been derived. These concern the blocks in the foreground, which are now more than twice as long as they are wide, and the fact that Ryneveld Street now meets Dorp Street in a T-junction and no longer continues across it. The two front blocks could well have been doubled in length as the village expanded, given that no cross-street is shown in the foreground of Stade's perspective. The closing off of Ryneveld Street beyond Dorp Street was probably because of the destruction of the Colony's stables in the fire of 1710 (see Chapter 9.3.3). This would not have been inconsistent with the development of Cape Town, where a far more important street leading axially from the Parade to the church was closed off during the period of this thesis [23].

As mentioned previously, Stade's drawings have been acknowledged selectively by writers in this field, and denigrated when they disagree with preconceived theories of the development of Cape Dutch architecture. While they cannot be regarded as having the accuracy of photographic documentation, they constitute the only convincing corpus of visual information on the last stages of the proto-Cape Dutch period.

Given the consistency of his style, and the confirmation of the accuracy of his drawings by other contemporary artists (as seen particularly in the case of Vergelegen, which corresponds with his depiction of Constantia and of Henning Hüsing's house in Cape Town), his record should be accorded the same validity as the equally incomplete written records of the period. In other words, his relationships between the buildings, their roof forms, their gables and their facade treatment (which he does not always show as symmetrically arranged), should be accorded greater authority.

The correlation between this reinterpretation and Stade's drawing is thus of central importance to a re-assessment of Stade's accuracy in all six of his perspectives of the Cape in 1710. Once his drawings are allowed to speak for themselves, without being subjected to an overlay of later developments and evolutionary arguments, they can be acknowledged as the most accurate representations available from the proto-Cape Dutch period.

9.3.3 THE DROSTDY AND ITS OUT-BUILDINGS

As has been described in Chapter 9.3.1, the drostdy was formally commissioned by Simon van der Stel on the 29th July 1686. It was under construction early in 1687, when Lieutenant Olof Bergh was supervising its erection by the "master-builder Baas Arie" [1], and had been completed by the middle of April [2].

This first drostdy suffered a partial collapse in 1707, as was reported on the 17th September, when the Landdrost and Heemraden were instructed to hold their meetings in the secretary's house instead [3]. The Landdrost himself was to move into the "Colonies Huis" ("Colonieshuis 3"), which was being rented by a freeburgher who would be given notice to vacate it by the end of the month [4].

A more detailed report received on the 20th September stated that part of the drostdy ("Raadhuijs") had collapsed, and that the remainder was leaking and dilapidated. It was therefore decided that the upper storey would be demolished to prevent the collapse of the rest of the structure, and that any sound timber would be salvaged. The walls of the ground floor would also be inspected to establish whether they could be retained and rebuilt, or whether they should also be taken down. It was resolved in either case that the new or rebuilt drostdy would be one storey less than its predecessor [5].

This is an important entry as it confirms that the first drostdy was double-storeyed [6], in contrast to its three single-storeyed successors [7]. This followed the precedent established by the official buildings in the Castle and by Simon van der Stel's homestead at Constantia, and would have resulted in a far more imposing structure than the other buildings in the village.

Its partial collapse only twenty years after its erection is probably explained by the inordinate haste with which it was built, caused by the impatience of Simon van der Stel. The first floor was built in the same week that its bricks were fired, and the upper floor had received its roof beams only two weeks later [8].

The rebuilding of the drostdy was evidently well under way by the 3rd April 1708, when instructions were given that thatching reeds for "the new Council House" were to be cut in the neighbourhood, and transported by the freeburghers. The ironwork was

also to be manufactured locally by the free smith, Hans Jacob Conterman, as instructed on the 4th April [9]. This reveals that the village of Stellenbosch was now beginning to develop its own industries, and was no longer solely reliant on Cape Town and the Peninsula for its building materials.

A more detailed description of the repairs to the drostdy was provided in a letter to Amsterdam dated the 18th April 1708. The first intention had been "to break it down as far as the second storey, in order to prevent its tumbling in; the woodwork was found to be quite new still, and was carefully saved; however, on a second careful examination the whole building was found to be so dilapidated, that the next wind or rain-storm would throw it over. Therefore, excepting the two front rooms and passage, the whole was broken down, and the new building is at present nearly finished, and is a storey lower than the old one, having four apartments inside" [10].

This description is also very instructive in that it suggests a front wing comprising an entrance hall flanked by a room on either side. It is probable, therefore, that the original drostdy was the exemplar for the symmetrical facades seen in some of the houses in Stade's 1710 drawing of the village, but absent from the sketches on the title-deeds of the early farmhouses in the district.

Work on the rebuilding of the drostdy proceeded slowly, however, as was noted on the 7th June 1708. It had not yet been roofed, and the winter rains had already caused part of the structure to collapse. Instructions were therefore given for the woodwork to be removed and stored until such time as the weather permitted the resumption of building operations [11]. An inventory of the building elements in storage was drawn up on the 9th July 1708: "Included were 16 doors and a total of 22 double and four single casement windows, equalling '48 vensters', each with windowpanes set in lead". There were also "Two 'dak cousijnties' or dormer windows" and six "schoorsteenmantels" or mantelpieces [12].

By the 26th October the drostdy must have been nearly completed, as the Landdrost requested a glazier to be sent from the Cape. He was required because "many panes of glass in the Council room are broken" [13]. This entry could have suggested that the windows in the other rooms were unglazed, as was the case in many of the early

buildings at the Cape, but this possibility is contradicted by the inventorial evidence.

Vos has provided a "possible reconstruction" of the drostdy in its first and second stages [Fig 204], suggesting that it was "based on existing U-shaped house plans of the Cape Peninsula" [14]. He also draws a comparison between the first drostdy and "the later (sic) Constantia" [15], on the basis of the two dormer windows mentioned in the inventory, suggesting in his reconstruction that these were both on the front facade [16].

This reconstruction, however, is implausible for a number of reasons. The first is that Vos assumes that the plan of the original double-storeyed drostdy (which he proposes was the same on both levels) was repeated in its single-storeyed successor. This would have resulted in the halving of its floor area when the upper floor was removed. It is more probable that the original drostdy was double-storeyed only over its front wing, which would have resulted in a loss of merely a third of its habitable rooms when it was reduced in height [17]. It is also more likely that the two dormers would have been placed above its front and back doors, thereby creating a central focus to both facades.

The second is that Vos' ground floor plan shows eight rooms, which would probably have been repeated on the upper storey apart from the "flat-roofed" room behind the "voorhuis", giving a total of fifteen rooms. It is unlikely that Simon van der Stel would have sanctioned the erection of such a palatial dwelling for one of his minor officials, when his own residence in the Castle as well as those of his other senior officials was cramped in comparison.

The third is that this plan, which forms the basis for Vos' reconstructions of both the original double-storeyed drostdy and its single-storeyed successor, does not correspond with the contemporary description of the latter. This states clearly that the rebuilt drostdy comprised four apartments in addition to the passage. Vos' plan, however, shows six rooms on either side of a "voorhuis-agterhuis" arrangement, and also ignores the fact that the entrance hall was described as a "gang", suggesting a passage narrower than it was deep rather than one wider than square.

A narrow entrance hall, moreover, would also preclude the single casements flanking the door, a feature unrecorded in visual sources prior to Vergelegen, which was

probably the progenitor of this arrangement. Such windows, significantly, do not appear on the representation of the third drostdy built after the fire of 1710, and the presence of a narrow gable above the entrance on this drawing suggests a correspondingly narrow hall inside.

Vos also attempts to correlate the six mantelpieces mentioned in the inventory with Stade's perspective, stating that the drawing "clearly shows three chimney stacks on the western side of the Drostdy, and possibly three on the eastern side" [18]. This, however, is a misreading of the evidence, as the "middle" chimney on the western side was actually at the back of the eastern wing, and there is no reason for Stade to have omitted two of the "missing" three chimneys on this side. Moreover, had there been six chimneys, a double-storeyed building would have required twelve mantlepieces unless the upper rooms were not provided with fireplaces.

Vos' reconstruction of the first drostdy is thus unconvincing, based as it is on a misinterpretation of an inventory, an anachronistic plan, and a misreading of Stade's drawing of its successor. Moreover, it does not acknowledge the evidence presented by contemporary descriptions in the VOC records. However, it is possible to reconcile the building elements described in the inventory with the description of the rebuilt drostdy, despite the paucity of contemporary drawings and the absence of archaeological evidence, as will be outlined below.

The second drostdy has been described in detail in the Company's records, but unfortunately only in the most general of terms in the accounts of visitors to the Cape. Kolbe describes the drostdy as having been a "fraai rechthuis" [19], but does not elaborate further on the building, which suggests that he had not seen it himself. He does mention, however, that the fire which destroyed most of Stellenbosch was caused by the fact that a spark from some live coals, brought to the Landdrost through the door from the "binnenplaats", was blown in by a strong south-easterly wind and set alight the underside of the thatched roof, which had no ceiling. This "binnenplaats" was probably the narrow court between the rear wings of the U-shaped drostdy depicted by Stade [Fig 203] [20].

Kolbe states further that the foundations revealed that the drostdy must have been very

well constructed ("zeer wel gebouwt") prior to its destruction by fire in 1710. He also describes its siting, on an island in the river and surrounded by tall trees, its front facing the village and its rear having a view of the fields. One of these trees was apparently so large that a tree-house ("zomer-huijsje") had been erected in it, large enough to accommodate eight people [21]. Kolbe's reference to the foundations of the drostdy confirms that he did not have first-hand experience of the building itself, but was relying on the accounts of the villagers, as suggested also by his account of the tree-house, which was probably also burned down in the fire of 1710.

Valentyn describes the drostdy as "one of the largest houses there, at that time surrounded by a fine grove". This account, however, was almost certainly based on hearsay, given the brevity of Valentyn's visit to Stellenbosch in 1705 and the absence of any detailed description of the drostdy itself [22].

The visual records are only slightly more informative. The drostdy is shown on the Stellenbosch island in a number of maps of the period [23], but the only plausible depiction appears in M1/1158 [Fig 164], where it is labelled "Stadhuys" [24]. Here it is shown with a central doorway and two symmetrically placed windows on either side, corresponding with the verbal description of its rebuilding. The roof is hipped, with chimneys at its apexes, which also corresponds with what can be seen in Stade's 1710 perspective of the town. Not too much should be inferred from this map, though, given the inaccuracy with which the church is depicted.

Unfortunately not much of the drostdy is visible in E V Stade's drawing [Fig 203], as its walls are obscured by the buildings in the foreground. However, a hipped roof with chimneys at the four apexes can be seen, revealing a U-shaped roof-plan reminiscent of the configuration encountered on a larger scale at Constantia. This corresponds with the verbal description of the rebuilt drostdy, which retained the two front rooms and passage of its predecessor, and had a total of four apartments. The other two rooms must therefore have been placed behind the two at the front. The front rooms probably communicated with those behind through interleading doors, but official proceedings would have been interrupted if this had been the only means of access. These rooms at the back were therefore probably also entered from the the "binnenplaats" described by Kolbe (the narrow court behind the "voorhuis" or "passage") [Fig 205]. If this were the

case, the plan of the drostdy would have been significantly different from the reconstructions of Stander, Fransen and Vos, which suggest a wide U-plan with a large courtyard between the rear wings [25].

The four chimneys, which correspond in number and location with the four rooms, also give an indication of the internal planning of the drostdy. None of the fireplaces could have been on the walls separating the front and back rooms, as their chimneys would then have emerged from the centres of the ridges of the rearward facing wings. Moreover, the simplest and most thermally efficient solution to heating the four rooms would have been to use back-to-back fireplaces on these internal walls, requiring only two chimneys instead of four. The fireplaces must therefore have been located on the end walls of the front and rear wings, as at Constantia, and have been cranked within the roof space in order to emerge from the apexes of the hips. The complication of this arrangement suggests that the internal walls did contain doors permitting access between the rooms to the front and to the rear. Moreover, if the doors and fireplaces were centrally located, the latter would have created an axial termination to the former in each of the four rooms [26] [Fig 205].

Unlike Constantia, the second drostdy did not have any gables along its front facade. This is not surprising, given the partial collapse of the original building within twenty years, and the questionable structural stability of the re-used front walls. It is doubtful, therefore, that the roof space would have been used as a storage loft, particularly given that the room in which the fire commenced was not provided with a ceiling, in which case there would have been no reason to provide it with a gabled window. Moreover, the rebuilding of the drostdy was an unwelcome expense for the Company, which would have been unlikely to allow any unnecessary embellishments in the circumstances [27].

Having established a plan for the second drostdy on the basis of Stade's drawing and the evidence in contemporary records, it is possible to use this plan as contributory evidence for the derivation of the plan of its double-storeyed predecessor. Unlike Constantia and Vergelegen, the documentary sources suggest that the second drostdy was built on the foundations of the first (as there is no mention of new foundations having been laid), and retained the three front rooms on the ground floor.

This evidence also suggests that it was only the front row of rooms that were double-storeyed, as the ground-floor rooms to the rear should not have been subject to water-proofing problems if there had been a second storey above them. The present author's reconstruction has been based on this assumption, and correlates precisely with the number of doors, windows and mantelpieces mentioned in the inventory of the building elements salvaged from this first drostdy [Fig 206].

Apart from the removal of the upper floor, comprising a room on either side of a central stair hall, this plan differs from its successor only in the relocation of the doorways opening off the entrance hall. Without the inconvenience of a staircase along one of the walls, the single doors in the corners could be moved to a central position as double doors on axis with the fireplaces, corresponding with the relationship between the rooms in front and those to the rear.

The present author's reconstruction of the original drostdy is the only example during the proto-Cape Dutch period of a building comprising a double-storeyed front wing with single-storeyed rear wings. This is probably explained by the partial collapse of the first drostdy, which provided an example to be avoided rather than a precedent to be followed. Nor is there any other early precedent for a "voorhuis" narrower than its flanking rooms. Here, on the other hand, the drostdy does appear to have been influential with regard to planning developments in the residential buildings of the village, as suggested by the facade treatment of some of the houses in Stade's perspective [Fig 188].

The symmetry of this arrangement would have been accentuated by a central position for the dwarf-gables containing the "dak cousijnties", one over the front door and one over the back. The first drostdy could thus also have been the stimulus for the central dwarf-gables seen on Linnes' cellar (No 12) and the farmhouse of Voorgelegen in the right foreground of Stade's perspective [Fig 188].

The siting of the drostdy was probably intended from the outset to terminate the later Drostdy Street. However, there is no firm visual evidence to support this in Stade's drawing. If this were the case, though, it would have been the only example of such an urban refinement prior to 1710, except for the original and soon to be superseded

approach to the church in Cape Town [28].

As far as the out-buildings are concerned, Stade's drawing shows a rectangular gabled building behind the drostdy, with a chimney at one end. Another rectangular building, possibly aligned with the first, appears some distance beyond the drostdy. Whether this structure was part of the drostdy complex is not clear, nor can it be determined from the drawing whether it was located on the "Stellenbosch" island or across the river [29].

The building behind the drostdy probably served as the prison and kitchen. Kolbe described the prison as being close to the drostdy [30], but the structure appears to be too large for this purpose alone, and it is unlikely that a fireplace would have been provided for the convenience of miscreants. The chimney is more likely to have served an external kitchen, as no cooking facilities are mentioned in the description of the rebuilding of the drostdy outlined above. An outside kitchen, moreover, was mentioned in the account of the guest house in the Company's garden in Cape Town, suggesting that this was not an unusual arrangement [31].

Kolbe's description of the fire that destroyed the drostdy and the whole village is also persuasive in this regard. Given that the coals brought to light the pipe of the Landdrost set fire to the roof of the drostdy [32], it is almost certain that they were brought from outside the building. The fireplaces of the four internal rooms, moreover, would hardly have been alight in the heat of a southern hemisphere December.

The use of the second outbuilding, if indeed it was part of the drostdy complex, cannot be established from documentary evidence. It could have been the prison if the building behind the drostdy was used solely as a kitchen, but it is too far away to conform with Kolbe's description of the proximity of the "Rechtshuis" and "Gevankenis". It could also have been the district stables, but this is unlikely, as these were also destroyed in the fire of 1710, which spread in the opposite direction. It is therefore more probable that the stables were at the end of Ryneveld street, to the south of the house on the corner of Dorp Street ("Colonieshuis 1") purchased by the sick-comforter Jan Mahieu [33]. This would have given the horses immediate access to a street, and avoided congestion of and damage to the bridge leading to the drostdy. Moreover, Hugo

describes the stables as having been damaged on the 18th October 1706 because of floods which caused the river to overflow its banks [34]. This suggests conclusively that the building was on the outer rather than on the inner side of the river, corresponding with Stade's depiction [35].

Vos also locates the stables on the outer edge of the river, and mentions that by the late 17th century there was "a large pound which was enclosed with a high wall in the vicinity of the Company's stables" [36]. However, his location of this building on the south-eastern corner of the intersection of Dorp Street and Ryneveld Street contradicts the evidence of Stade's drawing, which shows a house in this position (No 11), at right angles to Vos' orientation. Moreover, there does not appear to be any archaeological evidence to support this location. It is more likely in terms of Stade's evidence [Fig 203] that both the pound and the stables (No 5) were located at the end of the extension of Ryneveld Street [Fig 198].

The second drostdy was destroyed in the fire of 1710, as reported on the 18th December [37], and had not yet been rebuilt when Kolbe left the Cape in 1713 [38]. Nevertheless, its precedent probably encouraged the erection of symmetrical domestic buildings in the village when they were rebuilt after the fire.

9.3.4 THE CHURCH

Although widely described as the first permanent church at the Cape, predating the Cape Town church by seventeen years, the first church at Stellenbosch was almost certainly the temporary structure ("opgeslage loots") proposed by Commissioner van Rheede in 1685. Its formal commissioning by Simon van der Stel on the 29th July 1686, its construction, and its inauguration on the 19th October 1687, have already been described in Chapter 9.3.1.

The church was evidently poorly constructed, as the Landdrost Cornelis Linnes informed Simon van der Stel in August 1691 that the west wall containing the entrance door was threatening to collapse. A contract was therefore signed by the Heemraden with the "Meesters Werkbaasen Matthijs Diderick en Simon Janssen" to rebuild the west wall from its foundations, and to plaster and whitewash the church on the outside

and the inside. A commemorative plaque ("gedachtenis steen") was also to be let into the wall above the entrance door.

Another entry in the Resolutions of the Landdrost and Heemraden, dated the 21st August 1691, concerned the four hinges and bolts that were required for the window frames of the vestry ("consistorie") [1]. Whether the vestry was an addition to the church in 1691, as suggested by Hugo, or whether it was part of the church from the outset, cannot be determined without confirmatory visual or archaeological evidence [2]. Further alterations in 1691 concerned the belltower, which was unstable on account of the weakness of its timbers, and it was decided on the 21st August that the bell should be hung somewhat lower. More repairs were required on the 18th January 1696, and the decision was made on the 13th February to reduce the turret by three and a half feet [3].

Hugo also mentions that the entire cemetery was surrounded by a drainage ditch, and that the excavated earth was piled up on the inner side. This prevented the graves from being inundated when the river overflowed its banks, and also protected the cemetery from incursions by wild animals. The ditch was crossed by three bridges, two of them pedestrian to the east and the west, and the third a wagon bridge on the northern side. This was presumably for the hearses which brought the bodies for burial.

These bridges were not barred, however, with the result that horses and other livestock crossed the wagon bridge and trampled down the oak saplings that had been planted around the periphery by the Landdrost Linnes in 1693. It was therefore resolved on the 11th June 1694 that a gate would be erected at this entrance, and Simon van der Stel gave permission for one of the Company's carpenters to carry out the task.

The loose earth excavated from the drainage ditches would be used to level the ground around the church, and new saplings were to be planted along the line of these mounds once they had been removed. It was also decided on the 18th November 1709 that the sexton would be given the responsibility of levelling the paths leading to the western and eastern entrances to the church. These were to be as wide as the church itself, and the path on the northern side as wide as the wagon gate [4].

By 1698 the Stellenbosch church had become too small for its congregation, and

permission was requested for a larger church to be erected [5]. The Governor referred the matter to Holland on the 18th March 1699, but agreed in principle to the erection of a cross-shaped church. The Company would provide the necessary glass and iron, but the congregation were to meet all other expenses. They had, in fact, already collected a sum of 1000 rixdollars for the project [6]. Permission for the new building was granted by the Seventeen on the 30th October 1699 [7], but despite a letter of the 14th March 1701 stating that work would be commenced "as soon as possible", nothing more appears to have been done [8].

Both Hugo and Smuts assumed that this cross-shaped church would have been an enlargement of the existing rectangular structure. This is unlikely, however, given the instability of the original building and the wording of the correspondence on the matter. It is more probable that the intention was to build a new and permanent cross-shaped church to replace the temporary "opgeslage loots" which would have continued in use until the new church was completed [9].

The original church did in fact continue to be used until the 17th December 1710, when it was destroyed in the fire that engulfed most of the village. Although the walls and tiled floor [10] were still intact, the first church was not rebuilt. It was replaced by a new structure on a different site, following a resolution taken by the Landdrost and Heemraden on the 31st March 1713. The new church, now with a centralized Greek-cross plan, and sited axially at the end of the present Church Street, was finally begun in 1717, but was only completed in 1723 [11].

The fact that the original structure was not re-erected, although it seems to have survived the fire substantially intact apart from its roof, is instructive. Moreover, even if the walls had been too damaged to support a new roof, it is surprising that they were not rebuilt on the same site, if this building had indeed been intended as the permanent church. By 1719, however, the walls had collapsed in places, and their foundation stones were already being removed for use in the new church [12]. This suggests that the fire provided the catalyst for building the permanent church on the site originally selected in 1685 by Commissioner van Rheede and requested by the congregation from 1698 [13].

Unfortunately there are no verbal descriptions of this building apart from Kolbe's brief statement that the village had contained "a beautiful Church and Council-house" prior to their destruction in the fire of 1710 [14]. Given the brevity of this account, in comparison with his more detailed description of the far less significant "church" at Drakenstein, it is unlikely that Kolbe had seen either of these two buildings before the fire, and was relying on the word of the local inhabitants. His appointment to the post of secretary of the Stellenbosch district was made only after the fire, in 1711.

However, Hugo gives an indication of the interior arrangements as revealed by the Resolutions and Letters of the Heemraden. The pulpit was at the eastern end, raised high above the ground and reached by steps. Pews were provided only for the men, with loose chairs for the women and children, as was the case in the later Cape Town church. These pews, apparently, were only installed nine years after the inauguration of the church [15].

Apart from diagrammatic representations on the maps of the period [16], the only plausible three-dimensional view of the church is provided by Stade's drawing of the 15th February 1710 [Fig 202]. He depicts it as a rectangular building with a hipped roof and a doorway in the shorter side. No windows are shown, and the only elaboration is a small domed belltower in the centre of the ridge, surmounted by a finial. This was constructed of timber and commissioned by Simon van der Stel, a point of interest given its similarity to the belltower over the Castle gateway, commissioned by the same Governor [17]. There is, however, no indication of the "porch" in which the schoolmaster held his classes [18]. This must either have been an internal subdivision, as in the Cape Town church, or have been on the eastern side and hidden from view in Stade's drawing. It is unlikely, though, that the main entrance to the church would have been from behind the pulpit.

Hugo is almost certainly correct in suggesting that the vestry ("consistorie") was on the eastern end, where it would have been directly behind the pulpit and would have afforded a private entrance for the minister. Whether the vestry was a narrower addition as speculated by Hugo, or a further internal subdivision similar to the lobby, cannot be established from the visual evidence. However, two such subdivisions within a space only 40 feet long would have left little room for the congregation and pulpit.

It is possible, though, that the so-called porch was a reference to the "consistorie" itself, which was pressed into service as a schoolroom because no other suitable space was available. Such an action might have incurred the disfavour of the Council of Seventeen, which could have explained its description as a "porch" in the instructions sent to Stellenbosch by the Council of Policy [19].

It appears, therefore, that the eastern pedestrian bridge allowed the congregation access to the churchyard, but that the eastern entrance to the church itself was reserved for the minister and the members of the church council. The congregational entrance was from the western side through the door depicted by Stade. The plaque above the doorway is not shown, but this is explained by the small size of Stade's drawing.

The churchyard is depicted as surrounded by bushes, rather than the trees ordered in 1694 [20], with the exception of one at the north-eastern corner. Two large posts appear on the northern side, which Hugo has identified as the gate-posts of the wagon entrance [21], although as drawn they are too high and too far apart, corresponding almost with the length of the church itself.

The simplicity of this church is notable, as is its rectangular plan, in contrast with the centralized Greek-cross type which had already been commenced in Cape Town, although its construction was temporarily abandoned [22]. However, the Stellenbosch church, as a temporary structure, should be compared rather with the even less prepossessing shed at Drakenstein which was described by Kolbe in such uncomplimentary terms [23]. Significantly, a cross-shaped church was envisaged for its successor, as was eventually built after the fire.

Hugo ignores the temporary nature of this church in his criticism of the accuracy of Stade's drawing. He points out first that the church is depicted much larger than it was in reality [24], but this was part of Stade's graphic convention as already seen in his exaggeration of the size of the Cape Town church (see Figs 79 & 80). He also dismisses the drawing on account of the absence of windows [25], but Stade was consistent in omitting windows along the sides of all of the houses in the vicinity of the church, on account of the obliqueness of the view. It has already been noted at Constantia that he reduced the number of windows along the side for the same

reason [Fig 139].

On the basis of these supposed inaccuracies Hugo also states that the church could not possibly have had a hipped roof and must have had gabled ends, as shown in Stander's "corrected" drawing [Fig 191] [26]. He goes on to say that a person with the pretensions of Simon van der Stel would have been ashamed to have been responsible for erecting such a "wretched farmer's hovel" ("armsalige boere-stulp") as a church for his "beloved colony" ("lieflingscolonie") [27].

Hugo, however, is ignoring the fact not only that this church was merely a temporary "opgeslage loots", but also that Van der Stel's own Constantia had a hipped roof as depicted by Stade and confirmed by Heydt [Figs 139 & 140], as did his son's Vergelegen as depicted in the "Korte Deductie" and the "Contra-Deductie" [Figs 227 & 230]. Gabled ends did not necessarily denote status at this time [28]. Moreover, given that Stade did show gabled ends to the church and the hospital in Cape Town, and even gave a suggestion of their outline, it is inconceivable that he should have made such an elementary error in the case of the Stellenbosch church.

Despite his dismissal of the accuracy of Stade's depiction of the buildings themselves, Hugo uses the same drawing as "confirmatory" evidence for his identification of the remains of the original church. He correctly describes this as shown by Stade precisely in the middle of the churchyard ("presies in die middel van die kerkhof") and states that there is no doubt that this was the correct location ("aan die ligging val nie te twyfel nie") [29].

He identifies its site as the narrow hatched rectangle shown on Hertzog's 1817 survey of Stellenbosch, roughly in the middle of the block surrounded by the present Plein, Ryneveld, Church and Andringa streets [Fig 189]. Hugo discovered the remains of a burned out building on this site, containing old broken glass and broken floor tiles along the edges of the walls.

There are, however, five major anomalies concerning this ruined building identified by Hugo as the original church. The first concerns its depiction on Hertzog's 1817 survey cited by Hugo. It is shown no wider than the narrowest of the houses and out-buildings depicted on the plan. Moreover, the site is not annotated, in comparison with other

buildings or open spaces of public note. It is also possible that the hatching was added later by a hand other than Hertzog's, as he does not use this convention elsewhere in the plan [Fig 189].

The second concerns the markedly off-centre location of the building on the block, despite Hugo's statement that Stade is correct in his portrayal of the church "precisely in the centre" of the churchyard. Hugo's measurements reveal that its southern wall, which subdivided the two rows of plots in the block, was 124 feet from Kerkstraat and 98 feet from Pleinstraat [30]. These dimensions give an even more asymmetrical siting for the so-called church. With a width of 22 feet, it would have been 124 feet from Kerkstraat and only 76 feet from Pleinstraat, which is hardly likely [31] and, moreover, does not correspond with its central position in Stander's reconstructed plan illustrated by Hugo [Fig 190].

They also contradict Hertzog's survey of 1817 [Fig 189], which shows the southern wall as subdividing the block equally. The building identified by Hugo would therefore have been even further to the north than the hatched rectangle shown on Hertzog's plan. It is unlikely that Hertzog was inaccurate with regard to these dimensions, given his care in portraying far more complex site subdivisions on the same survey drawing.

If, on the other hand, the present east-west subdividing line did date from 1783, it would suggest a site for the church to the south rather than to the north. This would result in a distance of only 102 feet from Kerkstraat and 98 feet from Pleinstraat to the outside of the side walls of the church. Its centre-line would therefore have been only two feet out over a distance of 222 feet, a discrepancy of less than one percent [32].

The third anomaly concerns the size of the original churchyard, derived by Hugo and Stander from the size of the present block surrounded by Plein, Ryneveld, Kerk and Andringa Streets. This block is almost twice as long as it is wide, and more than twice as large as the churchyard in Cape Town and its own 18th century replacement in Stellenbosch itself. Given the temporary nature of the church itself and the small size of the congregation, it is unlikely that such a large cemetery would have been laid out initially, only to be reduced by more than a half when the new and enlarged church was built for an increasing population [Figs 190 & 189].

The fourth concerns the documentary evidence regarding the names of the streets to the east and to the south of the church. Hugo has pointed out that Ryneveld Street was originally called "de Groote Kerkstraat" and that Church Street was "de Kleine Kerkstraat" [33]. It is surprising that the "Groote Kerkstraat" should have been only half the length of the "Kleine Kerkstraat" with regard to the churchyard as shown in Stander's reconstructed plan.

This evidence suggests that Stade's drawing is accurate in its relationship between the buildings. According to the present author's graphic analysis of this drawing [Figs 194 & 198], the "Groote Kerkstraat" would have been twice as long as the "Kleine Kerkstraat", assuming that the former extended beyond Dorp Street as far as the stables, and that the latter extended as far as the later Drostdy Street, as shown by Stade.

The reconstruction of Stander [Fig 190], however, shows the "Kleine Kerkstraat" almost twice as long as the "Groote Kerkstraat". Moreover, the main entrance to the church did not face the "Groote Kerkstraat" but was on the opposite side, suggesting that its higher status was not derived from its position. Given that there is no significant difference in the widths of the two streets as depicted on Hertzog's survey plan, their lengths were probably the determining factor in their nomenclature. It is therefore likely that the original churchyard approximated more closely to the square than to the double-square.

The fifth anomaly concerns the siting relationships between the buildings depicted by Stade. While his drawings were not a photographic record, he would not have positioned the buildings at random, particularly given that all six of his views of the Cape are of architectural subjects. These siting relationships have already been analysed in Chapter 9.3.2 (see also Figs 194 & 198), but it is central to the present argument that they also suggest a square rather than a double-square periphery to the original churchyard. This would have accorded more closely with the orderly planning demanded by Commissioner van Rheede in 1685.

In the light of this evidence, therefore, it is not improbable that the first church was to the south-east of the site discovered by Hugo and further excavated by Vos [34]. It is

not disputed that a building of considerable age was found on this site. What is being questioned is whether this was built on the site of the temporary church.

Hugo presents evidence that instructions were given in 1782 for the site of the original church not to be built upon when the old churchyard was subdivided and sold. It was to be separated from the surrounding properties by a "ringmuur" on the original foundations [35]. It is possible, though, that this instruction was not carried out. The only evidence that Hugo provides for the "ringmuur" having been built was that payment was made to the master builder Lambert Fick for the erection of a "scheymuur" in 1783, which Hugo assumes was the "ringmuur" in question [36]. However, it is improbable that the Landdrost and Heemraden would have described the "boundary wall" of 1782 as a "subdividing wall" one year later. Nevertheless, Hugo believes that a "ringmuur" was built around the site which he identified, corresponding with the rectangle on Hertzog's survey plan.

Vos provides an explanation for the structure identified by Hugo in his statement that in 1783 "Master-builder Beyleveld was commissioned to construct a wall on the foundations of the 1687 ruin and also a 'Beenhuijsje' within its confines" [37]. Hugo, significantly, makes no reference to this charnel house which was built to preserve all the unidentified bones in the old churchyard. Vos, however, does not address the discrepancy between the "ringmuur" and the "scheymuur", and the fact that Beyleveld was commissioned to build the wall but Fick (to whom Vos makes no reference) was the contractor who received payment [38].

Vos did undertake archaeological work on the "first church" [Fig 207], but states that only "a grave and tiles dating from before 1710 could be located during excavations" [39]. However, the tiles of the temporary church were removed from the ruins in 1719, according to Hugo. If the tiles identified by Vos are as early as pre-1710, they must have been brought from elsewhere and re-used in the charnel house, particularly since they were found on steps dating from as late as c1780. Moreover, the fact that only a single grave was found is further circumstantial evidence that the charnel house must have been built outside the perimeter of the original church. Having been in use for over twenty years, it is probable that the floor of the church would have contained a number of graves of prominent members of the community, as was the case in the

successive Cape Town churches.

Vos also mentions the foundations of a vestry, subsequently subdivided, which he discovered during his archaeological investigations [40], but these are neither shown nor annotated on his archaeological plan [Fig 207]. He also states that during the excavations of the ruins "the eastern end of the first church was exposed, as well as many late eighteenth century features which clearly belonged to Beyleveld's charnel house" [41]. However, the nature of the 17th century remains is not described, and the "original granite foundation of 1687" is shown on plan at the south-western corner of the site, rather than on the eastern side as described in his text.

There are thus clear contradictions between Vos' written account of the "church" excavations and his own archaeological plan. An even greater contradiction exists between Vos' "approximate inner dimensions of church" [Fig 207] and the dimensions recorded in 1687 [42]. These contemporary dimensions of 22 by 40 feet probably referred to external dimensions, which would convert to 18 by 36 feet if a wall thickness of 2 feet were subtracted. Vos' internal dimensions correspond in width at 18 feet, but are far too long at almost 60 feet.

Even if a vestry had been added to the length of the church as suggested by Hugo, there is no indication of the foundations of an end wall for the church itself at a distance of 40 feet from either the eastern or the western side of the site. Measuring from the eastern side, the end wall would have corresponded with the western side of the unidentified semicircular feature shown on the archaeological plan. However, no foundation wall is shown extending across the site from this position. If, on the other hand, the "church" had been located on the western side of the plot, its end wall would have cut across the centre of the only grave that was discovered. Neither possibility is reconcilable with the available archaeological evidence, as demonstrated in the plan which overlays the 1687 dimensions on the archaeological plan [Fig 208].

Given these contradictions, and the markedly asymmetrical siting of the building between Church and Plein Streets (which neither Stander nor Vos acknowledge, as both of their reconstructed plans depict it as centrally located), the site in question becomes increasingly suspect. It appears, therefore, that the excavations of the "original church"

are not conclusive.

The present author's suggestion for a more probable location of the temporary church is shown in Fig 196, immediately to the south of the charnel house but about fifty feet to the east. The precise form of this structure cannot be determined without additional documentary and archaeological evidence. However, an attempt will be made to reconcile discrepancies in the available documentary material on the basis of two assumptions. These are that the vestry or "consistorie" was the same room as the so-called "porch" used as the schoolroom, and that the dimensions of 22 feet by 40 feet were external rather than internal.

If the "porch" and "consistorie" were synonymous, and were placed within the temporary church at its eastern end behind the pulpit, they would not have seriously encroached upon the space available for the congregation. The hinges and the catches for the windows requested in 1691 do not necessarily indicate that this room was a later addition. It is more probable that the original windows were only shuttered, and that these were replaced in 1691 with glazed window frames in order to protect the documents stored in the vestry.

If the dimensions of 22 feet by 40 feet were external, these would have provided internal dimensions of 18 feet by 36 feet, in a proportional ratio of 1:2. If, moreover, the "consistorie" had been 9 feet deep, which would have been the minimum for its use not only as a schoolroom but also for the meetings of the church council, its internal proportions would also have been 1:2, and those of the congregational area of the church would have been in the ratio of 2:3. These numerical ratios are consistent with those employed at Constantia by Simon van der Stel, who could have been responsible for the initial design of this interim church, the implementation of which was undertaken by the Company's craftsmen.

Although unprepossessing with regard to its exterior form, the planning of the temporary church could thus have followed the proportioning relationships outlined in the architectural treatises of the Renaissance present at the Cape at this time.

9.3.5 RESIDENTIAL AND OTHER NON-OFFICIAL BUILDINGS

The Company's records do not provide any overall descriptions of the village of Stellenbosch, concentrating almost entirely on matters of detail. Ironically, the most revealing of these entries was the most unfortunate, when news was received on the 18th December 1710 that a disastrous fire had broken out the previous day. This had destroyed the "Council House, the Church, the district stables and twelve houses". The fire was said to have originated in the "Council House", but the cause was not yet known [1].

The origin of the fire was described by Kolbe, who was present at the Cape at the time. A slave of the Landdrost, who had been ordered to bring him a light for his pipe, had delivered some live coals. A spark from one of these had been blown into the house and set fire to the underside of the thatched roof, which had no ceiling. The conflagration had been spread by the strong south-easterly winds, and had left only "three or four" houses standing in the village [2].

This information was repeated by Valentyn, who last visited the Cape in 1714 [3]. He also described the village as being "not large, since I saw then only 13 or 14 houses near the church", a figure largely corresponding with those shown in Stade's depiction [Fig 188] prior to the fire of 1710 [4].

Mentzel, who arrived at the Cape only in 1732 or 1733 [5], described the village as having consisted (before the fire) of thirty houses along two streets lined with oak trees [6]. He also confirmed Kolbe's and Valentyn's explanations for the outbreak of the fire, but as he was not present at the time, both accounts could only have been based on hearsay [7].

No plans of the village survive from this period, the earliest being Hertzog's survey of 1817 [Fig 189]. Here the (fourth) drostdy is shown on the same site as its predecessors, although no longer on an island as the river had been diverted. The church had been relocated after the fire of 1710, and the residential quarter of the village had expanded considerably. A detailed view of the village does survive, however, in E V Stade's drawing of the 15th February 1710, which depicts the outlying farms as well as the buildings of the village itself [Fig 223].

Of these buildings, identified and numbered in Chapter 9.3.2 (pp474-476), the official buildings comprising the drostdy (No 1), its gaol and kitchen (No 2), the unidentified outbuilding (No 3) and the stables (No 5) have already been discussed in Chapter 9.3.3, as have the temporary church (No 6) and the charnel house of 1783 in Chapter 9.3.4. The non-official buildings comprise the mill, and the houses and out-buildings of the villagers, which will be discussed in the present chapter.

The first of these is the second mill (No 4), identified in Smuts as the obliquely placed building at the end of Dorp Street [8]. This building, however, was identified by Stander as Scheffer's house [Fig 190], as repeated by Vos although he also attributes it to Conterman. While Vos' earliest reference to Scheffer dates only from 1721, he gives a date of c1703 for Conterman's occupancy [9]. Had this "house" predated the establishment of the village, its oblique siting with regard to Van Rheede's orthogonal grid could have been explained, but this is not possible with a date of c1703. Moreover, this small building is shown without any out-buildings, although Hans Conterman as the village blacksmith would have required a forge as well as a house. Significantly, no chimney appears on Stade's drawing.

Vos shows this building as centrally placed at the end of Dorp Street [Fig 193], but Stade depicts it as encroaching only slightly on the southern side of the street [Fig 203]. This edge is demarcated by shrubbery, beyond which there is a narrow open space in front of a dense and uninterrupted area of vegetation. It is likely, therefore, that the open space shown by Stade was the river itself, and that the vegetation beyond was the grove of trees on the Stellenbosch island, as described by Valentyn [10]. Such an arrangement also corresponds with Vos' reconstruction of the course of the river [Fig 209], requiring only a relocation of this building to the edge of the river, as shown by Stade.

Vos, however, believes that the mill was further upstream, not far beyond the bifurcation of the river around the Stellenbosch island. This could correspond with the large building (No 3) which Stade shows to the east of the drostdy [Fig 203], but this is shown parallel to the drostdy and probably aligned with the kichen/gaol behind in the contemporary perspective, whereas Vos inclines it at an angle of some 30 degrees [Figs 193 & 209].

Although there is no evidence for the use of this unidentified building depicted by Stade, there are two reasons for its unlikelihood of having been the village mill. The first is that it was too large for the purpose, even if it was also used as the miller's house [11]. The second is that it was too close to the "dam" shown on Vos' reconstruction of the course of the Eerste River [Fig 209]. A location further downstream is more likely, as the turbulence caused by the "dam" wall would have been avoided and the flow of water would have increased in velocity, particularly on the outer edge of the bend in the river, where "scour" would occur as opposed to "deposition" on the inner edge [12].

It is probable, therefore, that Smuts' identification of the "Scheffer" or "Conterman" house as the mill is correct, particularly since its functional siting would explain its oblique location with reference to Van Rheede's orderly and orthogonal grid. Vos, on the other hand, has not provided any conclusive archaeological evidence for an alternative siting of the second mill.

The other buildings in the village will be described as they appear along its streets, beginning with those on the southern side of Dorp Street. If the present author is correct in assuming that this street was subsequently narrowed (see Chapter 9.3.2), the houses depicted by Stade would all have been set back from today's street edge to the extent of its width. The houses along the present edge would therefore have been built in front of their predecessors, thereby explaining the absence of early archaeological evidence [13].

Closest to the drostdy is the "Pietersz" house (No 11), on the south-eastern corner of Dorp and Ryneveld Streets, where Vos shows the Colony's stable [14]. An inventory of this house dating from 1713 reveals that it contained two rooms, one furnished as a bedroom and one as a kitchen. The latter, however, did not have a "hearth chain", suggesting the absence of a chimney and thus correlating with Stade's drawing, as noted by Vos [15]. Stade depicts this house as a rectangle with a hipped roof, but does not show the door and window openings [Fig 203].

To the west of the "Pietersz" house was the gap corresponding with the width of Ryneveld Street, although Stander [Fig 190] and Vos [Fig 193] displace this opening to

the plot one to the west of the corner, corresponding with the house identified by the present author as that of the sick-comforter Mahieu (No 10). The vacant plot was the site of the "Couchet" house (No 25), described by Vos as dating from "just before or after the 1710 fire". This house comprised only an entrance hall ("voorhuijs") and a small room ("kamertjie") [16], unless there were other rooms devoid of contents omitted from the inventory.

The displacement of the site of the "Couchet" house on the plans of Stander and Vos clearly contradicts the evidence of Stade. It is possible, therefore, that the extension of Ryneveld Street across Dorp Street was closed off by the "Couchet" house after it had become redundant following the destruction of the stables in the fire. This suggests that the Colony had already decided to build replacement stables on another site, given the flood damage which had already been sustained before the fire (see Chapter 9.3.3).

The erection of a new stable seems to have been held in abeyance, but its site as shown on Van der Bijl's reconstructed plan of c1750 [17] corresponds exactly with the positions of the "Couchet" and "Pietersz" houses. These persons both died within a year of each other, in 1714 and 1713 respectively [18], providing the opportunity for the Landdrost and Heemraden to purchase these two properties for the purpose of erecting a new stable less liable to flood damage, but still conveniently close to the drostdy.

The house shown by Stade on the south-western corner of Dorp and Ryneveld Streets [Fig 203] was "Colonieshuis 1" (No 9), abutted on its western side by Mahieu's house (No 10). These two houses are located by Stander [Fig 190] and Vos [Fig 193] two plots further to the west, and identified as the Sax house ("Saxenhof") and the Van den Berg house ("Loubserhuis"). "Colonieshuis 1" as identified here thus corresponds with their location of the "Pietersz" house, and Mahieu's extension with the "empty plot" later occupied by the "Couchet" house.

The history of these two houses has been discussed in Chapter 9.3.1, as has the probability of their having been sited on the south-western rather than the north-western corner of the intersection. As shown by Stade, these two adjoining buildings have a rearward extension, and two smaller out-buildings in the foreground to the rear. This

has given rise to three different interpretations of the plan configuration, none of which corresponds with the evidence of Stade's ground lines and eaves lines.

Stander [Fig 190], Fransen [Fig 192] and Vos [Fig 193] all agree that the "Sax house" (ie "Colonieshuis 1") was rectangular in plan. Vos, however, shows it separate from its western neighbour the "Van den Berg house" (ie Mahieu's house), instead of contiguous as depicted by Stade.

The main discrepancies concern the latter house. Stander shows it as a T-plan with a lateral wing extending westwards from the tail, and a rectangular out-building behind it. The closer sides of the front wing of the house, its lateral extension and the out-building are all aligned as in Stade's drawing. Fransen also shows the house as T-planned, but depicts the lateral extension as a separate out-building, the western edge of which is aligned with the eastern edge of the house, in contradiction to the evidence of Stade's ground lines. Fransen also adds another rectangular out-building to the west of the one behind the house, although no such structure appears on Stade's perspective. Vos, on the other hand, shows the house as L-shaped, but agrees with Fransen that both out-buildings were separate structures, although he positions them differently, again without reference to Stade's ground lines.

However, an analysis of the ground lines and eaves lines of the rearward wing reveals that these correspond with the junction between Mahieu's house in the foreground and "Colonieshuis 1" on the corner. Mahieu's (No 10) was therefore rectangular in plan, and it was "Colonieshuis 1" that was L-shaped, thus corresponding with the other two "colonieshuisen" in the village (Nos 7 and 8).

Together, the two houses owned by Mahieu (Nos 9 and 10) would have been T-shaped in plan, but they cannot be seen as an early precedent for this plan type. The addition in the foreground has a higher roof ridge and parapet gabled ends as depicted by Stade, and both houses are shown with symmetrical facades and central entrances. The higher ridge and the two high-level windows on either side of the chimney in this gable end also indicate the presence of a loft [Fig 203]. While there might have been an interleading door between the two houses, the evidence of Stade suggests that the additions were designed as a self-contained house.

The comparatively small floor area of this house would explain the need for a separate kitchen, which is probably the gable-ended out-building with a chimney aligned with the rear of "Colonieshuis 1". The L-shaped out-building behind (as depicted by Stade, rather than the rectangle shown by Stander, Fransen and Vos) could have been used as a garden store and for the accommodation of slaves employed in Mahieu's garden immediately to the west. Such an arrangement suggests that the internal fireplaces in the gable ends of the house were used for heating rather than cooking, and that all menial activities were accommodated to the rear of the house. This would have corresponded with the probable arrangement at the drostdy, which Mahieu as secretary was probably attempting to emulate.

This house was apparently the only one along Dorp Street to survive the 1710 fire, saved by Jan Mahieu himself at risk of life and limb [19], probably as a result of the protection offered by the gabled ends. It could be that this was the reason for the later adoption of gabled ends and the abandonment of hipped roofs in the village, a change that could have taken place immediately after the fire.

Significantly, this plot (No 10) was owned by the Colony (or the Landdrost and Heemraden) as late as c1750, according to Van der Bijl [20]. It is not unlikely, therefore, that this property was purchased by the Colony shortly after the fire, given the shortage of accommodation elsewhere in the village. It is probable that it was here that the meetings of the Landdrost and Heemraden were held until the replacement drostdy had been erected, and that the property remained in the Colony's ownership.

If the present author's identification of Houses 9 and 10 as depicted by Stade is correct, the "Sax" house (No 18) and the "Van den Berg" house (No 19) identified by Stander and Vos could not yet have been built, since they would have been located on the garden shown by Stade to the west of Mahieu's house. Stander, however, shows Jan Mahieu's garden to the west of the "Van den Berg" house [Fig 190], and therefore west of the garden depicted by Stade [Fig 188].

The property on which the "Sax" house or "Saxenhof" stands was apparently granted in 1704 [21], but the earliest inventory dates only from 1725. At that time the house comprised only a bedroom and a kitchen, the latter equipped with a "schoorsteen-

ketting", indicating the presence of a chimney. Behind the house there was also a small out-building ("agterhuisie"), containing "a few odds and ends" [22].

In his attempt to correlate this inventory with the house shown by Stade on the south-west corner of Dorp and Ryneveld Streets ("Colonieshuis 1", No 9), Vos acknowledges the absence of a chimney, but argues that it could have been obscured by the building in the foreground. However, he does not address the discrepancy between the large out-building behind (identified by the present author as the stables, No 5) and its description in the inventory as an "agterhuisie". Moreover, he depicts this "little out-building" as larger than the main house on his own reconstructed plan [Fig 193].

Immediately to the west of the "Sax" house was the "Loubserhuis", apparently owned by Van den Berg from 1704 (see Note 21) until 1713. No archaeological excavations appear to have been made on this site, and Vos acknowledges that the house was burned down on two occasions, in 1710 and 1803. Nevertheless, he does illustrate a plan derived from the restoration work undertaken in 1982, which suggests that the 18th century walls described an L-plan, thus corresponding with his interpretation of the building in the foreground of Stade's drawing (Mahieu's house, No 10).

However, the restoration process of stripping off the plaster from the walls revealed that the original facade was markedly asymmetrical [23]. This evidence does not correspond with Stade's representation, and supports the present author's contention that this house had not yet been built at the time of Stade's visit. Moreover, if Dorp Street had been halved in width after 1710, as suggested by the evidence of Hertzog's survey (see Chapter 9.3.2), this house would have been built considerably later than 1710, on the present rather than on the original street edge.

Moving to Ryneveld Street, the house on the north-eastern corner of its intersection with Dorp Street was "Colonieshuis 3" (No 7), which abutted the cellar of the Landdrost Linnes (No 12) on its northern boundary. Stade shows these two adjoining buildings with hipped roofs at their ends, but gives no indication of a party wall between them as the junction of the roofs is obscured by the trees in the foreground. It is probable, though, that they were separated by a gable similar to that between Mahieu's house and "Colonieshuis 1" (Nos 10 and 9) [Fig 203].

"Colonieshuis 3", the history of which has been outlined in Chapter 9.3.1, was L-shaped in plan as revealed by the minutes of the Landdrost and Heemraden and the archaeological excavations undertaken by Vos [24]. The rearward extension is not visible on Stade's drawing, however, as this building together with the adjoining cellar and the Schreuder house behind the church is depicted in elevation [Fig 203].

According to Vos, the minutes of the 11th June 1694 described "a proposed L-shaped colonial building with inner dimensions of 11m x 9,8m x 4,9m deep and walls 3,4m high (36 x 32 ft x 16 ft deep, 11 ft high)". The materials required "included 1000 baked bricks [25], 10 beams of 5,5m (18 ft) each [26], 122m (400 ft) of boards and 10 frames ('kosyne'), which probably included both doors and windows. Between eight and ten loads of shells had to be burnt to provide lime for the new house as well as for the other two existing 'colonieshuise'" [27].

This description reveals that the house was provided at least partially with a ceiling, which probably corresponded with the two front rooms facing Ryneveld Street. It was also to be plastered with lime, as were the two "colonieshuisen" erected the previous year, suggesting that they were already experiencing damage from the elements.

Vos' archaeological plan [Fig 210] indicates two early stages in the development of this house, the first dating from its initial erection in 1694, and the second from alterations and additions made in c1710. These, however, had evidently been completed by the time of Stade's visit, as it is the enlarged house which he shows in his perspective [Fig 203].

The 1694 foundations correspond approximately with the internal dimensions described in the minutes, although the Ryneveld Street front is 33½ feet instead of 36 feet long, and the Dorp Street front is 30½ feet instead of 32 feet long. While these dimensions are slightly shorter than those specified, the rooms facing Ryneveld Street are deeper, at 16½ feet instead of 16 feet. The width of the rearward extension of the L-plan, however, is considerably less, measuring only 13½ feet. Moreover, the northern wall of this wing does not correspond with the position of the internal wall subdividing the two front rooms, being displaced by half the wall thickness. This suggests that the rear wing was roofed under a lean-to, and that only the two front rooms were covered with

a hipped roof and provided with a loft, as shown diagrammatically in Fig 211.

The alterations and additions of c1710 identified on Vos' plan [Fig 210] involve an extension to the north of the Ryneveld Street front of 15 feet and to the east of the Dorp Street front of 5 feet [28]. The rear wing was also widened to correspond with the roof span of the front wing facing Ryneveld Street. Vos also shows a narrow foundation outside the house, which could have been a low wall enclosing a yard in the re-entrant angle of the L-plan. The internal alteration concerns the foundations of a narrow wall 4 feet to the north of the subdividing wall between the original two front rooms.

The location of this wall in the rebuilt house is intriguing, as it is unlikely that the original subdivision would have been removed and replaced with a new one only 4 feet away. Moreover, this wall does not line up with the new external wall of the rear wing, where it could have given added structural support to the valley rafter at the re-entrant angle of the L-shaped roof. It is likely, therefore, that it was built in addition to the earlier subdividing wall, thereby creating a narrow 4-foot passage between the two. This passage, however, is inconveniently and asymmetrically positioned in the enlarged plan.

It is probable, therefore, that these narrow foundations date from a time between the initial construction and the later additions. If the larger of the original two rooms facing Ryneveld Street had been entered immediately to the left of the subdividing wall, the door would have been roughly in the centre of the facade. This would have permitted the erection of the later subdivision without seriously reducing the size of the room to the north. Its width would thus have been 12½ feet in comparison with the 14½ feet of the room to the south of the passage, and the doorway would have been only one foot off-centre over a facade width of 37½ feet [Fig 212].

The foundations of this non-structural passage wall could therefore have predated the additions of c1710 [29]. A possible date is 1700, when the minister Hercules van Loon moved into the house, which thus served as the first parsonage in Stellenbosch [30]. As minister, he would have required a private study, explaining the necessity for the passage. The resulting symmetrical arrangement of the front wing followed the precedent already established by the drostdy.

The alterations and additions, then, comprised firstly the lengthening and widening of the rearward wing, accounting for the dislocation between the new wall and the original subdividing wall in the front wing. This widening permitted the replacement of the lean-to with a hipped roof of equal span to that covering the front wing. Secondly, another room was added to the northern end of the Ryneveld Street wing. This was 13½ feet wide in comparison with the 14½ feet of the room to the south of the passage, creating an almost symmetrical arrangement on either side of the original room to the north, which was now located in the middle. Thirdly, this arrangement was made explicit by removing the passage wall of 1700. The house would thus have been entered through a "voorhuis" 18 feet wide and 16½ feet deep, thereby approximating square proportions, and wider than the rooms on either side. In this respect it would have resembled the plan of the guest house in the Company's garden in Table Valley [31]. Fourthly, the entrance door was probably relocated to the centre of the "voorhuis", and the windows repositioned on the facade in a symmetrical arrangement [Fig 213].

The formality of the front wing of "Colonieshuis 3" in its 1700 and 1710 variations, as suggested by the present author, cannot be established with certainty from Stade's drawing [Fig 203]. The facade is obscured by trees and the precise junction between this house and the adjoining cellar is not shown. However, there is a suggestion of a central doorway with two windows on either side, and Stade clearly depicts symmetrical facades on the Schreuder house (No 13), "Colonieshuis 1" (No 9), "Mahieu's" house (No 10) and "Voorgelegen", the farmhouse set back from Dorp Street in the foreground of the village.

The only firm discrepancy between Stade's perspective and Vos' archaeological findings is that Stade shows "Colonieshuis 3" as adjoining the cellar next door, whereas even the extended house ends 25 feet short of the site boundary as shown on Vos' plan. This suggests that the plot boundaries on this block had not yet been established when Linnes erected his cellar 15 feet from the northern end of the original house. The additions would thus have linked the two buildings, as depicted by Stade [Fig 203].

The building adjoining "Colonieshuis 3" was the cellar (No 12) erected by the Landdrost Cornelis Linnes between 1693/94 [32] and 1695/96, when he died in office [33]. This building is depicted by Stade with a triangular dwarf-gable containing a small

window above its entrance [Fig 203], similar to those shown by the same artist in Cape Town [Fig 58] and at Constantia [Fig 139].

While it might seem unlikely that the only centre-gabled building in the village itself should have been a mere cellar, it could be that the Landdrost was attempting to emulate the buildings of his superiors, such as Simon van der Stel's residence at Constantia. Another possible explanation for this feature is the description of the building as a "wijnhuis of pershuis", when an internal wall was demolished to facilitate its use as a temporary church after the fire of 1710 [34]. If Linnes had erected this structure as a tavern ("wijnhuis") as well as a wine-press ("pershuis"), the dwarf-gable could have served the same advertising function as the earliest full-height gables in Cape Town on Van Harwaerden's inn, shown in the cavalier perspective of 1660 [Fig 56]. It is not unlikely that Landdrost Linnes was engaged in private trading, given the latitude afforded to the Company's officials during the Van der Stel regime. Moreover, he probably used the entire property to the north of "Colonieshuis 3" as a private vineyard.

To the rear of this block, on the intersection of the present Church and Drostdy Streets, Stander depicts an L-plan building (No 28) on his reconstructed plan [Fig 190]. This is identified as "Huis Conterman", thereby contradicting Vos' attribution of the ownership of the building identified in Smuts as the second mill. Fransen reduces this building to a simple rectangle [Fig 192], but Stade's perspective [Fig 188] provides no evidence that any building existed on this site at the time of his visit in February 1710 [35]. Vos accepts this building as rectangularly planned, although he attributes it to Linnes, and also shows another two buildings (Nos 26 and 27) on the eastern side of the property occupied by "Colonieshuis 3" [Fig 193]. However, he does not identify them in his annotations, nor does he refer to them in his text. None of the buildings shown along Drostdy Street, which had probably not yet been laid out, conform with the visual evidence of Stade's perspective, nor are they satisfactorily confirmed by any other evidence presented.

"Colonieshuis 3" (No 7) and Linnes' cellar (No 12) did not extend over the full width of this block, leaving a gap before Church Street was reached [36]. Across this street, on the north-eastern corner of its intersection with Ryneveld Street, is the Schreuder

house (No 13). This house was depicted by Stade as a rectangular hip-roofed building with a symmetrical facade comprising a central door with two windows on either side. It was owned by the ex-secretary of the Stellenbosch mill, Sebastian Schreuder (or Schröder), who was granted the plot on the 10th October 1709 after he became a free-burgher [37]. It had thus only recently been erected when Stade visited the village.

The Schreuder house, the earliest surviving building in the village, was restored in the 1970s as a T-plan structure [38], but the rear wing was considerably later. Woodward noted that archaeological excavations had revealed that this was a later addition [39], and Obholzer stated that these corresponded with an inventory drawn up in 1712. This described "a [bed]room, 'voorhuijs' and, soon afterwards, also a 'combuijs'. Moreover, the inventory also mentions an 'afdack' (lean-to) now demolished, which adjoined the kitchen" [40].

The configuration of the house and its correspondence with this inventory will be discussed below. Of greater significance here, however, is the fact that no reference was made to Hertzog's depiction of the Schreuder house as rectangular, on his 1817 survey plan of the village [Fig 189], by Fagan, by Obholzer or by Vos (who undertook the excavations, and dates the T-shaped addition to c1735/40) [41].

This plan, compiled and drawn by a sworn surveyor, shows a variety of plan types and sizes that, for example, make a distinction between U-plans with arms of equal and unequal length. It is therefore most improbable that he would have shown the Schreuder house as a rectangle if it had already been given a central rearward wing. On the basis of Hertzog's evidence, this rearward extension could only have occurred after 1817. The restoration of the Schreuder house is also anachronistic with regard to its asymmetrical facade and half-hipped ends, which resulted from alterations and additions made long after 1710.

The Schreuder house is one of only two examples of early 18th century houses where both inventorial and archaeological evidence is available [42]. Here, however, the inventory dates only from 1712, when the house had already changed ownership, and the archaeological findings raise more questions than they provide answers.

The inventory was compiled on the death of Abraham Evertsz, and mentioned three

rooms and a lean-to, the uses of which have been identified by Vos on the basis of their contents: "Room A (see Fig 215) was used as a bedroom and possibly for cobbling and contained, as did the entrance hall (Room B), pewter dining utensils, so that meals may have been taken in both... Room C served as a kitchen". The lean-to (Room D) contained "a pair of scales, two guns and a pair of pistols" [43]. Vos contends that the value of the objects found in this lean-to extension reveals that such structures "formed an integral part of the early eighteenth century house" [44]. In this particular case, though, its contents suggest that it was no more than a large walk-in cupboard, and was not used as a habitable room.

As far as a correlation between inventorial and archaeological evidence is concerned, two floor hearths were found in "Room C" (the "kitchen"). The inventory reveals that this room contained hearth utensils, but makes no mention of a "hearth chain", suggesting that there was no chimney. According to Vos, this provides confirmation of the accuracy of Stade's drawing (which shows the Schreuder house without a chimney), and indicates the absence of a ceiling as the smoke would have had to escape through the thatch [45]. A similar arrangement was also discovered in the "Posthuijs" at Muizenburg by the same archaeologist [46]. What Vos does not explain, however, is why two hearths in close proximity should have been required in one room. Moreover, he gives no explanation for their location in the middle of the room instead of against one of the walls, an illogicality which will be addressed below.

The detailed archaeological plan [Fig 215], moreover, raises three problems in terms of its correlation with Stade's depiction [Fig 202], with Vos' reconstruction of its earliest form [Fig 216], and with the existing building as restored in 1974/75 [Fig 214]. The first concerns the asymmetrical location of the windows in the existing walls, in comparison with the symmetrical arrangement shown by Stade in 1710. The second concerns the position of an earlier wall in the "voorhuis", built at a slight angle to the otherwise orthogonal walls, which encroaches on the opening of the present doorway. The third concerns the discrepancy in depth of the rooms on either side of the present "voorhuis", the one to the right being slightly over 14 feet deep whereas the room to the left was only 13½ feet deep.

With regard to the first discrepancy, Vos subscribes to the accuracy of Stade's

representation, although acknowledging the asymmetrical location of the windows revealed in the restoration of the present house [47] [Fig 216]. In order to accommodate Stade's symmetrical facade, Vos has assumed that the angled foundation, which constitutes the second discrepancy, was the right-hand wall of the original "voorhuis" [Figs 215 & 216]. He also shows its left-hand wall as corresponding with that of the present house, but does not reveal the presence of any old foundations in this position [Fig 215]. However, his reconstruction results in the house ending eleven feet short of the corner of Ryneveld and Church Streets, whereas Stade depicts it as extending to the edge of the plot on this side [Figs 202 & 216, No 1]. Moreover, he does not indicate a foundation line in this position either.

Vos' archaeological plan, however, does show old foundations of demolished walls across Rooms A and C, the latter between the two floor hearths [Fig 215]. These foundations could correlate with a different interpretation of the house as it stood at the time of the 1712 inventory. This is that the foundations of the angled wall encroaching on the present doorway were those of the left-hand wall of the earlier "voorhuis", and that the foundations between the two hearths were those of its right-hand wall. In this case, the "voorhuis" would have been almost centrally positioned between the the right-hand end wall of the house and the foundation indicated across Room A, thus corresponding with Stade's depiction of the siting of the house as well as with its symmetry. Moreover, both the "voorhuis" and the kitchen would have been provided with floor hearths against an internal wall [Fig 218], explaining the otherwise illogical duplication of this feature in the middle of Room C [Fig 215].

Another anomaly is the angled nature of the left-hand wall of the "voorhuis" and the rear wall of the lean-to, which are almost at right angles to each other but do not correspond with the strict orthogonal planning of the rest of the house. This suggests that both the wall and the lean-to were built later, without the supervision of a competent builder. The house erected by Schreuder and depicted by Stade could thus have consisted only of two rooms, namely a large living and sleeping area with a small hearth, and a smaller kitchen with a larger hearth [Fig 217].

The later addition of the lean-to would explain its off-centre location, as otherwise there would have been no source of light for the "voorhuis", now cut off from the two front

windows illuminating the room to the north [48] [Fig 218]. Given that the 1712 inventory which lists these extra rooms described the property of Abraham Evertsz, a subsequent owner of the house, it is not improbable that he was responsible for these alterations and additions.

The third discrepancy, concerning the dissimilarity in depth of the rooms to the left and right of the "voorhuis", cannot be explained at all on the basis of the evidence recorded on the archaeological plan. While such a discrepancy could have been accommodated with difficulty if the house had been T-shaped from the outset, it cannot be reconciled with a continuous rectangular hipped roof. Significantly, Vos "corrects" this discrepancy in his drawing of the developmental sequence of the house [Fig 216].

The difference in the depth of the rooms flanking the present "voorhuis" is thus likely to have been caused by later alterations to the house. Given that Vos does not indicate any break in wall continuity on the right-hand side where his own reconstruction suggests an extension, or on the left-hand side as proposed by the present author, and that the archaeological plan reveals no evidence of the symmetrical facade depicted by Stade, it is likely that the walls were razed to the ground when the front wing was extended. This, however, does not explain the unequal depth of the re-erected rooms unless, as with the angled "voorhuis" wall, they were built without the supervision of a competent craftsman.

Without further documentary evidence, no firm conclusions can be drawn about the original form of the Schreuder house, despite the existence of an inventory and of archaeological investigations, as the correlation between these two sources of evidence can be interpreted in a number of different ways. All that can be stated with certainty is that the house as restored corresponds neither with the archaeological findings nor with Stade's depiction of it in 1710.

The block to the west of Ryneveld Street, between Drostdy Street and Church Street, contained only four buildings as shown on Stade's perspective of 1710 [Fig 188], but five appear on the reconstructed plans of Stander [Fig 190], Fransen [Fig 192] and Vos [Fig 193]. This is the most controversial block in the village, as only one of the buildings ("Colonieshuis 2" - No 8) identified on these plans can be positively

correlated with Stade's representation.

The additional house shown on all three plans is that of the secretary and sick-comforter Jan Mahieu (No 24), the history of which has been outlined in Chapter 9.3.1, and the probable location of which has been identified earlier in the present chapter and in Chapter 9.3.2. Its location on these reconstructed plans is unconvincing not only because of its absence from Stade's 1710 drawing [Fig 188], but also because Hertzog's 1817 survey plan [Fig 189] shows only a walled yard on the site in question. Moreover, this house is depicted on all three reconstructed plans as a simple rectangle, smaller than "Colonieshuisen 2 and 3". Mahieu's additions to "Colonieshuis 1" (which probably also had an L-plan similar to the other "colonieshuisen"), as described by Adam Tas in 1705 [49], have thus been ignored in these reconstructed plans. Stade, on the other hand, shows two adjoining buildings across Dorp Street which correspond more closely with the descriptions of this enlarged structure [Fig 203].

There is no dispute about the position of "Colonieshuis 2" (No 8), which was on the south-western corner of Ryneveld and Church Streets, but no archaeological investigations are possible as the house was demolished and rebuilt as an apartment block with basement parking [50]. Vos, however, does provide additional documentary evidence derived from the minutes of the Landdrost and Heemraden: "In 1701 it was enlarged for minister Beck by the addition of a large room 7,6m wide, 5,5m deep and 3,0m high (25 x 18 x 10 ft)" and it was mentioned in 1709 that "a kitchen 6,1m wide and 4,6m deep (20 x 15 ft)... needed to be added to the parsonage". Mention was also made in 1721 of the necessity of re-plastering a lean-to [51], which could have been built before 1710 as this house was not damaged in the fire.

Without any surviving material evidence there can be no certainty about the interpretation of these additions. However, it is not improbable that the first converted an originally rectangular house into the L-plan hip-roofed building depicted by Stade, particularly given its similarity in span (5,5m or 18 ft) with "Colonieshuis 3". The kitchen proposed in 1709 was only 4,6m or 15 ft in depth, suggesting that it was under a flat roof or the lean-to mentioned in 1721, as was the kitchen at Oude Molen (see Chapter 9.3.7). Whether the kitchen converted the L-plan into an asymmetrical U-plan with a new flat-roofed wing, or whether it was built under a lean-to roof along the rear

wall of the front wing, cannot be determined without additional documentary evidence. Interestingly, Stander [Fig 190] and Vos [Fig 193] depict it as L-shaped on their reconstructed plans, but Fransen [Fig 192] shows this house with a symmetrical U-plan.

The houses shown by Stade [Fig 188] in the foreground of this block (Nos 14, 15 and 16) have been identified by Stander [Fig 190] and Vos [Fig 193] as those of Van Wijk or Diederik (No 21), Swart (No 22) and Emmenes (No 23). However, these houses are shown too far to the west to correspond with the ground lines on Stade's drawing (see Figs 194 & 195), and the Swart and Emmenes houses are shown as almost adjoining, whereas Stade depicts the two buildings facing Dorp Street as separated by their own width [Fig 188]. It is probable, therefore, that houses 14, 15 and 16 were located on the "empty" plot identified by Stander as "Mahieu", between the "Pastorie" ("Colonieshuis 2") and "Coopman" [Fig 190].

Stade depicts all three buildings with hipped roofs, but no facade details are provided owing to the obliqueness of the view. No 14 is L-shaped, with a chimney half-way along its rearward extension, and a window on either side. No 15 and No 16 are both rectangular, the former with a chimney at the apex of the hip and the latter without a chimney.

Significantly, Stade shows the plot on which all three buildings are located as unsubdivided, although it is separated from that of "Colonieshuis 2" by a line of shrubbery [Fig 188]. This suggests that all three buildings were owned by the same person. Without having consulted the original title-deeds, an identification of this person and of the possible use of the three buildings can only be speculative. Nevertheless, they could have been owned by Hans Conterman, the village blacksmith referred to in 1708 in connection with the ironwork for the rebuilt drostdy (see Chapter 9.3.3). In this case, the L-shaped building (No 14) could have been his house, the rectangular building with a chimney (No 15) could have been his forge, and the building without a chimney (No 16) could have been his charcoal store.

The existence of three buildings on one large plot is similar to that of the four structures on "Van Tonderen's" property (No 17) to the north of the church, which was originally owned by the wagon-maker Abraham Pyl. Moreover, a central location for the smithy

corresponds with Van Rheede's instructions that the plots between the church and the river were to be reserved for the village craftsmen and tradesmen. This site is therefore more likely for a blacksmith's establishment than those on the edge of the village suggested by Stander (No 28) [Fig 190] and Vos (No 4) [Fig 193].

As discussed previously, it is probable that the Coopman, Diederik, Swart and Emmenes houses (Nos 20-23 respectively) were only erected after Stade's visit to Stellenbosch in February 1710, but before the fire in December of that year. All four properties were apparently granted in 1704, although a date of 1709 appears to be more likely (see Chapter 9.3.2).

House No 20 was on land granted to a certain Coopman, who was described as a gunsmith and blacksmith ("roermaker en vrysmit"), and had rented one of the "colonieshuisen" in the late 17th century [52]. Given the location of his property next to that of Conterman (House 14), it is not unlikely that both blacksmiths shared the use of the forge (No 15) and the charcoal store (No 16). No description of Coopman's house is possible, however, given its absence from Stade's drawing and the lack of any archaeological findings or inventorial records.

The house on the south-eastern corner of Church Street and the present Andringa Street (No 21) was attributed to "Van Wijk" by Stander [Fig 190]. According to Vos, however, the land was granted to the master-builder Matthys Diederik, and the house was occupied by Johannes Elsevier from 1705 until the death of his wife in 1709, when an inventory was made of its contents. These were not listed room by room in the inventory, but Vos believes that they indicated that the first house "consisted of a kitchen and an oblong room which was possibly divided", creating a two- or three-roomed dwelling [53].

However, his archaeological investigations [Fig 219], revealed only a cobbled "stoep/dripline" at right angles to Church Street on the line of the later "voorhuis" wall of 1760, and "a semi-circle of river stones at 1,2m below surface level, which may have been associated with an early hearth" [54]. The latter was found against the back of the wing facing Church Street in a position which Vos believes correlated with that of the chimney of the L-shaped rearward extension of House 14 shown by Stade. Vos

also notes that the "rooms were provided with hard, compacted clay floors and on top of one of the surfaces definite signs of the 1710 fire were found in the form of charcoal and scorched clays". Moreover, the cobbles outside were covered by "a relatively thick layer of carbonized thatch" [55].

This evidence is clearly suggestive that the house was erected prior to December 1710, but is not conclusive with regard to its correlation with the L-shaped building depicted by Stade in February of that year. Vos does not reveal in which of the rooms the evidence of the fire was discovered, and the semicircular "hearth" could have been an external feature against the rear wall of the house. Moreover, he found no evidence of early stone foundations, explaining their absence by suggesting that they "were dug out and re-used in later constructions" [56].

As with his suggested development of the Schreuder house, Vos' interpretation of the archaeological evidence is questionable, based as it is on an attempt to correlate the building depicted by Stade with a later structure on a different site. His sequence of development for the Diederik house [Fig 220] begins with the L-plan building "depicted" by Stade. This was apparently rebuilt on the same plan after the fire, and an "out-house" was added in c1720. This "out-house" was linked to the main house in c1740, when the original L-shaped rearward extension was demolished and replaced by an asymmetrical T-shaped rear wing. Given the depth of the rear wing, it could not have been roofed under a lean-to, suggesting a major re-organization of the roof structure.

In c1750, however, the "original" L-shaped rear wing was rebuilt on the old foundations, although now extending further backwards to reach the end of the tail of the T-shaped wing. Vos depicts the new wing as pitched, meeting the front wing in a hipped junction. However, he gives no indication of the roofing of the older central rearward extension. It is unlikely that both were pitched with a valley gutter in-between, as there is no evidence that the necessary technology was available to the ordinary burghers in the country districts during the proto-Cape Dutch period.

Twenty years later, in c1770, the house appears to have been radically rebuilt as a U-plan on new internal foundations. Only the perimeter walls of the front wing

correspond with their earlier positions, and the wider rear wings would have required an entirely new roof structure. Finally, the house was rebuilt again on a smaller U-plan in c1810, after the fire of 1803. The relocated internal walls, intriguingly, correlate precisely in width with those of the house in "c1740", as reconstructed [Fig 220].

This tortuous developmental sequence was necessary in order to reconcile the archaeological findings with the house shown in the foreground of Stade's perspective. Once it is acknowledged that this building had probably not yet been built at the time of Stade's visit, a far less complex development can be derived from the archaeological evidence.

This is that the first stage comprised a two-roomed house facing Church Street, extending as far as the edge of the cobbled surface on which carbonized thatch was discovered. The second stage involved a lateral extension after the fire, converting the house into a symmetrical three-roomed plan. Internal changes must also have been made, as the eastern wall of the "voorhuis" was now located over the cobbled surface. The third stage involved the rearward extension into the U-plan of c1770. Apart from the relocation of the "voorhuis" walls after the fire of 1710, all these changes were incremental, and none of them required the demolition of existing rooms or major alterations to the roof structure.

It was therefore only after the destruction of the house in the fire of 1803, and the introduction of the Georgian model from England, that it was radically rebuilt on different foundations. Given that Vos acknowledges that all the original foundation walls were dug up and used elsewhere, it is thus not improbable that the complexity of his developmental sequence was based on the misconception that the positions of the Georgian foundations corresponded with those of the original house erected a century earlier.

The argument outlined above suggests, in addition to the evidence provided by the analysis of Stade's perspective (see Chapter 9.3.2), that the Diederik house had not yet been built by February 1710. However, an inventory of its contents had already been made in 1709, apparently proving its existence in 1710. This anomaly will be discussed at the end of this chapter, together with a similar contradiction regarding Callebassen

Craal, a building also "omitted" from Stade's drawing.

The houses of Swart (No 22) and Emmenes (No 23) must also have been erected after February 1710, when Stade made his drawing. Although Vos has undertaken extensive archaeological excavations, no conclusive evidence was discovered on either site dating from prior to 1710 [57].

The four small buildings to the north of the church, attributed to Van Tonderen by Stander [Fig 190] and Vos [Fig 193], are shown at No 30. However, the analysis of Stade's ground lines [Figs 194-197] reveals that they were sited further to the east (No 17). These four buildings, depicted as rectangular with hipped roofs and without any chimneys, were probably erected as the wagon-making establishment of the first owner of the plot, Abraham Pyl. Although Stander shows one of the buildings as larger than the others [Fig 190], there is no evidence of this in Stade's drawing [Fig 188]. The two in the foreground are both shown with two windows in their end walls, but the openings on their longer sides are not shown on account of the obliqueness of their depiction in the drawing.

The last house "omitted" by Stade was Callebassen Craal which, according to Vos, "was built in 1698, but was probably demolished and rebuilt by the middle of the eighteenth century" [58]. This "small-holding near the Drooge River which had originally formed part of the Voorgelegen farm" had come into the possession of Maria van Swaanswijk in the 1690s, "but it was only after her death in July 1698 that the property was registered". The inventory of her possessions described the property as "a small house and garden ('een huisjen en thuijn')", which Vos interprets as a house of two or three rooms, "one being the kitchen with a chimney, as a hearth chain was mentioned" [59].

Vos attempted to identify these rooms on the basis of a partial archaeological excavation undertaken during the renovation of the present house in 1979, but his developmental sequence is as complex and unlikely as that of the Diederik house [60]. He suggests here that a rectangular house was extended by an L-shaped wing to the rear, later demolished and replaced by a central rear wing converting the plan into a T-shape, which was later rebuilt as a U-plan [Fig 221]. As with the Diederik house, the

T-shaped extension is unlikely to have been built at any stage.

Stade does not show a house in the position of Callebassen Craal, although a hipped rectangular building does appear on the land grant of 1698 [Fig 222]. This, however, is depicted more precisely in outline than the other contemporary sketches on title-deeds, and more diagrammatically in that no doors or windows are shown, suggesting that the house could have been added to the drawing at a later date. It is possible that the house was hidden amongst the trees along the Drooge River to the east of the "Van Tonderen" houses (No 17), but Vos locates it further to the north, where it would have been visible to Stade had it existed [Fig 193].

However, Stade does show a large piece of ground to the north of the "Van Tonderen" buildings [Fig 223], demarcated by shrubbery, which corresponds roughly with the small-holding registered in 1698. It is possible, therefore, that although Callebassen Craal was "owned" by Van Swaanswijk, she was not yet living on the property at the time of her death. Moreover, the fact that the property was registered only when her estate was being tied up suggests that she would not have built a house before the property was legally hers, and probably used the land only for market gardening purposes.

The presence of an inventory is not conclusive proof of the existence of a house on Callebassen Craal in 1698 if Van Swaanswijk had been renting a house elsewhere. She could, for instance, have lived in the small L-shaped house in the right foreground of Stade's drawing [Fig 223], complete with chimney and a small garden to the side, thus corresponding with the inventory description.

A similar situation could explain the contradiction between the presence of an inventory of 1709 for the Diederik house and the absence of the house from Stade's view of the village in 1710. It is probable, therefore, that Callebassen Craal and the Diederik house in the village [61] were erected only after Stade's visit, as were the Coopman, Swart, Emmenes, Sax and Van den Berg houses.

The unreliability of title-deed and inventorial identifications is also illustrated by the absence of firm attributions for the plots owned by the sick-comforter and secretary Jan Mahieu and the blacksmith Hans Conterman. Although these were the only two figures

in the village to be mentioned in the Resolutions of the Council of Policy, apart from the Landdrosts and ministers, neither Van der Bijl nor Vos have located their properties with any certainty. Nor have any inventories been found of the possessions of these two prominent persons. This casts further doubt on the accuracy of the correlation between other properties, previously identified, and documents which were probably destroyed in the 1710 fire and reproduced from memory.

9.3.6 A NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF THE BUILDINGS OF STELLENBOSCH

Having described the individual buildings in the village, it is necessary in this chapter to correlate their architectural characteristics. This will take the form of a numerical analysis of the buildings depicted by E V Stade in February 1710 [Fig 188]. These buildings are referenced on the present author's reconstructed plan [Fig 198], the legend of which is provided in Chapter 9.3.2 (pp474-476).

Of the 22 buildings in the village, 17 have rectangular plans, including the church. Four are L-shaped, and only one has a U-shaped plan. This was the drostdy, which Valentyn described as one of the largest houses in the village [1].

The use of the L-shaped plan, which followed the precedent of the larger houses in Cape Town already established as early as 1660 [Fig 56], is interesting in its application. While buildings of this nature usually wrapped themselves around street corners, two of the four in Stellenbosch (the houses numbered 8 and 9) have their rearward wings on the edge of the plot away from the street frontage.

Of more importance, however, is the absence of T-plans in the village of Stellenbosch. The re-evaluation of Stade's drawing, which demonstrates that the T-shaped plan of House No 10 shown in the reconstructed plans of Stander and Fransen is incorrect, is of vital significance to this thesis. If the house had followed such a plan, it would have been evidence of the existence of such a type by 1710. There are, however, no convincing visual records of the T-plan prior to this date, which suggests that it first arose as a partial attempt to emulate the double-fronted plan exemplified by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel's Vergelegen. This was later to be simplified into the H-plan, no examples of which are recorded prior to 1710. The T-plan, therefore, was not the

evolutionary predecessor of the H-plan, but was an example of the architectural simplification that followed the embargo on farming activities by the Company's officials.

The numerical count of roof configurations reveals a majority of hipped buildings and a minority of those with gabled ends. Of greater interest is the fact that some of them were hipped at one end and gabled at the other, suggesting no firm preference for one solution over the other. This contrasts with the practice of the later 18th century, when the hipped end was replaced by the end gable.

From the evidence of Stade's drawing it appears that 12 of the 22 buildings were entirely hipped. Two more, attached to each other, were hipped at their ends (Houses 7 and 12). The other eight were at least partially gabled, but the only house with clearly depicted parapet gables at its extremities is No 10, which appears to have been provided with a loft, given the windows of the gable in the foreground. This gable was triangular in form, with a rectangular finial at its summit [2].

As far as facade treatment is concerned, four buildings (Nos 10, 9, 7 and 13) are shown with symmetrically placed windows on either side of a central doorway [3]. A fifth (No 12) has a door directly beneath its dwarf-gable and was probably symmetrical, but half of the facade is obscured by the parsonage in the foreground. Stellenbosch, therefore, appears to have had a larger proportion of houses with possibly symmetrical facades than those visible in Stade's views of Cape Town. Precedence for this arrangement had already been established by the drostdy, however, and the same precedent might also have accounted for the predominance of hipped roofs. The greater formality of the houses in Stellenbosch is therefore unlikely to have been evolved by the freeburghers alone. It is more probable that they were stimulated by the example provided by the Company's drostdy.

Only one of the buildings within the village proper had anything resembling a centre gable. This was the tavern erected by the Landdrost Linnes (No 12), which is shown in Stade's drawing with a triangular dwarf-gable over its entrance door, similar to those appearing in his depiction of Cape Town.

Significantly this, the only centre-gabled building in the village, has a hipped roof at

one end and adjoins its neighbour at the other end. The only house in Stellenbosch with gabled ends (No 10), on the other hand, has no central emphasis above the entrance. The later convention of a consistent use of central and end gables had not yet been adopted, and thus confirms the experimental nature of this period, a phenomenon already observed in Cape Town.

9.3.7 BUILDINGS ON THE OUTSKIRTS OF STELLENBOSCH

Stade depicts a number of farm complexes in the vicinity of the village [Fig 223], but only the three in the foreground of his drawing will be analysed in detail, as the others are too distant for an accurate appraisal to be made. Of these latter, however, one is worthy of a brief mention. This is the house behind the foothills to the left of the village (identified as Idas Vallei [1]), which is shown with a centre gable and a symmetrical facade, revealing that the formality of this type had already spread beyond the town in Table Valley and the village of Stellenbosch.

The three farm complexes in question are Voorgelegen, Oude Molen, and Bergzicht. The first two appear on Stander's and Fransen's reconstructed plans [Figs 190 & 192], but the third is omitted [2].

Although very close to Stellenbosch, Voorgelegen was not part of the original village plan, as it did not follow Commissioner van Rheede's instructions regarding the buildings along the road later to be known as Dorp Street [Fig 188]. Its farmhouse was set back from the road, allowing room for a threshing floor in front. It also had an out-building, shown on Stander's and Fransen's plans as aligned at right angles with the rear of the house, but revealed by Stade's drawing to have been located somewhat further forward.

The farmhouse and its out-building both have hipped roofs, but the house is elaborated by an almost full-height gable, located above the central entrance which is flanked by two windows on either side. The gable is narrow, with vertical walls at the sides, which were probably supported by internal walls beneath. The plan could therefore have consisted of a narrow central hall flanked by wider rooms on either side, as in the houses of Cape Town [3].

Voorgelegen is also instructive in that, as with House 12 in the village of Stellenbosch, a centre gable is present in a building with a simple rectangular plan, whereas the more complex L-shaped houses and the U-shaped drostdy were devoid of any such central elaboration. This evidence does not support an evolutionary development from simple to complex, with a centre gable added as the final stage. It reveals rather that a number of possibilities were being tried simultaneously, as was the case in Cape Town.

The farm Oude Molen appears at first sight to be less adventurous than Voorgelegen in its planning and three-dimensional form, consisting merely of a rectangular end-entry farmhouse with a hipped roof. Both Stander and Fransen give the house a T-shaped plan in their reconstructions [Figs 190 & 192], but there is nothing in Stade's 1710 drawing [Fig 224] to suggest such an arrangement.

The two out-buildings, moreover, are not orthogonally related to the farmhouse, but are randomly positioned. The one to the left, which is omitted from the reconstructed plans mentioned above, was possibly the original mill of the village. Obscured by the low wall in the foreground, one cannot determine whether its roof was supported by walls or extended down to the ground. Given that its ridge was hardly higher than the eaves height of the house, though, it is not unlikely that this structure was another example of an early "kapsteilhuis" [4].

The apparent unpretentiousness of the farmhouse of Oude Molen as seen in Stade's view is explained by the fact that only the end wall with its off-centre doorway can be seen. There is in fact a close correspondence between Stade's depiction and the sketch of the house as shown on the 1701 title-deed [Fig 179], which reveals that the principal entrance was roughly in the centre of the long facade (see Chapter 9.2.3). Although the lean-to in the foreground is not shown, the height of the hipped roof and the position of the chimney beyond the ridge line correlate with the 1701 drawing. It is possible that the lean-to had been removed by 1710, and that the off-centre doorway in the foreground had originally been an interleading door. The angle of Stade's perspective did not permit him to reveal the approximate symmetry of the facade, or the precise location of the kitchen beyond the main volume of the house.

Voorgelegen thus appears to have been a more sophisticated version of Oude Molen,

with its symmetrical facade and centre gable, and its kitchen within the rectangular outline of the plan. Whether Oude Molen was built first and its design was improved upon at Voorgelegen, or whether the latter provided an exemplar partially emulated by Oude Molen, cannot be established without a firm dating for the Voorgelegen depicted by Stade.

Bergzicht [5] [Fig 224], the third of these farm complexes, is the most unusual. It consists of three buildings, two of which are orthogonally related, but the furthest of which is angled with respect to the two in the foreground. This building is the most intriguing, as it appears to have a wide opening in the centre, extending through the entire depth of the building, surmounted by a gable corresponding in width. This opening might have been used as a threshing-floor, following Northern-European vernacular practice, or it could have been a covered loading space. As far as can be established, however, this was a feature never seen before [6] and never to re-appear in the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century.

This freeburgher's farm building just outside Stellenbosch is perhaps appropriate as a conclusion to the investigation of the architecture of the district as a whole. Its transient nature in the development of architecture at the Cape is contrasted by the continued evidence that it was the buildings of the Company and its officials that influenced future developments.

9.4 THE HAMLET OF DRAKENSTEIN

9.4.1 LOCATION OF THE HAMLET

The location of the settlement at Drakenstein, comprising a church and a mill and a few scattered houses, has not yet been definitively established, although circumstantial evidence points to the present village of Simondium as the site in question [1].

Unfortunately the contemporary written and cartographic records of the period are contradictory in this matter. Kolbe describes the church as being in the middle of the district, between the southern part (extending from the "Keer-weder" mountain) and the northern part (which continued as far as the entrance to the "Wagemakers-Valley")

[2]. This corresponds with the position shown on contemporary maps, but is contradicted by the sequence of farms suggested in Kolbe's description of the district. This sequence is as follows:-

Joannes Mulder's farm "Zorgvliet" at the "Bange Hoeck" (the entrance to the Drakenstein valley from Stellenbosch), Jacobus van As (the present Meerrust), and Abraham Villiers (farm unidentified). Without any mention of the church, which he had already described as being located between the two parts of the district, Kolbe continued with the northern part. This comprised the farm of Joan Blesius ("Simons-Valey"), the "Babilonische Tooren" (the hill of that name), Pieter van der Byl (the farm of Babylonstoren), Louis le Grand (farm unidentified), and the Drakenstein church. Beyond it was the farm of Willem van Zeyl (unidentified), the Paarl Mountain, and the farm of Francois du Toit (unidentified), which gave access to the "Wagenmakers Valey" [3].

The maps of the period, which are essentially similar, agree with Kolbe in all but two respects. These concern the positions of the church and the farm of Willem van Zeyl. Using M1/1159 [Fig 165] as an example (the map of the colonies of Drakenstein and Waveren which Kolbe uses to illustrate his own "Beschryving"), the amended itinerary is as follows:-

"Sorgvliet", Jacob van As, Abraham Villiers, "Drakensteen" (with its church and water-mill indicated), De Heer Jan Blesius, Pieter van der Byl, Louis le Grand, the hill named "De Babiloonsche Tooren", the farm of Francois du Toit beyond the "Paarleberg", and that of Willem van Zeyl, shown behind the "Babiloonsche Tooren" on the road leading back to Stellenbosch.

The map itself is inaccurate in depicting Simonsvlei (the farm of the Fiscal Blesius) to the south-east of the "Babiloonsche Tooren" instead of to the north-east, as it is in reality [4]. Kolbe adhered to the sequence of farms shown on the map, but differed with regard to the location of the church. This is intriguing, as although the cartographer was incorrect in respect of Simonsvlei, it is unlikely that he would have shown the church and mill in the wrong position.

The reason for Kolbe's probable error could have been due to the position on the map

of Willem van Zeyl's farm. He described it as "a very fine Estate, contiguous to the Church", where "a Sort of Market" was held for the farmers attending the church [5]. Although Kolbe almost certainly visited the Drakenstein church, given his detailed description, he might only have had second-hand information about Van Zeyl's market. If he had been told that the market was close to the church, he could have assumed that the two were adjacent. This would explain his "relocation" of the church to the north of the "Babiloonsche Tooren", and his contradiction of the cartographic evidence appearing in his own publication.

The case for Simondium as the site of the Drakenstein hamlet is based on two pieces of evidence. One is the cartographic evidence, which places it between the present Meerrust and Babylonstoren (if the inaccurate location of Simonsvlei is disregarded). The other is a Resolution of the 21st March 1713, where it was stated that Petrus Simond, the first minister, had been granted land some years previously to erect a shed in which to conduct services [6]. The present village of Simondium was named after the Rev Simond, but without firm documentary and archaeological evidence it cannot be proved that this was the actual site of the original hamlet of Drakenstein.

9.4.2 THE CHURCH

The holding of church services at Drakenstein was first mentioned on the 8th November 1688, in connection with the newly appointed minister, Pierre Simond. These would be given in French on every second Sunday in one of the freeburghers' houses. Simond was also to officiate in the Stellenbosch church every alternate week, as a number of French-speaking Huguenots had been settled in this district as well.

In order to give the minister the most convenient access to his congregation, it was also resolved that he would be granted a plot of land between Stellenbosch and Drakenstein. Here a parsonage would be erected with the assistance of two of the Company's carpenters. The required timber was to be cut in the neighbouring forests, and any other necessary materials would be supplied from the Company's magazines [1]. This property is the present farm of Bethlehem, situated on the Drakenstein side of the Bangehoek [2].

In 1689 the Huguenots presented a request for a separate church at Drakenstein, but this was turned down emphatically on the 28th November of that year. This was largely due to Commander Simon van der Stel's opinion that they were indolent and recalcitrant, and that their desire to remain independent should be thwarted [3]. This is an interesting entry, and could well have been the root cause of the truculence of the Drakenstein burghers in the first decade of the 18th century. Moreover, the Council of Seventeen supported their request, and the Drakenstein congregation was granted independence from Stellenbosch in December 1691 [4].

However, there was still no suitable place of worship, and the congregation made a further request to the Council of Policy for assistance in the building of a small church. This was supported by Governor Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel on the 1st April 1703, in a letter to the Seventeen. He confirmed that their services were still "conducted in a barn or room of a farmer's dwelling" [5].

It was agreed on the 26th July 1703 that the Drakenstein minister would be granted an accommodation allowance until a parsonage had been erected for him. This suggests that the house at "Bethlehem" commissioned at the end of 1688 had either never materialised or had subsequently collapsed, unless it had been sold to another owner [6]. Apparently a house "at Stellenbosch" was erected as a temporary measure "until a proper parsonage has been prepared for him", as mentioned on the 31st March 1704 [7]. This, however, was more likely to have been in the district than in the village of Stellenbosch, and was probably close to the shed at Drakenstein used for church services.

Another resolution was made on the 8th June 1707 that a church would be erected at Drakenstein, where services were presently held in a shed ("een hok, of opgeslagen loots"). A parsonage and sick-comforter's house were also to be built. Instructions were therefore given for a suitable site to be selected and for an estimate to be made of materials and expenses. This would then be sent to the Seventeen for a final decision on the matter [8].

This was confirmed by the Council on the 12th July 1707, when it was also decided that a school would be established, to be run by the sick-comforter. This entry contains a

more detailed account of the conditions there, as related by the new minister Le Boucq. Not only was there no proper church at Drakenstein, but there was not even a cemetery. Services had to be held in "een vuil, en van de huisen verafgelegen hok" [9], a description corresponding in terms of meanness and isolation with that of Kolbe. However, it was only on the 18th April 1708 that a letter was sent to the Seventeen, requesting permission to build "if not a church, at least a respectable place of worship, and a compact house for the minister". The community would contribute to the costs, in order to limit the Company's expenses [10].

Kolbe (1713) was extremely critical of the Drakenstein church: "This is such a sorry Building, that you would take it for a very ordinary Barn, and not trouble your Eye a second Time about it. The Wall is not above Four Feet high at the most; and the Covering is of Reeds ("In plaats van pannen of leien", ie instead of tiles or slates). The Inside is as bad as the Out. You see Nothing within it but bare Walls and Reeds, a few plain Forms ("kleine stoelen", or benches) to sit on, brought by Some of the meaner Sort; and the sorriest Pulpit and Desk that ever were seen."

He did not ascribe this to the negligence of the Seventeen, whom he described as having always "in all their Territories, contributed most liberally to the Building and Maintaining of decent Edifices for the Publick Worship of God." Not being prepared to say anything further on the matter, one can only imagine that he thought that the burghers were to blame, as implied in his description of the furnishings of the church [11]. However, Kolbe also mentioned that there was still no house for the minister, despite the offer that had been made by the ex-Heemraad Jacobus van der Heyde to donate land for the parsonage and school-house. This entry suggests that not all the burghers were lacking in initiative [12].

Valentyn agreed with Kolbe that the church was very badly built and looked more like a barn ("een schuur") than a place of worship. He was more forthcoming about what he believed were the causes, attributing them to the slovenliness of the burghers, who were not short of money. His attitude is not surprising, given that he had been on very good terms with Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel, who had experienced difficulties with the Drakenstein burghers on a number of occasions, particularly with regard to their unwillingness to collect the timber required for the repairs to their own mill [13].

Although he was correct in the matter of the mill, Valentyn was unreasonable in his criticisms of the burghers with regard to the church. The Council of Policy had written to the Seventeen on two occasions already for permission to build a church and parsonage, but had not received a positive response.

Another letter was sent in support of the congregation's request on the 21st March 1713 [14], but it was only on the 24th June 1716 that permission was received to proceed with the church [15]. Work had evidently started on the parsonage at an earlier date, however, as it had already been completed by the 30th March 1717 [16].

Permission for the church to be commenced would only be given once a satisfactory plan and estimate had been submitted to the Council of Policy. This was duly complied with on the 30th March, and land for the church was granted on the 15th June 1717 [17]. The church was completed in 1720, but it was no longer at the hamlet of Drakenstein. Together with its adjoining parsonage, it was now located at the Paarl, where it formed the stimulus for a village which would soon eclipse its predecessor. The church, parsonage and village, however, are beyond the chronological limit of this thesis, and will therefore not be described.

There is no firm visual evidence of the first Drakenstein church, which is not surprising in the light of the contemporary verbal descriptions. The representations on the maps of the period are as stylized as those of the church at Stellenbosch, and follow a similar graphic convention [18]. No building obviously identifiable as the church is visible on E V Stade's drawing of 1710 [Fig 225], although a number of barns or sheds are shown [19]. This is interesting, as Stade confirms the accuracy of the maps of the period by contradicting the isolated location of the building referred to in Kolbe's account and in the Resolution of the 8th June 1707. His drawing is entitled "Drakesteijns Colonie aan Caap de goede hoop daar de kerk staat", suggesting that one of the buildings depicted was the one used as a church.

9.4.3 THE MILL

The mill at Drakenstein was first mentioned on the 3rd May 1702, in connection with the absence of records of its income [1]. By the 8th January 1703 practical problems

had also arisen, and the community requested that repairs should be undertaken [2]. These were promised by the Council of Policy on the 13th January, when it was resolved that the Company's carpenter, "Jan Baas", would soon be sent to repair the mill [3].

Following further complaints from the burghers, the Landdrost was instructed on the 11th May to have the mill repaired at once, and to explain why it had become defective [4]. His explanation was received on the 16th May, and described two shortcomings. The first was that the mill received very little water during the dry season. This problem could only be solved by the construction of a dam, which would be a costly undertaking. The second was that the mill had neither a door nor a loft, with the consequence that the freeburghers' corn had to be stored outside, unprotected from the elements. "Baas Jan" had already been paid to remedy the second of these defects, but had not yet done so [5].

Another report was received from the Heemraden of Drakenstein on the 21st May, this time outlining the unwillingness of the freeburghers to transport the timber required for repairing the mill, despite the fact that they would be "liberally paid" [6]. This state of affairs was a matter of extreme displeasure to the Governor, Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. He therefore gave orders on the 24th May 1703 that all the burghers would be compelled to transport the timber on a ballot system, or pay the Company's expenses in hiring a wagon and oxen. The millwright Jan Vosloo was also to be summoned before the Council of Justice to "compel him to complete his contract" [7]. A letter was also sent to Drakenstein on the same day, stating that an estimate of the cost of the dam required for the mill was needed before any decision could be made [8].

This was the last mention of the mill or its dam in the Resolutions. The episode, however, is another indication of the difficulties of using Northern European technology in a country with a significantly different climatic nature.

Kolbe states that the Drakenstein mill was "situated at the foot of the Pearl-Mountain" [9], but none of the maps of the period support him in this regard. It is consistently shown in the vicinity of the church, between Paarl and the furthest lands of Fransch-Hoek at "Den Berg Keerweer". There is no accurate visual evidence of this mill, but it

could have been one of the buildings depicted in E V Stade's view of the hamlet [Fig 225] described in Chapter 9.4.4, below.

9.4.4 GENERAL DESCRIPTIONS OF THE HAMLET

There are only two contemporary verbal descriptions of the hamlet of Drakenstein, neither of which reveals its architectural form. Kolbe merely states that it consisted of a church and a public mill, with no village attached [1]. Valentyn confirmed the presence of these two buildings, but also mentioned that it contained "some scattered houses" [2]. Although Valentyn is unlikely to have visited Drakenstein, his mention of the houses is consistent with the depictions of the hamlet on contemporary maps. Moreover, it is confirmed by E V Stade's drawing of 1710, which is the only contemporary pictorial record of the hamlet [Figs 225 & 226].

Stade depicts the hamlet as consisting only of a handful of buildings. In contrast to Stellenbosch there is no indication of an orthogonal grid, the buildings being placed at random on either side of the road. Moreover, all of the houses appear to be rectangular in plan, and do not have the more complex shapes seen elsewhere. There is, however, a similar variety in roof forms, some of the buildings having hips and others gabled ends, although the former are more common. Chimneys are along the ridges of the roofs, suggesting central fireplaces. Three buildings are depicted with central doorways, but in two of them the positions of the fireplaces preclude the possibility of symmetrical plans.

One of the houses is of greater interest than the others, in that it introduces a type not seen elsewhere in Stade's drawings. The largest of the houses depicted at Drakenstein, it has two chimneys set in from the apexes of the hipped roof and projecting from below the ridge. Moreover, although no elaboration is seen along the length of the roof, a dormer window with vertical sides projects from one of the hipped ends. This was probably there to give access to the loft. A peculiarity of this house is the way in which this hipped end is depicted, as the eaves-line is horizontal on either side of the dormer but slopes downwards at the front. This could either be representing a half-hipped end [3] or else the main roof was brought down lower to the ground than at the sides [4]. It could also have been a lean-to extension at a shallower pitch, but the necessary

horizontal line is missing. Whatever Stade's drawing was attempting to portray, this curiosity is indicative of the variety of roof types employed during the period under review.

One other structure worthy of mention is the unroofed or conceivably flat-roofed building on the right-hand side of the road. This might have been the mill, and would have corresponded with its location as shown on the maps of the district, although the Berg River does not appear in the drawing.

Stade's drawing of Drakenstein is important in two respects. The first is that it continues to reveal the variety of architectural solutions characteristic of the proto-Cape Dutch period. These have already been described with regard to his depictions of Cape Town, Constantia, Stellenbosch and the Paarl, and suggest that his drawings were accurate records and not merely diagrammatic representations. The second is that it confirms that the degree of architectural formality and elaboration decreased in relation to the distance from the Cape Peninsula. None of these buildings appears to have had anything but a rectangular plan, and none of them are shown with centre gables.

Stade's drawings are therefore not supportive of the evolutionary theory that Cape Dutch architecture was developed independently by ordinary farmers. They suggest instead that it was derived from the buildings of the Company and its officials, and those of the freeburghers in Cape Town who were wealthy enough to emulate them.

9.5 VERGELEGEN

Vergelegen, the estate at Hottentots-Holland established by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel, is the most thoroughly documented farm complex of the period of this thesis. The reason for this is the extensive written and considerable visual evidence recorded during the dispute between Van der Stel and the freeburghers, which led to his dismissal as Governor in 1707. Despite this evidence, which has been common knowledge for decades, there is still considerable confusion surrounding the form of the original buildings. The question of whether Van der Stel's homestead was actually demolished, moreover, has not yet been answered definitively.

The confusion about Vergelegen appears to be for the same reason as that regarding the original Constantia, namely that historians have not been able to reconcile the realities of late 17th and early 18th century architecture at the Cape with the dominant evolutionary theory. They have therefore dismissed the verbal and visual evidence of the period which, in the case of Vergelegen, corresponds extremely closely with recent archaeological findings, as will be discussed later.

The Vergelegen of Wilhem Adriaen is similar to his father's farm at Constantia in that its erection was not mentioned at all in the Resolutions of the Council of Policy. It was only after the Directors had ordered its relinquishment in 1706 that it first entered the official records.

The first official mention of the lands at Vergelegen was in the letter from Amsterdam of the 30th October 1706 depriving Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel of his post as Governor. The farm was to be repossessed by the Company, subdivided and auctioned. It was stated in this letter that the grant "has never properly come to our notice, much less has our approval of it been asked or given". Moreover, the Directors gave orders for the homestead to be demolished, "as such buildings which are for ostentation and more for pomp than use have been built by the Company's servants at the Cape and in India greatly to our annoyance" [1].

Van der Stel was presented with an extract from this letter on the 14th June 1707 by the Secretary Willem Helot and the Junior Merchants Corssenaar and Van Putten [2]. However, despite the arrival of the new Governor Louis van Assenburgh in January 1708 with confirmation of the Directors' orders [3], it was not until the 14th March that Van der Stel was eventually dislodged from Vergelegen [4]. This was on the orders of the Visiting Commissioner Cornelis Joan Simons, who sent the ex-Governor back to Holland with the return fleet waiting in harbour. Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel thus finally sailed from the Cape in the "Oosterstein" on the 24th March 1708 [5].

By the 19th December 1708 the lands at Vergelegen were in the Company's possession [6], and by the 21st February 1709 the farm had been "subdivided into four lots, to be sold at an early opportunity" [7]. It was also reported on the 30th April 1709 by Van der Stel's "authorised agents" ("gemagtigdens") that the demolition of the homestead

("groote woonhuijs") had already been commenced, and should be completed by November [8]. It was also mentioned in a letter to the Seventeen dated the 6th June 1709 that the demolition of the "groote woonhuijs" had indeed been commenced, and it was stated categorically in a letter of the 30th March 1710 that this task had been completed ("het groote woonhuijs reets afgebrooken en gesloopt") [9].

On the 20th August 1709 it was confirmed that the farmlands at Vergelegen would be sold as four separate properties, and orders were given for the surveyor Caje Jesse Slotsboo to prepare two plans of the farm. One would be displayed in the new "Cat" in the Castle, and the other would be kept at Vergelegen by the chief gardener Jan Hartog. A description and valuation of the buildings at Vergelegen was also presented by Van der Stel's proxies ("gemagtigdens") at the same meeting. These comprised the following:-

One farmhouse containing four rooms, provided for the most part with ceilings, together with an inner court surrounded by six separate small rooms, valued at 600 rixdollars.

Three sheep sheds of baked brick, each 100 feet long and 36 feet wide, with nine cross-beams ("gebinten"). Valued, together with their kraals of baked brick, at 900 rixdollars.

One stable for horses, 46 feet long and 38 feet wide, with four cross-beams. Valued, together with its large kraal of baked brick, at 150 rixdollars.

One pressing-house of baked brick, 150 feet long and 40 feet wide, with fourteen cross-beams, valued at 700 rixdollars.

One mill with its millstones and machinery, forming part of a 120 foot long stable. The mill also had five rooms with lean-to roofs, and the building had a 60 foot long loft for grain storage, built of heavy beams and two-inch thick planks. Valued together at 1100 rixdollars.

One slave lodge, 122 feet long and 38 feet wide, with eleven cross-beams, valued at 400 rixdollars.

One granary in the form of a cross, 72 feet long and 38 feet wide, with eleven cross-beams. Valued, together with its threshing floor, at 300 rixdollars.

One shed with a water driven leather mill and a pump-making mill ("een molen om pompen te booren"), 60 feet long and 25½ feet wide, with five cross-beams, valued at 250 rixdollars.

The total valuation of the buildings at Vergelegen was therefore 4400 rixdollars, but Van der Stel's agents accepted the Company's offer of Rds 3000 [10]. Significantly there is no mention of the homestead, which if not yet removed was already in the process of demolition, hence its absence from the valuation.

Three of the subdivisions of Vergelegen were sold on the 31st October 1709. The fourth, which contained most of the buildings, was retained by the Company for a price of 9000 guilders, until it was sold to Barent Gildenhuis on the 14th November for a sum of 9500 guilders [11].

It appears, however, that Gildenhuis' portion did not include the pressing-house and the "pietjes-hok", the latter probably having been demolished together with the homestead, as it was also not mentioned in the valuation. According to Botha, his lands contained only the farmhouse with its inner court and annexed rooms, two (rather than four) sheds, five kraals, the slave lodge, the granary and the two masonry threshing floors, and the pump-making and leather mill [12]. This description suggests, moreover, that the two sheds along the octagon on either side of the homestead were taken down at the same time, thereby creating another three kraals in addition to the two on the cross-axial entrances.

The farm was described by Commissioner Cnoll in 1710, shortly after its subdivision the previous year. "This estate, which was lately sold in lots, seemed to us a delightful place. The houses ("huijsinge") and a section of the garden were enclosed in a stout ("wakker") octagonal wall. On the outside of the wall were other houses ("wooninge") of good size; it took us about three hours to inspect this gigantic piece of work..." [13].

Mention of the estate had already been made by Bogaert (1702), Valentyn (1705) and Adam Tas in his diary (1705), but only in general terms [14]. However, the

memorandum of the freeburghers taken to Holland by Abraham Bogaert in 1706 was more specific, and detailed the size of the property at Vergelegen as well as the number and extent of Van der Stel's lands elsewhere in the Stellenbosch district [15].

While this memorandum provided no architectural descriptions, Van der Stel himself was more specific about the buildings in the "Korte Deductie". This was written in 1708 by the ex-Governor, in refutation of the freeburghers' charges.

The burghers had claimed that the estate was of such a large extent ("van soo wijdluftigen beslagh") as to resemble a whole town, and that the lands were capable of supporting fully fifty farmers [16]. According to Van der Stel, however, the house was of only one storey, and was 19 feet high from the ground to the roof. It contained six apartments or rooms, together with a kitchen and a small provisions cellar. In addition, there were a gardener's ("bouwknegts") house and six or seven sheds ("hocken") for the sheep, the cattle, the stables, the wine-press and the slave lodge.

He stated, moreover, that the houses of the Fiscal Blesius and the burgher Henning "Huysing" were "in all respects much larger, higher and grander" than his own [17]. He also claimed that his fifteen cattle posts mentioned in the freeburghers' accusation were merely enclosures made of bushes, with a hut of straw or branches for the herdsmen [18].

Another more extensive description was contained in "Annexure F.2" of the "Korte Deductie", signed by the chief surgeon Willem ten Damme, the sergeant David Vieravond, the chief wood-cutter Jan Vosloo, the chief gardener Jan Hartog, the under-gardener Joost Verhens, the coachman Jacob Uldricksz, the postilion Reynier Jansz, the joiner Gideon Frischart, and the sailor and gardener Jan van den Bos. All of them were well acquainted with Vergelegen, and they provided the following description of its buildings [19]:-

A "manor house" ("Heerschaps huys") of one storey, level with the ground, containing six apartments or rooms, and a flat roof for the kitchen; five small rooms or "guarde robes" under the flat roofs or lean-to's, and a small provisions cellar, together with a similar small room, all level with the ground without any other apartments or storeys.

A house for the gardener ("Bouwknecht") with two rooms and an entrance hall ("voorhuys"), two more small rooms under lean-to roofs, and an inner court ("binnen-plaets") with further lean-to's.

Three sheds ("hocken") for sheep and cattle, as well as a part of another shed. A shed ("hock") for the pressing-house. Another for the slave lodge. And another used for the horse-stable and the mill. In addition, there were two small sheds used as workshops ("werck-huysen") and for storing the tools.

According to Van der Stel there were no other buildings on the estate, as shown on "Annexure F.3", his drawing of the farm and homestead [Fig 227] [20].

Pryce-Lewis has suggested that there is significance in the fact that the verbal description and the drawing appear as separate annexures, and that the nine signatories might not have been shown this drawing [21]. However, although their description was more revealing than Van der Stel's, it also concealed the extent of the buildings and omitted to mention the pigeon-house, the granary and the leather mill. Given their disingenuousness in this regard, it is unlikely that they would have raised any objections about the accuracy of the drawing.

The accuracy of the verbal and visual descriptions in the "Korte Deductie" was first challenged by Abraham Bogaert in his "Historische Reizen", published in Amsterdam in 1711. Although Bogaert never visited Vergelegen, he did have access to the evidence of a carpenter and a gardener ("bouwknecht") who were in the Governor's service for four years. The carpenter was Albert Gerritszoon van Emmenes and the gardener was Jan Roman van Oke.

They stated in a declaration ("een verklaaring") that the "manor house" contained six rooms, of which two were 36 feet long, two were 24 feet long, and the other two were 18 feet long, all with a width of 24 feet. The gallery ("galderye"), which extended for the full depth of the house, was 16 feet wide and 80 feet long. Of the four other rooms built against the house ("gebout tegen het huis"), two were 24 feet long and two were 18 feet long, and all were 16 feet wide.

The farmhouse ("boerehuis") contained two rooms 18 feet square, and an entrance hall

("voorhuis") 18 feet long and 12 feet wide. These three rooms were extended by two adjoining lean-to's and a "voorhuijsje".

The slave lodge and the stable (which also served as the coach-house and contained the cornmill) were each 138 feet long and 38 feet wide. The pressing-house (and wine-cellar) was 150 feet long and 38 feet wide, and the granary or mill ("de koornschuur of molen"), which contained a number of moderately sized rooms ("met eenige matelyke vertrekjes voorzien"), was as long as it was wide ("eene gelyke langte en breete heeft"). As Bogaert pointed out, it was hardly accurate to describe buildings of such dimensions with the ridiculous ("onnoozelen") name of "hokken".

There were also four sheds ("hokken") for the livestock, each 100 feet long and 38 feet wide, as well as six kraals for enclosing the animals. In addition, there was a tannery mill, 16 feet wide and about 60 feet long.

Bogaert stated that all these buildings had been completed within four years, and also mentioned a house and two masonry kraals at the "vishoek", and a barn ("schuur") beneath the kloof of the Hottentots-Holland mountains [22].

Van der Stel's "Korte Deductie" was criticized mercilessly by the anonymous author of "Neutrale Gedagten", published in Amsterdam but undated [23]. The author dismantles Van der Stel's evidence paragraph by paragraph, and concludes that his drawing of Vergelegen was deliberately fraudulent. He begins by suggesting that Van der Stel's assertion that the house of the Fiscal Blesius was larger than his own was made only because Blesius was not prepared to support the Governor in his dispute with the freeburghers [24].

He continues by mentioning that while the Directors could not necessarily believe the accounts of uneducated burghers that the establishment was as large as a whole town, they could also not believe the claim that it consisted largely of "hokken" [25].

As far as the signatories to the description of the farm outlined in the "Korte Deductie" are concerned, the author suggests that they turned their telescope ("verrekyker") around, and viewed the estate through the larger rather the smaller lens, with the result that everything was diminished in size. He made particular reference to the so-called

"garderobes", with dimensions of 16 by 24 feet, and questioned whether such descriptions for rooms of this size would be used in Holland [26].

He also mentioned the other six rooms described in the annexed declaration ("Annexure F.2") but omitted from Van der Stel's initial account of his homestead. Reference was also made to the discrepancies between the ex-Governor's description of the farmhouse and that of the signatories, and the number of so-called "hokken" described. He noted, moreover, that such a word would not be used in Holland to describe buildings more than 100 feet in length [27], a point made also by Bogaert.

He goes on to describe Van der Stel's drawing [Fig 227] as having been purposely depicted from such a great distance in order to obscure the large gardener's house and a number of the out-buildings mentioned in the declaration. He also questions whether the homestead was indeed only single-storeyed, on the basis of its clear depiction as a double-storeyed building ("het klaar vertoont twe verdiepingen in de hoogte te zyn").

He is clearly referring here to the windows in the triple gables, but is probably incorrect with regard to the upper storey. It is more likely that this consisted only of loft rooms, particularly given that an upper storey was not mentioned in the sworn statement describing the homestead in the "Contra-Deductie". This document, which would not have omitted anything to the detriment of Van der Stel, was not available to the author of "Neutrale Gedagten", as it had not yet been published.

He also provides a detailed analysis of further inconsistencies between the drawing and the text, and comments in particular on the "inpertinente" depiction of the wild beasts in the background as being larger than the cattle sheds, in a so-called accurate or "pertinente" drawing [28].

While the "Neutrale Gedagten" exposed the contradictions in Van der Stel's "Korte Deductie", in which he attempted to recover his honour after his dismissal as Governor, the "Contra-Deductie" introduced further evidence derived from the sworn statements of witnesses at the Cape. This was written by Adam Tas and Jacobus van der Heiden, two of the ex-Governor's most outspoken critics, as a public refutation of Van der Stel's "Korte Deductie", and was published in Amsterdam in 1712.

It began, as the "Korte Deductie" had done, with a presentation of the freeburghers' original letter of complaints written in 1705. This described Vergelegen as a country house ("Hofstede") of such extensive dimensions as to resemble a whole town, and the farm as being large enough to provide a living for fifty farmers. The farm was managed by the Company's chief gardener, and Van der Stel also had fifteen cattle posts beyond the Hottentots-Holland mountains, supervised by the Company's assistant surgeon [29].

It went on to transcribe various interrogations, including that of the freeburgher Daniel Zevenhoven, who stated that the house was 72 feet wide in front, apart from the "uitlating" (in other words only the main facade, and omitting the lower lateral extensions), and was 80 feet deep [30]. This could suggest that Zevenhoven's facade length differed from Gerritszoon's, although they agreed on 80 feet as the length of the "galdery".

This apparent discrepancy is explained by the likelihood that Zevenhoven used internal dimensions for the "galdery", but overall dimensions for the facade. Given that he was describing the measurements of an existing building, he was probably taking the dimensions that could most accurately be established.

Gerritszoon, however, was describing the internal dimensions of the building he had constructed, and omitted to mention the two-foot thickness of the outer walls and those separating the "galdery" from the lateral rooms. If these are taken into account, his facade length correlates exactly with that of Zevenhoven, comprising dimensions of 2-24-2-16-2-24-2 feet, giving a total of 72 feet. These two accounts therefore confirm each other.

The "Contra-Deductie" mentioned how meanly ("gering") the ex-Governor had depicted the estate in his drawing and in his verbal account of it. The authors also noted the absence of the house of the farm-manager ("het gespecificeerde boeren huis") from the drawing ("printverbeelding"), and the ridiculous ("zeer onnosel") depiction of the out-buildings. These out-buildings were not accurately described with regard to their breadth, their height or their purpose [31].

Further information on the building process was given by two free carpenters who had been employed on the project, Albert Gerritsz van Emmenes (referred to above as

"Gerritszoon" in Bogaerts' description) and Jan Jansz. van der Heyden. The first of them stated that the farmhouse ("boerenhuys") was merely a shell ("geraamte") when he arrived on site, and that he had built the loft and installed the doors and windows, as well as building the four sheds ("hokken") in the octagon ("agtkant"). The second of them had built the pressing-house and the barn, after the departure of the first. The remaining buildings, comprising the Governor's homestead ("Heeren huys"), the slave lodge, the horse-stable which also contained the cornmill, the smithy, the fulling-mill, and the house at the "Vishoek", were erected by both carpenters [32].

The second carpenter, Jan Jansz. van der Heyden, also stated that he had built a hot bath ("Badstoof") at Vergelegen, the first mention of such an amenity at the Cape. This was 10 feet square, with a sunken area ("uitgeholde bak") 6 or 7 feet square in the centre, faced with brown and white Delft tiles ("Delfse steentjes") [33]. Water was supplied to the bath from two large kettles, one containing hot water and the other cold, through two large copper pipes, each of which was equipped with taps.

This little room was heavily walled ("digt bemuurt") and dark inside, with only a single window in the wall of the octagon, high enough to prevent anyone from looking in. The roof of the bath was flat, and a mirror two feet wide and somewhat longer was attached to its underside [34]. This curious feature enabled Wilhem Adriaen to watch the people who were bathing through the window without being observed, as was commented on later in the document [35].

The "Contra Deductie" also included three drawings of Vergelegen in its prime, which revealed a far more handsome ("veel nettere") building than that depicted by Van der Stel in his "Korte Deductie".

The first of these was a plan showing the internal subdivisions of the homestead and the farmhouse, prepared from measurements by the ex-deacon Gerrit Remkes [Fig 229]. It also depicted the buildings outside the octagon, and described their purpose. These, however, could not be shown in their proper relationship with the octagon on account of the size of the paper on which the plan was drawn.

Remkes therefore explained in his annotations that the mill was 26 roods and 8 feet from the nearest corner of the homestead. The slave lodge, which was aligned with the

mill ("dat met de Moole in een regte linie is getimmert"), was 30 roods and 8 feet away. The granary ("Schuur") was another 48 roods away, and the smithy was about 60 roods further. On the other side of the homestead, the pressing-house or wine-cellar ("Pers of Wynhuys") was 25 roods and 7 feet away, and the distance from this to the so-called pigeon-house ("zo genoemde Pieties Hok") [36] was also 30 roods and 8 feet, thus corresponding with the slave lodge on the other side.

The second was an aerial perspective ("een regte natuurlyke afteikening"), by an unfortunately unknown artist ("den daar na toe gebragten Schilder"), who depicted Vergelegen as accurately as he could ("na 't leven, zoo goed als in zyn vermogen was") [Fig 230]. This demonstrated that Van der Stel's own drawing of the estate had been a miserable, wretched, feigned and false portrayal ("zeer elendig, kreupel, verdigt en valsch"). The authors also pointed out that the farmhouse in their perspective had been placed in the foreground, in order to reveal the octagon more clearly.

The third drawing was a site plan of all the buildings [Fig 231], showing their relationship with each other and with the farmlands beyond, as well as the ordered subdivisions of the latter [37].

Tas and Van der Heiden also referred to the so-called estate of Piet Snap next to the Company's post in Hottentots-Holland [38], to the "Vishoek" where the ex-Governor had erected two houses and some kraals, and to his fifteen cattle posts in the interior [39].

The so-called post of Piet Snap was actually owned by Van der Stel, and was sold by his agents ("gevolmagtigdens") at the same time as Vergelegen. It contained a farmhouse 39 feet wide and 23 feet deep, and a shed which was 165 feet long and 32 feet wide.

He had also erected two houses at the "Vishoek" (near the present Hangklip), each 46 feet wide and 21 feet deep, as well as three or four kraals, each 155 feet long and 72 feet wide [40].

The sixteen (sic) cattle posts were described by Calis Louw and Jan Human as being at "de Bot Rivier, Rustenburg, de Boonties Kraal, de Vesante Kraal, de Warmwaters

Kraal, de Swarte Rivier, de Sergiants Rivier, de Quartels Rivier, het Sieken huys, de Vleermuys, de Hartebeesten Kraal, de Leeuwe Kraal, de Tygerhoek, de groote Vlakte, Welgelegen en Wytgelegen". The last of these was a full sixty hours from the Cape [41].

The authors also noted that if the cattle posts at the "Soetendaals Valley" and the "Kleine Hoogte" at the "Rivier Zonder Einde" (described below) were included, the total number of Van der Stel's holdings beyond the Hottentots-Holland mountains would amount to eighteen rather than fifteen [42]. Only four of these, however, were permanently occupied. These were "Bot Rivier", "Warmwater", "Welgelegen" and "Wytgelegen", the rest being used only on a seasonal basis [43].

As mentioned above, Van der Stel also had a grain farm called "de kleine hoogte" at the "Rivier zonder ent" [44]. In addition, he had grazing lands at the "Soetendaalse Valley", where the timber was cut for the 14-foot long palisades used to construct an enclosure for 4000 sheep, and a house with a length of 20 feet was erected for the shepherds [45]. There was also a house with a shed 100 feet long and 30 feet wide, together with a granary ("koornhuis"), at the so-called "Bot Rivier" [46]. Such structures, as the authors pointed out, were hardly the enclosures of branches and huts of reeds described in the ex-Governor's "Korte Deductie".

Returning to the estate of Vergelegen itself, the authors of the "Contra-Deductie" stated that the buildings were erected between 1701 and 1704, with the exception of the granary, which was begun and completed in 1705 [47].

Kolbe was never invited to visit Vergelegen, a surprising fact given that Wilhem Adriaen was his benefactor when he first arrived at the Cape, allowing him the use of the guest house in the Company's garden [48]. His only knowledge of the estate was therefore in the awkward circumstances of finding Van der Stel on the property when he visited the estate in the company of three of the foremost freeburghers who had contributed to the ex-Governor's downfall. This was a matter of distress to Wilhem Adriaen, as he pointed out to Kolbe during a walk in the Company's garden on a subsequent occasion [49]. Kolbe was therefore unable to give a detailed account of the homestead, which he stated categorically had been demolished ("waarvan het grote huis

reeds voorheen was ingestort") prior to the sale of the four subdivisions of the estate [50].

He did mention, however, that Wilhem Adriaen had dammed up the river running past his property, in order to avoid flooding during the winter and to ensure a constant water supply during the summer. This river, moreover, had been diverted in order to drive the water-mill which was at one end of the stable [51]. The ex-Governor had also intended to erect a "Pleasure-House" on the summit of the Schapenberg, from which he would have been able to observe the ships entering Table Bay. This plan, however, was thwarted by his dismissal and recall to Holland [52].

Valentyn, who did visit Vergelegen, also mentioned the projected pleasure house on the Schapenberg [53]. He made reference as well to the prints of the estate, which he stated was beautifully represented ("cierlyk afgebeeld") in the "Deductie" (sic), in the "Contradeductie" (sic) and "in the work of A.Boogaard" (Abraham Bogaert's "Historische Reizen") [54], but unfortunately does not comment on their comparative accuracy [55].

He visited the estate in 1705, having been invited there by the Governor after conducting the afternoon church service at the Castle. The party left at six in the evening in a coach drawn by six horses and arrived at midnight, having changed horses half-way, probably at De Cuijlen [56].

The homestead ("dit schoon huis") was located within an elegant ("cierlyke") octagonal wall, built high and wide in order to protect it against wild beasts. The hall ("galdery") in the middle was 80 feet long and 16 feet wide. This had an exceptionally fine view over the lands and vineyards towards False Bay (described by Valentyn as "Kaap Falso"), while on the other side there was a garden subdivided into four quarters. His wording here suggests that the principal facade faced the bay, and that the "other side" facing the garden was the rear facade. Valentyn also mentioned that there was a river which was diverted into two branches, thus confirming Kolbe's account [57].

On either side of this elegant and particularly pleasant hall ("schoone en byzondere vermaakelyke galdery"), which was very tall and airy ("die zeer lugt en hoog was"), were four elegant rooms, and another four beyond them, all well furnished. It was

therefore to be regretted that such a beautiful building had been demolished on the orders of the Seventeen. Valentyn refers his readers to the "Deductie", the "Contradeductie" and to "Boogaard" in this regard, but it is unfortunate that his own description of Vergelegen was not as detailed as that of Constantia [58].

Valentyn's statement that there were only four instead of six rooms opening off the "galdery" is intriguing, particularly given that he makes reference to the "Contra-Deductie" which contained two plans clearly depicting six rooms rather than four. This point will be raised later, when evaluating the evidence.

Valentyn was, however, more specific about the demolition of the homestead which, he stated, was taken down some time after 1710. He is incorrect with regard to the date, as the demolition had already been commenced in 1709, but his statement that it brought in 7000 or 8000 rixdollars (presumably from the sale of salvaged materials) provides added evidence that the building was in fact razed to the ground [59].

As far as visual records are concerned, it is perhaps significant that E V Stade did not make a drawing of Vergelegen, as he did of Constantia. Had he done so it could have provided a datum against which to evaluate those appearing in the "Korte Deductie" [Fig 227] and the "Contra-Deductie" [Fig 230]. These, likewise, could have given a basis of comparison for the accuracy of Stade's own drawings. He did not, however, despite the fact that Vergelegen had been the most noteworthy building at the Cape. This was because Stade was at the Cape in 1710, and his omission thus provides further circumstantial evidence that the homestead had been demolished in its entirety by that time.

Vergelegen appears for the first time on M1/1162, a map of the whole settlement dating from the first decade of the 18th century [Fig 163], and is shown again on the slightly later M1/1158 [Fig 164], a map of the Colony of Stellenbosch. In both it appears as an octagon spanning the Lourens River, suggesting that the depiction is a diagrammatic one portraying the main building complex as the whole farm.

The farm complex itself is shown in four extremely important drawings. As well as being the most detailed of this period, they confirm the accuracy of E V Stade's drawings with regard to his depiction of the larger houses with triple-gabled facades

and hipped roofs. The drawings comprise a perspective from Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel's "Korte Deductie", and two plans and another perspective from the "Contra-Deductie" of Adam Tas and Jacobus van der Heiden. While they differ in detail, their similarity in most respects is of greater interest, a point that will be discussed below.

The site plan from the "Contra-Deductie" [Fig 231] reveals an octagonal central complex of buildings surrounded by an orthogonal arrangement of subsidiary buildings and farmlands. The lands adapt themselves to the sinuous course of the river, which appears to have been diverted twice in order to supply the two water-mills.

At one end of the central octagonal complex was the Governor's residence, or "manor house" [60] ("Heerenhuis" - 1) [61]. This faced outwards towards an avenue flanked by three rows of camphor trees ("Plantagie van Kamferbomen" - 23), which extended as far as the river. This avenue was not the public approach to the house, but formed a vista focusing on the vineyards across the river. However, the wide staircase in the centre of this garden front suggests that this was the primary facade of the house.

The farmhouse ("Boerenhuis" - 2) was on the opposite side of the octagon, and faced a narrower avenue of trees, described as chestnuts, walnuts, figs, pomegranates and almonds ("Plantagie van Kastanie- Okernoten- Vygen- Granaatappel- en Amandelbomen" - 27), these forming a single row on either side.

At either end of the cross-axis were two irregularly shaped six-sided enclosures giving access to the octagon. These are not annotated in the plan but served as entrance courts, which probably doubled as the kraals referred to in the valuation.

The angled sides of the octagon contained four roofed animal enclosures. These comprised two sheep sheds (pens in the translation, although they were roofed - "Schapenhok" and "ander Schapenhok" - 14 & 15) adjoining the farmhouse, and a milking shed and cattle shed (the latter also described as a pen in the translation) adjoining the Governor's residence ("Melkhok" and "Beestenhok" - 13 & 16).

The octagon itself contained an orangery ("Orangerie" - 3), divided into four parts corresponding with the major axes of the space within the surrounding buildings. The crossing of these axes was accentuated with splayed edges to the four segments, thereby

repeating the form of the enclosing octagonal plan.

In close proximity to the central complex were four subsidiary buildings. These were located at right angles to the main axis, the outer edges of the first two aligned with the facade of the Governor's residence, and the inner edges of the second two with the wall giving access to the farmhouse [62].

These were all rectangular in form and are shown in this plan as identical in size. The two aligned on either side of the residence were the wine-cellar ("Pershuis" - 4) to the right and the stable and cornmill ("Paardestal en Koornmolen" - 7) to the left, the mill-wheel of the latter depicted on the inner side. The other two, aligned on either side of the farmhouse, were the pigeon-house ("Pietjeshok" - 5) to the left and the slave house ("Slavenhuis" - 6) to the right, as seen when facing the octagon. Although these two pairs of out-buildings were aligned with each other in both directions, they were not symmetrically located with regard to the cross-axis. The significance of this will be discussed later.

There were also three other out-buildings which have not been mentioned in any of the publications dealing with Vergelegen, possibly because they do not appear on the perspectives in the "Korte Deductie" and the "Contra-Deductie". These buildings do not conform with the formal arrangement of the buildings discussed above except in that they are positioned orthogonally.

The first was the cross-shaped barn ("Koornschuur" - 9), which corresponds with the description in the valuation. This might have been based on the Company's granary at Rondebosch, the description of which refers to two loading platforms which could possibly have been projecting wings. What is certain, though, is that this was the first cross-shaped non-religious building to be graphically recorded at the Cape, a plan type rarely repeated except in churches.

Two circular threshing-floors ("Dorschvloeren" - 10) were located immediately outside the ends of the longer arms of the cross, suggesting that the shorter arms were used for access. The only formal relationship between this building and the main complex is that one side of the longer wing was aligned with the ends of the slave lodge and the mill/stable.

The other two buildings were not related in any way to the main group or to the granary. The brick-kiln ("Steenoven" - 11) was a rectangular structure parallel to the longer arm of the granary, while the smithy and tanner's mill ("Smitswinkel en Zeemmolen" - 8, referred to as the pump-making and leather mill in the valuation) was a rectangular building at right angles to the kiln. The plan shows a partition separating the two functions, as well as a water-wheel.

The outline of the farmlands is also worthy of comment. The vineyards at the upper end of the plan are symmetrically splayed, opening up a view to the Schapenberg beyond. However, the three rows to the left, the last of which has a return splay, have only two to balance them on the right. In addition, the grid of the orchards to the right is unrelated to that of the vineyards. Moreover, the vineyards across the river on the right-hand side have no formal relationship with the grid of the orchards or with the axis extending from the front facade of the Governor's residence. Not only is the axis not extended across the river, but the centre-line of the vineyards does not correspond with that of the avenue leading from the residence.

In terms of siting arrangements, the visual evidence contradicts Biermann's contention that Vergelegen was Baroque in layout and the precursor of a "rural Baroque" at the Cape [63]. The approach route from the town (across the two rivers to the north) was a winding one between two asymmetrically positioned out-buildings, which led to an insignificant gateway in the octagonal wall. Such an understated and cross-axial entrance is contrary to the specific formality of Baroque planning, where the visitor usually approached the main building on axis [64].

Tree-lined avenues do extend from the octagon at right angles to the entrance axis, but the one extending westwards from the principal facade of the residence is interrupted by the vineyards beyond the river, another contradiction of Baroque practice. The widest and most noticeable avenue extending from the octagon, moreover, is that leading southwards to the Schapenberg, but it too is reached from a mere gateway, and has asymmetrically placed buildings on either side.

To suggest that the site plan of Vergelegen could have influenced later Cape Dutch farm arrangements is unlikely in the extreme. The octagonal plan was never repeated,

and the so-called Baroque plans comprising a farmhouse approached between symmetrical out-buildings are in a distinct minority, all surviving examples of which date from the late 18th or early 19th century [65].

The detailed plan of the octagonal complex of buildings [Fig 229] has been given no coverage at all in publications on Vergelegen. This might be because it does not locate the out-buildings as accurately as in the site plan, but the reason for this has already been established. It is also sometimes inconsistent with the written sources in its representation of the sizes of the rooms in the homestead and the farmhouse. However, its importance lies in the depiction of the internal subdivisions of these two buildings, which correlate largely with the written sources, and in the dimensions it gives for the out-buildings.

The internal court of the main complex was a regular octagon with sides of 128 feet ("lang 10 Roeden 8 Voeten") [66]. Within this court was the orangery, comprising four orchards each containing 39 trees planted on a gridiron pattern. These were surrounded by an octagonal walkway and crossed by two pathways on the cross-axes.

The Governor's residence was located on the western side of the octagon, approached by the narrow avenue between the fruit-trees, and without any indication of an entrance landing. On the far side, however, a broad terrace or landing is shown extending almost the full width of the facade. This was reached by steps on all three sides as shown on the site plan, although here the drawing suggests that it was walled [67].

This landing, which is similar to that of the fourth drostdy at Stellenbosch, and might have been the precursor of the Cape Dutch stoep, faced the wider avenue between the triple line of camphor trees, beyond which the view towards False Bay described by Valentyn was obtained. The formality of this terrace is further evidence that the principal facade faced the avenue, and that the one facing the octagon was the rear facade.

Moreover, the main facade which was 72 feet long as described above, was flanked by lower structures comprising the lean-to's and the walls of the yards on either side. The yards were omitted from the perspective in the "Korte Deductie", as will be seen later. However, each flanking wing was also 72 feet in length, thereby creating a 1:1:1

proportional relationship between the principal facade and its subsidiary wings.

The dimensions referred to here and in the description of the Governor's residence and of the farmhouse below, have been derived by constructing a scale from the stated dimension of 128 feet for the length of sides of the internal octagon. As drawn, however, these reveal a variation between 124 and 125 feet on the east-west axis, and 130 and 132 feet on the north-south axis, although the diagonal sides conform largely with the 128-foot datum. These minor inaccuracies could have been due to faulty setting-out of the octagon, but could also have resulted from the measurements of an amateur. Remkes was an ex-deacon, not a sworn surveyor, and the minor inaccuracies in his measurements of the residence and the farmhouse should be seen in this light.

The Governor's residence ("'t Heeren-huis") itself is depicted with a central hall extending without interruption from the front to the back of the house. On either side of this hall were three symmetrically placed rooms. Although equal in width they differed in depth, those facing the avenue being longer than those on the octagon side, and the two in the middle being the longest of all.

Beyond the main volume of the building, another three "rooms" were shown on either side, although these were not symmetrical. Those on the left-hand side, when viewed from the stoep, were identical to the rooms flanking the hall. The central of these, however, was more likely to have been an open court, as otherwise the inner room would have been deprived of light and ventilation.

On the other side, two of the outer rooms were separated from the main block by what appears to be a passage. This was probably an error in the case of the room facing the octagon, as will be explained below. The large room in the middle, however, was most likely to have been the flat-roofed kitchen referred to by Van der Stel and his nine signatories in the "Korte Deductie". This would have needed to be separated from the main block by a narrow court (rather than a roofed passage) in order to admit light and ventilation to the other large room flanking the "galdery".

The row of rooms at the rear of the house, facing the inner octagon, was continued around the angle, two "rooms" facing the orangery on either side. These appear on the site plan as well, but differ in their internal arrangements, as does the passage between

the first and second ranges of rooms shown here on the left-hand side, as viewed from the court. These discrepancies will also be dealt with when the evidence is evaluated.

The scaled dimensions taken from the plan reveal the central block as comprising a "galdery" of 17½ feet flanked by rooms of 27 feet each. These also appear to contradict Gerritszoon's figures, but if Remkes had based his dimensions on centre-lines, as drawn and as was the graphic convention of the time (seen in the plan of the hospital and indicated verbally in Valentyn's dimensions of Constantia), there would be a far closer correlation. Translating Gerritszoon's description into dimensions based on centre-lines, the figures would be 26-18-26. This suggests that Remkes' "galdery" should have been half a foot wider and his flanking rooms a full foot narrower.

There are also discrepancies regarding the length of the "galdery" and the depth of the rooms on either side. Remkes' plan reveals dimensions of 88 feet for the "galdery", and 27½, 38 and 22½ feet for the flanking rooms. Gerritszoon, however, gives a length for the "galdery" of 80 feet (as confirmed by Sevenhoven and Valentyn), and his centre-line dimensions for the flanking rooms would have been 26-38-20 [68].

In comparison with Gerritszoon's description, therefore, Remkes' plan correlates with the dimension of the 36-foot rooms, but exaggerates the 24-foot rooms by 1½ feet and the 18-foot rooms by 2½ feet. If, however, Remkes was using a combination of external dimensions and centre-lines here (as appears to have been the case in his plan of the farmhouse described below), his discrepancy would have amounted to only 6 inches at the front of the building and 18 inches at the back. Such a small discrepancy over a distance of 80 feet suggests that his plan agreed substantially with Gerritszoon's description.

A more serious discrepancy is found in the width of the flanking lean-to's. These are drawn with a width of 27 feet on Remkes' plan, instead of 16 feet as described by Gerritszoon. However, this discrepancy can also be explained. Gerritszoon's dimensions, taking wall-thicknesses into account, still fall short of the actual 125 feet of the octagon front, to the extent of 18 feet. This would have allowed two more small rooms to have been located on either side of the lean-to's, each 8 feet wide and thus making up for the difference between 27 feet and 16 feet, taking wall-thicknesses into

account. These could have corresponded with the provisions cellar and the similar small room described in "Annexure F.2" of Van der Stel's "Korte Deductie".

Remkes probably forgot to include these subdivisions on his plan and, having done so, repeated their total width on the facade facing the avenue. This could also explain his continuation of the light-well between the kitchen and the main block into the wing facing the octagon, whereas this space was more likely to have been the provisions cellar beyond the lean-to. A lean-to roof in timber over an unsupported span of 27 feet, moreover, would have been an extremely precarious structure. The only wider spans at the Cape at that time, at 30 feet, were those of the hall of Constantia and the crossing of the church in Cape Town, neither of which were required to support eccentric loads.

Unfortunately, none of the visual evidence of the Governor's residence can be compared with the written evidence of the valuation, as the building had either been demolished or was in the process of demolition, and was therefore not described. However, Remkes' plan of the farmhouse ("'t Boeren-huis") corresponds closely with the description in the valuation, and its main volume correlates with the account of Gerritszoon, apart from minor dimensional discrepancies.

It consisted of four rooms on either side of a similar transverse hall to that shown in the Governor's residence (although the hall was not mentioned in the valuation). As scaled off the plan, these have dimensions of 16 feet for the hall and 20 feet for the rooms on either side, in contradiction to Gerritszoon's internal dimensions of 18-12-18. If, however, Remkes had measured from the outer edges of the end walls and incorporated the 2-foot thickness of the "voorhuis" walls within its width, his dimensions would have read 20-16-20, which would have corresponded exactly with Gerritszoon's account. Moreover, his longitudinal dimensions, if read with regard to centre-lines, reveal the larger rooms as being 20 feet deep and the smaller rooms having a depth of 12 feet. This again would have corresponded with Gerritszoon's description, apart from the anomaly of 10 feet instead of 12 feet for the smaller dimension, if a 2-foot wall thickness is subtracted.

This anomaly could well have been the result of an unmethodical system of measurement on the part of an amateur. It is therefore suggested here that Gerritszoon's

dimensions are more reliable than those of Remkes. If this is the case, the dimensions of the farmhouse were derived directly from those of the Governor's residence, but on a smaller scale. The smallest depth of the main rooms in the residence (18 feet) was repeated in the square front rooms of the farmhouse, with a 12-foot "voorhuis" between them (giving proportions of 2:3). The "voorhuijsje" beyond was 12 feet square and was flanked by minor rooms 12 by 18 feet, again in the proportion of 2:3.

Beyond the main house was the "binnenplaats", an open court with an indication of a well or pond in the centre, surrounded on three sides by six rooms. The precise form of these differs in the two plans, the site plan moreover suggesting that the four rooms facing each other across the court were separated from the other two by heavy walls [69]. This, however, is contradicted by the valuation description. Both plans, on the other hand, agree in showing two rooms on either side of the courtyard and two flanking its entrance. They also agree in their depiction of two yards, one on either side of the farmhouse. These yards extend from the back of the rooms facing the internal court as far as the sheep sheds facing the internal octagon.

The eastern side of the external octagon, through which the farmhouse is entered, corresponds in width with the open court, and is thus considerably narrower than the northern and southern sides. Moreover, the entrance front to the Governor's residence projects from the perimeter of the outer wall, thus emphasizing the major axis at right angles to the direction of approach. The regularity of the inner octagon is therefore not expressed in the form of the outer wall.

The other buildings are shown only in outline, but their external dimensions are given, providing an interesting comparison with those given in the valuation. The plan shows two sheep sheds ("Schapen-hok"), one cattle shed ("Beeste-hok") and one milking shed ("Melk-hok") surrounding the octagon, all with dimensions of 102 feet by 36 feet ("lang 8 Roeden 6 Voeten, breed 3 Roeden"). The valuation report records three "schaapenhokken" 100 feet by 36 feet and one "paardehok" 46 feet by 38 feet. While the first three might have been inaccurately designated, the fourth must have been incorrectly dimensioned.

Of the four rectangular out-buildings surrounding the octagon, only three are mentioned

in the valuation. Significantly the one omitted is the pigeon-house, the only non-productive building in the complex. Moreover, the dimensions of the other three differ from those described in the valuation, and the four are not equal in length, as suggested by the site plan.

Both the wine-cellar ("Pershuis") and the pigeon-house ("Pietjes-hok") are shown on plan as being 156 feet by 44 feet ("lang 13 Roeden, breed 3 Roeden 8 Voeten"), whereas the wine-cellar ("Parshuis") is described as 150 by 40 feet in the valuation.

The stable and cornmill ("Paardestal en M[olen]") are shown on the plan as 129 feet by 42 feet ("lang 10 Roeden 9 Voeten, breed 3 Roeden 6 Voeten"), whereas the valuation describes the building as being 120 feet long, without specifying the width.

The slave lodge ("Slaven-huis") is 144 feet by 42 feet ("lang 12 Roeden, breed 3 Roeden 6 voeten"), according to the plan, but 122 by 38 feet in the valuation.

Finally, the granary ("Koorn Schuur") is described on plan as 76 feet by 42 feet, in comparison with the valuation report which states that it was 72 by 38 feet [70].

In every case the valuation understates the extent of the buildings shown on plan, but only by a small amount. Given that the recent archaeological excavations reveal that the dimensions of the three buildings excavated correspond precisely with those in the valuation [71], it is likely that all the contemporary measurements in the valuation were accurate. Remkes' measurements on behalf of the freeburghers were therefore probably slightly over-estimated, but not to a significant extent. This is not surprising, given the inaccuracies already described with regard to his plans of the farmhouse and the Governor's residence.

The Company's surveyor Slotsboo also made a plan of Vergelegen, copies of which were displayed at the Castle and at the farm itself, as mentioned above. This plan could have provided a comparison with Remkes' plan, but unfortunately it does not appear to have survived, unless it was the site plan illustrated in the "Contra-Deductie" [Fig 231].

The two perspectives will be described simultaneously. The one appearing in Van der Stel's "Korte Deductie" [Fig 227] is taken at ground level from the avenue of camphor trees facing the entrance facade of the residence, with the octagon behind. The drawing

in the "Contra-Deductie" [Fig 230] is an aerial perspective showing the rear or courtyard facade of the residence, with the octagon in the foreground. Both drawings show only the octagonal court and the surrounding four out-buildings, omitting the granary, the brick-kiln and the leather mill.

The positions of the four surrounding out-buildings differ in the two drawings, and neither perspective corresponds with the positions shown on the site plan. Those in the "Contra-Deductie" are set in from the edges of the octagon and are not aligned. In the "Korte Deductie" those in the foreground are aligned with the facade of the residence, corresponding with the site plan, but the more distant ones are positioned in front of the corners of the octagon wall, the length of which is exaggerated in this drawing.

All four are depicted with half-hipped ends and mansard roofs in the "Contra-Deductie". The mansard roofs were almost certainly accurate, and not an engraver's error, as has been revealed by recent archaeological findings [Fig 232] [72]. In the "Korte Deductie", however, the mill is given a gabled end, with the thatch projecting over it rather than being contained by a parapet.

To add to the confusion there are two versions of the "Korte Deductie" perspective, one reproduced by Walton [73] and the other by Smuts [74]. The first [Fig 227] is the original engraving which was commissioned by Van der Stel, and the second [Fig 228] was the copy commissioned by Bogaert. In the former a half-hipped end is clumsily shown in the case of the slave lodge, while in the latter a hipped end is suggested.

The "Contra-Deductie" shows all four out-buildings with oval windows under the half-hips and, apart from the water-mill, with rectangular doorways. The "Korte Deductie", however, depicts three rectangular windows in the gabled end of the water-mill and an arched entrance to the slave lodge.

Both drawings reveal other variations between the four buildings. In the "Contra-Deductie" the wine-cellar has eight square windows with projecting surrounds on its longer side. Only the end of this building appears in the "Korte Deductie", however, with the result that only one unelaborated square window can be seen on its side. Moreover, the reproduction in Smuts is unclear, but it seems that the doorway is flanked by windows with a further three openings above, under the half-hip. The wine-

cellar cannot be seen at all in the drawing reproduced by Walton, as it has been cropped out.

The mill is also shown differently in the two drawings. Apart from the difference in roof construction, it is depicted as an undershot mill in the "Contra-Deductie", whereas the "Korte Deductie" shows it as overshot, a point noted by Walton [75]. Again, only one window appears along the side of the building in the latter drawing, as most of its length is omitted. This window is rectangular in form and corresponds in proportion to the first three windows shown in the "Contra-Deductie". These are slightly deeper than they are wide and are also given projecting surrounds, and probably correspond with the part of the building used as a mill. Beyond them, however, are five much narrower and more closely spaced windows, without surrounds, which would correspond with the part used as a stable.

The slave lodge is shown in the "Contra-Deductie" with five irregularly spaced square windows without surrounds along the side, and two chimneys. In the "Korte Deductie", however, nine windows are shown, together with another arched entrance which is asymmetrically positioned. Only one chimney appears in the Walton reproduction, and none at all are shown in the Smuts version.

Lastly, the pigeon-house appears in the "Contra-Deductie" with eight narrow rectangular windows, without surrounds, along the side. A similar number appear in the Smuts version of the "Korte Deductie" drawing, but 23 much smaller openings are depicted in the Walton version [76].

There is greater correspondence between the two views with regard to the out-buildings enclosing the octagon, although significant differences do occur between the two perspectives and with the plans described above.

All four out-buildings are shown in the "Contra-Deductie" with half-hipped ends containing rectangular doorways with oval openings above, similar to the other out-buildings in the same drawing. The eaves of their mansard roofs, however, are depicted as stopping short of the inner and outer octagon walls.

The sheds flanking the residence are shown continuing as far as the internal corners of

the octagon, instead of ending short of them. Moreover, the inner walls continue beyond the buildings before changing direction on the cross-axis. As a result, the entrance courts/kraals do not correspond with those depicted in the two plans.

The milking shed to the left and the cow shed to the right are both shown with windows facing into the octagon, those to the left being rectangular and those to the right square. Both, however, extend beyond the roofs of the buildings in question, suggesting an engraver's error.

Only the milking shed and the cow shed appear in the perspective in the "Korte Deductie". These agree with the previous drawing in having half-hipped mansard roofs and windows beneath their ends, although they are square rather than oval. Here, though, the thatch projects over the walls of the octagon, and a row of small windows is shown directly under the eaves. No such outer windows appear in the "Contra-Deductie", although here it was the sheep sheds that were shown in the foreground.

The farmhouse appears only in the "Contra-Deductie" drawing, as it is obscured by the residence in the perspective in the "Korte Deductie". The depiction of this building is confusing, as it does not correspond with the plans in a number of respects.

The entrance from the outside of the octagon is centrally placed and flanked by pilasters. Above this, and extending the full length of the wall, is a projecting element casting a shadow on the wall. This could have been a simple but very deep cornice, except that its junction with the top of the otherwise unelaborated wall of the octagon is not consistent with this supposition. It could also have been the lean-to roof of the two rooms on the inner side, but this would have necessitated the forward projection of the front wall of the octagon to the depth of these two rooms, which is not shown here or on either of the plans. Moreover, it is hatched in the convention used here for walls, rather than cross-hatched as in the case of roofs.

Behind the entrance is the court, containing three "chimneys", one in the centre and one in each corner. While the outer ones could have been associated with the rooms on either side of the entrance, the central one is inexplicable, unless the rectangle in the centre of the court was a separate room. This could have been an outside kitchen, but this is unlikely and, moreover, is not consistent with the description in the

"Korte Deductie".

The rooms on either side of the court are shown merely as windowed walls, without roofs behind, the windows having similar surrounds to those on the farmhouse itself. This has what appears to be a half-hipped mansard roof, similar to those of the eight out-buildings described above, with a chimney on the right-hand side. The facade comprises four equally spaced windows, apparently with no doorway.

This is clearly in contradiction with the plans and with the description of Gerritszoon that the smaller rooms of the farmhouse were roofed with a lean-to. Not only is an entrance not shown, but the lean-to roof is also omitted. It is likely that the drawing from which the engraver worked was sketchy in relation to the farmhouse, that he mistook the central doorway for a chimney, and that he misread the pitches of the roof, shown here as a mansard. Had the upper part been steeper than the lower, the drawing would have shown a lean-to attached to a hipped roof. A similar lack of accurate information could also have accounted for the perplexing "cornice" along the upper part of the octagon wall.

Three possible solutions to the problem can be extrapolated from the available evidence, the first based on the assumption that the errors mentioned above were in fact made.

The first possibility is that the house had a hipped roof with a lean-to roof facing the courtyard. A central door was flanked by two pairs of windows, but these would have been placed further away from the door in order to accommodate the width of the "voorhuijsje". The other three sides of the court would have had walls at the same height as that of the lean-to of the house, but with lean-to roofs sloping backwards from these walls, as possibly suggested by the "cornice" above the entrance. This, however, would have resulted in an uncomfortably low eaves height, particularly over the entrance door.

The second possibility is that the lean-to in front of the hipped roof of the house was continued around the courtyard, sloping inwards on all four sides in the manner of a Roman atrium house, with a pool in the centre for drainage. Here, however, the disadvantage would have been an excessively high outer wall.

The third possibility is that the rooms surrounding the court had inner walls at the same height as that of the lean-to end of the house, but had flat roofs behind. This would have been the most elegant solution, as it would have permitted the height of the external wall to continue without interruption.

Lastly, the Governor's residence must be addressed. This was the most important building in the complex, and the one with the most discrepancies between the two drawings. Moreover, neither of the perspectives corresponds exactly with either of the plans. A number of attempts have been made to explain these discrepancies by attributing them to the fact that two different facades of the residence were depicted in the two drawings [77]. However, the relative elaboration of the two facades is inconsistent with the detailed plan and with the functional reality of the complex.

The principal apartments would hardly have faced into the octagon, with its adjacent cow shed and milking shed and their concomitant unpleasant odours. Nor would the principal apartments have been narrower in depth than those towards the "back" of the house. The facade towards the avenue of camphor trees leading from the octagon, on the other hand, had a wide terrace reached by steps, giving access to the most formally planned rooms on either side of the hall, those which were 24 feet square.

This evidence suggests emphatically that the principal facade of Vergelegen faced the avenue rather than the octagon [78]. It is inconceivable that the principal outward-facing facade would have been less elaborate than the minor inward-facing facade, thus contradicting the "evidence" provided by the perspective in the "Korte Deductie", which was certainly too simplified, and possibly by that in the "Contra-Deductie", which might have been over-elaborate.

The perspective in the "Contra-Deductie" [Fig 230] must therefore depict the minor facade facing the octagon. The main volume comprising the "galdery" and the six rooms on either side is shown with a hipped roof, and the flanking rooms with lean-to roofs. However, the rooms continuing across the angles of the octagon, as shown on plan, are omitted and the out-buildings meet the corners of the lean-to's directly. Only the main volume is elaborated, the flanking lean-to's merely providing visual support.

The residence is depicted with a five-bay facade, each bay of which is demarcated by a

pilaster. The pilasters are raised on pedestals, and linked horizontally by a stringcourse which corresponds with the level of the raised floor, reached by five narrow steps. These correspond with the entrance door, which itself is flanked by narrower pilasters, and has a rectangular fanlight above. This in turn corresponds with the upper halves of the windows between the pilasters, half-width versions occurring on either side of the doorway and full-width windows between the major bay subdivisions. These windows are all cross-shaped in form, with opening lower casements and fixed upper panes [79].

The lower facade is separated from the elements articulating the hipped roof above by an entablature and cornice, the horizontal emphasis of which is interrupted by forward projections reflecting the positions of the eight pilasters which visually support it. The roof itself is articulated by a central gable with two flanking dwarf-gables, as in the Stade drawings of Constantia and the house of Henning Hüsing in Cape Town. Here, however, these elements are depicted in far more detail.

The main gable has inward-curving scrolls resting directly above the pilasters demarcating the extent of the central hall. These scrolls are continued upwards by brief vertical mouldings, above which are concave curves which are terminated by a horizontal cornice. This is surmounted by a semicircular pediment which continues the line of the concave curves, with a spherical finial at its apex. Immediately beneath the cornice are two double-casement windows, with raised surrounds [80].

The flanking dwarf-gables are simpler in form, but are not mere "dormers" and therefore not worthy of comment, as suggested by the majority of sources on the period [81]. They are as much a vertical continuation of the plane of the facade above the cornice as the centre gable is, and also have a moulded surround, here roughly semicircular, with the same spherical finials at their apexes as found above the centre gable. Each contains a double-casement window, larger than the two in the main gable.

Behind the articulating gable and flanking dwarf-gables is the roof itself. This is shown as hipped with four chimneys, but the two in the foreground are set in slightly from the edges of the roof ridge of the facade. This suggests that they were not at the apexes of the hips, but were set back along the ridges of the roofs over the rooms flanking the "galdery", as shown on the reconstructed roof plan (see Fig 242).

The location of these chimneys suggests, therefore, that they emerged directly above the back-to-back fireplaces proposed in the reconstructed plan (see Fig 239), in contrast to those on the other facade. These are shown in the perspective in the "Korte Deductie" [Fig 227] as located precisely on the apexes, which would have required them to be cranked. This complication would have been necessary to avoid water-proofing problems, but would also have accentuated the formality of the principal front, following the precedent of Constantia and its own 17th century progenitors in Holland.

The perspective in the "Korte Deductie", taken from the camphor avenue, shows a simplified version of the octagon facade [Fig 227]. Moreover the residence is shown incorrectly in relation to the outer walls of the octagon, which it meets at the corners of its flanking lean-to's. It should have projected forwards as in the two plans, and its width should have been extended by walls on either side. The stoep or terrace, shown on plan as being almost the full width of the main volume of the house, is also omitted, four narrow steps giving access to the entrance instead.

The facade has a similar arrangement of a doorway flanked by half-width windows and two pairs of windows on either side. However, the number of pilasters has been reduced to four, those framing the door and those between the pairs of windows having been omitted. The pilasters, moreover, spring directly from the ground instead of being raised on pedestals. The windows are of the same cross-shaped type, but are smaller in relation to the area of the wall.

On either side of the main facade are the lean-to roofs of the outer range of rooms, sloping downwards from the lower edge of the entablature, as was the case in the octagon facade. These, however, as were those in the "Contra-Deductie", are too narrow in relation to the main volume to correspond with Gerritszoon's width of 16 feet.

The upper part of this facade is much simpler than that depicted in the "Contra Deductie" facing the octagon. The three decorative gables have been reduced to three swept dormers [82], the central one being slightly larger than the other two. The pilasters beneath the cornice have been continued upwards and meet the curved edges of the central dormer in a particularly unresolved manner. The facade treatment beneath

has also been repeated here, a central window corresponding with the door being flanked by half-windows, in contrast to the two windows shown on the octagon facade. The eaves of the hipped roof are raised above the cornice, supported at the outer edges by continuations of the corner pilasters, instead of resting on the cornice directly. The effect of this is that the three dormers are merely upward projections of the wall, hovering uneasily above the cornice, instead of being expressed as individual elements.

It is unlikely that either of these drawings is entirely correct, as has already been seen in their discrepancies with the plans. It is equally unlikely, though, that they are both entirely incorrect. The reality of Vergelegen was probably somewhere between the two.

The octagon facade is the more convincing architecturally, except for the pilasters between the windows, which have an awkward relationship with the dwarf-gables above. The windows, however, could not possibly have been so large, nor could the roof have been supported on the narrow piers between them. There is a quality of Dutch Classicism about the drawing, reminding one of 17th century houses such as Huis Bartolotti in Amsterdam, although they had far more elaborate strapwork gables than that of Vergelegen.

The avenue facade is more convincing in terms of the relationship between wall and window [83], and in the omission of the pilasters beneath the flanking dwarf-gables. The proportions of the facade below the cornice are similar to those of Cape Dutch farmhouses of the later 18th century, particularly with regard to the half-windows flanking the door in the central bay. This is the first appearance of this characteristic fenestration which corresponded with the width of the hall (or "voorhuis" in later farmhouses) behind.

The position of the entablature and cornice, however, is almost certainly incorrectly shown, arbitrarily located between the windows and the eaves. Not only is this architecturally inept, but it is found in no other 18th century houses at the Cape [84]. A cornice was used to continue the line of the eaves across the centre gable and flanking dwarf-gables of Constantia and Henning Hüsing's house in Cape Town, two buildings contemporary with Vergelegen. This feature, moreover, is also widely encountered in the Cape Dutch facades of the later 18th century. However, the only

known example with a full-width entablature, the fourth Stellenbosch drostdy of c1763, locates it immediately below the eaves as in the octagon facade shown in the "Contra-Deductie".

The lack of elaboration of the three gables is equally unlikely, as this was the principal facade. So too is the continuation of the pilasters into the centre gable, which dissipate into the curve of the swept dormer. There are also differences in detail between the versions of this drawing reproduced in Smuts and Walton. In the first [Fig 228] the entablature cuts across the pilasters without interruption, whereas in the second [Fig 227] its mouldings are projected forward to acknowledge the projection of the pilasters [85], as in later Cape Dutch town houses such as the Lutheran Parsonage in Cape Town.

Another important anomaly in this drawing is that a doorway is shown in the angled outer walls on either side of their junction with the residence. It has already been mentioned that this junction does not correspond with the plan, but of greater interest is the fact that similarly placed doorways are shown on either side of the farmhouse in the "Contra-Deductie". Moreover, the positions of the out-buildings beyond the residence cannot be reconciled with the plan of the octagon [Fig 229], but do correspond with their relationship to the farmhouse.

This could suggest that the residence was depicted in this view as an elaborated version of the farmhouse, with triple swept-dormers and a pilastered facade added, but without the full-width stoep and the flanking yard walls shown on plan. If this were the case, it would accord with contemporary accusations that this perspective was a distortion of the reality. What is certain, though, is that an attempt was made to misrepresent the size and ostentation of the residence.

The reality was probably that Vergelegen had equivalent facades (as did Hüsing's house in Cape Town), the one facing the avenue possibly being slightly more elaborate than the one facing into the octagon. They probably had a lower facade treatment similar to that shown from the avenue, but the upper elements comprising the entablature and the three gables are more likely to have been similar to those in the view from within the octagon [86].

The last pieces of evidence regarding Vergelegen are the recent archaeological excavations and the measured drawings of the existing house. The excavations concern the slave lodge, the mill and horse-stable, and the wine-cellar [Figs 233, 234 & 235]. These were all found to correspond with the positions outlined in the site plan of the "Contra-Deductie", and with the dimensions given in the valuation [87].

All three had internal supports in the form of brick piers or timber posts, set in from the outer walls but providing a wider central aisle. Moreover, the number of these piers corresponds with the number of cross-beams mentioned in the valuation. A reconstruction of the slave lodge [Fig 232] confirms the mansard roofs shown in both the "Korte Deductie" and the "Contra-Deductie" [88]. The internal arrangements of these buildings also correspond with the verbal descriptions in the case of the mill/stable, and the drawings in the case of the two chimneys of the slave lodge as depicted in the "Contra-Deductie" [89].

These buildings are a graphic illustration of the scale of Wilhem Adriaen's building operations, as the only contemporary triple-aisled structure known at the Cape was the hospital erected by his father, but with a width of only 30 feet. Van der Stel's out-buildings, however, varied in width between 38 and 41 feet.

The survey plan of the complex [Fig 236], together with the measured drawings of the homestead and its flanking structures prepared in 1991 by Rennie and Goddard [Fig 237], are even more interesting in the correlation which they reveal with the author's reconstruction of the plan of the original Governor's residence [Fig 239].

Based on the descriptions of Gerritszoon and Zevenhoven, there is an almost exact correspondence between the width of the present building and the original core comprising the "galdery" and the rooms on either side. Moreover, the 16-foot lean-to's correspond with an otherwise inexplicable narrowing of one of the cross-walls in Walgate's additions of the 1920s.

This wall is on the line of the inner wall of the present room facing the old octagon, and is parallel to the wall and pier placed half-way between the space separating the front and back wings of the present house. The narrowing corresponds exactly with the line on which the latter wall ends. This wall and the pier, moreover, are almost exactly

24 feet from the inner wall of the front facade, thereby suggesting that they were built on the inner foundations of the front rooms as described by Gerritszoon.

The depth of the present house does not correspond at all with the descriptions outlined above. However, the total depth shown on the survey plan as far as Walgate's colonnade is 84 feet. This would provide an internal dimension for the "galdery" of 80 feet, assuming that the external walls were 2 feet wide. The line of this colonnade also reveals a dimension of 125 feet, similar to the length of the octagon facade suggested by Remkes' plan.

Before attempting a reconciliation of the evidence presented so far, it is necessary to introduce the contradictory evidence of Stavorinus, who appears to have been responsible for the misconception that the present Vergelegen is a reduced version of the residence of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. Stavorinus, who stopped at the Cape in 1774, visited Vergelegen on the 24th July and described it as follows:-

"The front of the house faced the east. Before it lay a large garden, of a regular octagonal form, inclosed (sic) by a wall. The walk which led up to the house, was bordered on each side by orange and lemon-trees... Along the back of the house stood a row of very high and large camphor-trees...

"The dwelling-house... is a handsome edifice... with a long and broad gallery, which is the sitting and eating room of the family, and many large apartments on each side.

"The garden, the buildings, and the plantations, all bore very evident signs of the magnificence and wealth of the founder, who spent large sums of money upon this spot; but everything is now very much decayed..." [90].

Stavorinus evidently believed that the house he saw was the original residence of Wilhem Adriaen, but was almost certainly mistaken. His description of the "long and broad gallery" being used as "a sitting and eating room" corresponds more closely with the "voorhuis-achterhuis" combination of an H-shaped Cape Dutch house [91] than with the 80-foot long hallway of the original residence, which would probably have been used primarily as a circulation space.

Moreover, as Admiral of the return fleet, he ought to have been aware of his bearings,

but he "mis-orientated" Vergelegen to the extent of 180 degrees. According to him, the front of the house faced eastwards towards the octagonal garden, and the camphor avenue was at the back. However, the drawings in the "Korte Deductie" and the "Contra-Deductie", as well as the measured drawings of the present house, all suggest that it faced westwards, thus conforming with Valentyn's description of its view towards False Bay.

It is therefore possible that an interim Vergelegen was built facing the courtyard, between the demolition of the original structure and the erection of the present building. Although there is insufficient evidence available to prove such a proposition, it would explain the otherwise incomprehensible orientation described by Stavorinus.

Fransen and Cook suggest that the present gable dates from c1780 [92], and the archaeological evidence reveals that the interiors of the mill and the slave lodge were renovated in the second half of the 18th century [93]. These alterations could well have been made shortly after the visit of Stavorinus, thereby explaining the decayed condition of the buildings which he described.

Another misconception concerns Walgate's reconstructed plan of the original building, which he published in 1926 in the South African Architectural Record after his renovations and additions to the existing house [94]. This showed a plan consisting of an H-shape with an intermediate wing, separated by courtyards from the front and back wings. This extra wing, he believed, was what distinguished Vergelegen from the less ostentatious houses of the freeburghers, but there is no evidence that the conventional H-plan of the later 18th century was yet in existence.

This plan was re-drawn and published by Pearse [Fig 238] [95], thereby popularising the misconception that the original building was only partially demolished. De Bosdari referred to this possibility [96], as did Fransen and Cook, who suggested that only the wing facing the octagon was demolished [97]. Van der Meulen described the present house as "a much later construction" than the original, and described Pearse's (sic) reconstruction of the plan as "questionable" [98]. However, he suggested later in his thesis that the original gable "has remained despite various reconstructions" [99]. Obholzer also implies that Van der Stel's residence was not completely demolished, by

suggesting that the roof beams of the present house are those of the original structure [100].

Fransen corrected the misconception regarding the plan in his thesis, and suggested that it was more likely to have been "covered by one deep hipped roof" than by three parallel ridged roofs [101]. This is implausible, however, given the external dimensions of the house, as this would have resulted in a short but inordinately high ridge perpendicular to the facade. Moreover, Fransen mistakes the front of the house for the back, on account of accepting Van der Stel's drawing at face value [102].

Woodward accepts Walgate's plan with the three separate lateral wings [103], and believes that Van der Stel's view was accurate in portraying the less elaborate rear facade of the house [104]. Pryce-Lewis also subscribes to the accuracy of the facade shown in the "Korte Deductie", stating that if this were the entrance front "we are left with a design completely at variance with contemporary practice in terms of which the front elevation was always the most important".

This statement is open to question, as the only contemporary building for which there is visual evidence of both facades is Hüsing's house in Cape Town. This, however, was depicted by E V Stade with equivalently elaborated facades. Pryce-Lewis also suggests that the farmhouse acted as a "propylaeum" to the complex, thereby providing the "Baroque" approach referred to by Biermann, but this suggestion is not supported by any of the evidence [105].

The contention that the Governor's residence was only partially demolished is contradicted by Walgate's statement in 1926 that the walls of the present house were "largely composed of debris", confirming that the original structure was razed to the ground. He also found evidence of the foundations of the flanking lean-to's, but unfortunately did not show them on his plan, nor did he indicate their width [106].

A more likely sequence of events is that Barend Gildenhuys and his successors lived in the farm manager's house until they had built a new house on the site of the old residence. This probably faced towards the octagon and had fallen into a state of disrepair by 1774, when it was described by Stavorinus. The renovations mentioned above probably took place after his visit, and included the re-orientation of the house

towards False Bay.

This H-shaped house corresponded in width with the original hall and the rooms flanking it on either side, and was almost certainly built on some of the foundations of Van der Stel's residence. However, the depth of the original rooms was not repeated, as spans of 24 feet were no longer practicable. The present house, which was probably a re-modelling of the structure described by Stavorinus, thus appears to have been built only partially on the original foundations. It followed them in respect of the width of the three rooms to the front and the rear, but ignored them with regard to the depth of the wings and the central hall. In this respect it is not dissimilar to Cloete's rebuilding of Simon van der Stel's Constantia.

The acceptance at face value of the accuracy of Van der Stel's perspective has also been responsible for another misconception, namely that the swept dormer predated the parapet gable as the central feature. Using this drawing as a datum, Fransen casts doubt on the accuracy of Stade's drawings, suggesting that all his dwarf-gables were dormer windows [107]. Pryce-Lewis, moreover, reduces the flanking dwarf-gables at Vergelegen to swept dormers in his proportional reconstruction [108].

However, both the swept dormer and the parapet gable appear in the first three-dimensional representation of Cape Town, dating from 1660 [Fig 56], indicating that their introduction was roughly simultaneous. Moreover, the swept dormer does not appear in subsequent drawings from the period of this thesis, except in the unreliable case of Van der Stel's depiction of Vergelegen.

Returning to the primary evidence, there are still a number of contradictions that need to be reconciled. These concern both the accommodation within the Governor's residence and its dimensions. Although some contemporary sources reveal more accommodation than others, there is no fundamental disagreement about the residence comprising six rooms flanking a "galdery", with a further four rooms beyond them, under lean-to's. There were also a flat-roofed kitchen, a provisions cellar, another "similar room", and a bath with hot and cold water.

The contradictions appear in "Annexure F.2", which describes five "guarde-robes", and in Valentyn, who states that the "galdery" was flanked by only four rooms. The

"guarde-robes" were probably a euphemism for the rooms under the four lean-to's, one of which might have been subdivided, but the fifth could also have referred to the vestibule of the bath.

Valentyn's four rooms are more difficult to explain, as all the other evidence points to six. It could be that the two facing the octagonal court were private bedrooms to which he was not given access. This, however, does not explain how he could have described the rooms beyond as being well furnished. Perhaps his memory was at fault when writing about Vergelegen, as his description is significantly less detailed than those of Constantia, the church and the hospital.

The dimensional discrepancies have largely been reconciled in the presentation of the evidence, but those concerning the width of the lean-to's and the length of the "galdery" still need to be addressed. Gerritszoon's width of 16 feet for the lean-to's is contradicted by the 27 feet shown on Remkes' plan, the 12 feet suggested in the "Contra-Deductie" perspective, and the 9½ feet suggested in the "Korte Deductie" perspective [109]. The reduction in the "Korte Deductie" could well have been intentional, in order to represent these rooms as convincing "guarde-robes". The 12-foot width depicted in the "Contra-Deductie", on the other hand, is more difficult to explain.

The excessive width of 27 feet in Remkes' drawing was almost certainly due to the omission of the wall between these lean-to's and their flanking flat-roofed rooms on the octagon side, as described earlier in this chapter. It could be, therefore, that the engraver followed the plan in extending the lean-to's as far as the internal corners of the octagon, but reduced their width in order to exaggerate the extent of the main facade.

The length of 80 feet for the "galdery", given by Gerritszoon, Zevenhoven and Valentyn is contradicted by Remkes' dimension of 88 feet. This would become 84 feet internally if the 2-foot wide external walls were subtracted, but this does not correspond with the survey plan of the existing complex, which gives an overall dimension of 84 feet.

Remkes must therefore have overestimated the length of the "galdery", as he did the

widths of its flanking rooms. There is, however, still one more inconsistency that needs to be resolved. Assuming that the transverse walls separating these three rooms were the same width as those on either side of the "galdery", viz 2 feet, the length of the "galdery" would have been 82 feet (24-2-36-2-18) instead of 80 feet. These internal walls must therefore have been only one Rhineland foot wide (314mm). Despite their 18-foot height, this is not improbable, as they were not supporting any direct roof loads or an upper floor, which was the case at Constantia.

The evaluation and attempted reconciliation of all the evidence presented above is the basis for the suggested reconstruction of the original Vergelegen presented here [Figs 239-242] [110].

From the principal entrance facing the camphor avenue one reaches the "galdery", 80 feet long and 16 feet wide. Double doors lead centrally into reception rooms on either side, 24 feet square, each with a fireplace on axis. These are flanked by a real door and a false door, the former leading to a bedroom beyond, 16 feet wide, with a back-to-back fireplace.

Further double doors lead from these front rooms on their cross-axes to the largest apartments beyond, with dimensions of 24 by 36 feet, which also have fireplaces on axis. Both of these rooms are also reached from the "galdery" through another centrally located double door.

The room to the left communicates through another double door with a paved terrace, beyond which is a yard enclosed by the walls flanking the facade. That to the right, which was probably the banqueting hall, has two single doors at its outer edges. These communicate with the 8-foot wide service passage and light-well separating it from the flat-roofed kitchen, which is of equal dimensions.

The last range of rooms consists of those along the octagon front. These comprise two bedrooms, 24 feet by 18 feet, with fireplaces on their longer walls behind those in the main reception rooms. The bedrooms communicate with smaller rooms beyond, 16 feet by 18 feet, which could have been either "guarde-robes" or additional bedrooms.

Beyond these, and outside the main volume of the house and its lean-to extensions, are

two further rooms under flat roofs. The one to the right could have been the provisions cellar, communicating with the kitchen and with its adjacent trapezoidal yard, and that to the left the "similar room" mentioned in "Annexure F.2", opening off the triangular yard adjoining it.

There were also structures beyond the internal corners of the octagon, as shown in Remkes' plan. These have been separated from the main structure by the two yards referred to above, in order to avoid roofing complications. These yards correspond, moreover, with the spaces depicted by Remkes.

The rectangular structure on the right-hand side, beyond the trapezoidal yard, was probably a buttery. This communicates directly with the milking shed on the one side, and with the pantry and kitchen across the yard. That on the left-hand side was probably the infamous bath, reached through an antechamber/changeroom, and flanked by the boiler-room and fuel store [Fig 239].

The two diagrammatic elevations have followed the evidence used in the reconstruction of the plan, resulting in a far shallower pitch to the lean-to's, which in turn are flanked by full-height walls. The extent of these walls gives the facade even greater prominence on the west elevation [Fig 240] than in the drawing of the "Korte Deductie" [Fig 227] and, to a lesser degree, on the east elevation [Fig 241] in comparison with its depiction in the "Contra-Deductie" [Fig 230].

It has been assumed that the latter depiction was substantially correct, apart from its proportional inaccuracies. The suggested diagrammatic reconstructions therefore place the cornice directly under the eaves, instead of "floating" as in the suspect "Korte Deductie" perspective. These reconstructions have been presented diagrammatically rather than pictorially because there is not sufficient detailed evidence to provide a definitive elevation. The same holds for the other buildings analysed in this thesis, where pictorial reconstructions have likewise been avoided.

The roof configuration of Vergelegen also needs to be discussed, but this can only be a matter of speculation. All that is clear is that both the front and the rear wings of the house had hipped roofs, and that the rooms beyond the main volume were roofed with lean-to's. There are three possibilities:-

The first is that it had three adjoining pitched roofs parallel with the two facades, but this is unlikely as the variation in the depth of the rooms would have resulted either in three different ridge heights or in different pitches for the three roofs. These discrepancies would have been visible, and would have resulted in an awkward solution to the side elevations, thereby compromising the formality of those to the front and the rear.

The second is that the front and rear wings, again with different ridge heights, were linked by a transverse roof over the hall or "galdery", with a lower ridge than the other two. The rooms between these wings, however, would have had to be roofed with lean-to's, which would have been too low when extended to their external walls, or else with flat roofs. Both possibilities would also have been extremely inelegant solutions when viewed from the side, and there is no mention in contemporary descriptions that any of the central rooms were roofed in such a manner. On the other hand, they are explicit about the outer rooms having lean-to roofs, and the kitchen being flat-roofed.

The third possibility is that the main volume was roofed in the manner of the Mauritshuis in 's-Gravenhage [Fig 142], with a continuous ridge line around all sides of the house. This would have necessitated valleys on either side of the transverse hall and some means of draining away the rainwater, but the solution is not that unlikely. Given the resources available to Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel, the house could well have made use of construction techniques familiar in Holland but beyond the resources of farmers of the later 18th century.

It has therefore been assumed that the third solution was the one that was adopted [Fig 242]. The main roof would have had a span of 24 feet, corresponding with the depth of the front rooms and the width of the side rooms. It would have been supported by 2-foot walls on all its outer edges and along the length of the central hall or "galdery". The "galdery" itself would have been covered with a similar pitched roof, but of smaller span and therefore with a lower ridge height, which was probably continued into the gables on either side. This would have permitted the latter to correspond with the the width of the "galdery", which would have been structurally advantageous.

Drainage for the internal valleys was probably effected through downpipes in the thickness of the 2-foot walls flanking the "galdery". While this might seem improbable in terms of later Cape Dutch practice, it should be remembered that the light-well between the kitchen and the dining room also required underground drainage. The same problem would also have been encountered in the slave lodge and in the stables in Cape Town, and in the farm managers' houses at Constantia and Vergelegen itself, all of which were built on a courtyard plan [111].

The reconstruction outlined above, although based on the available evidence, does not pretend to be definitive. However, as with those of the hospital, the church and Constantia, its purpose is to show that the contemporary sources can be given greater credibility than they have been accorded in the past, and that their descriptions could have been more accurate than has previously been acknowledged.

Vergelegen will remain an enigma, as no one will ever be able to present an incontrovertible reconstruction of its original form. Too many contradictions exist in the four contemporary drawings for this to be possible, and no amount of excavation can resolve the three-dimensional questions which are central to the discipline of architecture.

The final question with regard to Vergelegen concerns the extent to which it influenced the development of Cape Dutch farmhouses in the later 18th century. Biermann was the first to suggest that Vergelegen inspired the burghers to build "not only large, but also grandiose buildings" [112]. He also suggested that the H-plan of the interior districts was derived from Vergelegen, while the U-plan of the Peninsula had its origins in Constantia [113].

These two suggestions would appear to be consistent with the argument presented in this thesis, namely that the Company's buildings and those of its senior officials created the precedent that led to the development of the Cape Dutch style. However, their influence does not appear to have been as direct and straightforward as suggested. The demolition of Vergelegen coincided with a diminution in the scale of the freeburghers' houses in Cape Town, as can be seen by comparing Rach's drawings of the 1760s with Stade's of 1710. If any one building were to have stimulated large-scale building

activity later in the century, it was likely to have been Constantia, which appears to have been the only "grandiose" building to have survived for a significant number of years.

Regarding Biermann's second point, it has already been seen that the U-shaped plan of Constantia was considerably modified in order to adapt it to a technology more appropriate to the comparatively limited means of the burghers. If the original Vergelegen were the precursor of the H-plan of the interior districts, it would have undergone an even more complicated metamorphosis. It has already been noted that Van der Stel's building was not H-planned at all, as can be seen from the contemporary drawings and descriptions. Apart from the flanking lean-to's and other subsidiary structures, its main volume was contained under a continuous roof around all four sides.

Its significance lies rather in the fact that it is the earliest graphically recorded example of a building with a transverse plan. The guest house in the Company's garden, Constantia and Nieuwland all had central halls only one room in depth, flanked by rooms of smaller width. At Vergelegen, however, the "galdery" traverses three rooms across the depth of the house, all of which are wider than the central hall.

This plan type is unlikely to have influenced later developments directly, as the house was demolished in 1709. If, however, an interim building had been erected on some of the old foundations as suggested above, this could have provided the precedent for the H-plan at the Cape. A U-plan would have been impracticable for an ordinary burgher because of the prohibitive width of the 24-foot span of the side wings. However, an 18-foot depth for the front and back wings, making use of the foundations of the "galdery" and the outer walls, would have been a very economical solution.

It could be, therefore, that it was the second Vergelegen that was the first H-plan building at the Cape. It could also have been extremely influential, given its legendary status. The misconception of Stavorinus that this building was indeed the one erected by Wilhem Adriaen is significant in this regard. He was probably given this information by the contemporary owner, who himself might not have known that Van der Stel's residence had been completely razed.

It is possible, however, that the transverse plan at the Cape predated Vergelegen. Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel mentioned that his house was less impressive than those of Henning Hüsing and the Fiscal Joan Blesius. These houses were both in Cape Town, and were described by Valentyn as "dubbelhuijsen", in other words with a central hall flanked by rooms on either side. These were built between 1695 and 1705, as Valentyn made no reference to them on his second visit (1695), but described them explicitly on his third (1705). They could thus have predated Vergelegen in their use of the transverse hall, and Wilhem Adriaen could have been attempting to surpass them at Vergelegen in order to assert his authority as Governor.

While the second Vergelegen was possibly the accidental progenitor of the H-plan, through its partial re-use of the original foundations, it could be that its use of the transverse hall was following a precedent already established at the Cape. Although certainly the most pretentious establishment erected at the Cape during the entire VOC period, the original Vergelegen is perhaps not as significant in terms of the development of the subsequent Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century as has previously been suggested [114].

10. THE EARLIEST COMPANY'S OUTPOSTS

10.1 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EARLIEST COMPANY'S OUTPOSTS

Apart from the Company's cattle stations previously mentioned [1], three outposts were established in the earliest years of the settlement. These were at Robben Island, Dassen Island and Saldanha Bay. St Helena Bay was also inspected, but was found to be unsuitable [2].

Although the buildings at all three outposts were utilitarian, they do contribute to our knowledge of the form and construction methods of the early architecture of the Company at the Cape [3].

10.2 ROBBEN ISLAND

Robben Island was used for a number of purposes apart from that of protecting the entrance to Table Bay.

Its first suggested use, made in 1652, was its most notorious: as a place of confinement [1]. However, it was only inhabited from 1653, when a sheep station was established there [2]. The island was first suggested as an alternative anchorage in 1654 [3]. Train-oil boiling was temporarily undertaken in the same year [4], when agriculture was also suggested [5] and rabbit breeding was commenced [6].

Its most important use as far as building work is concerned was the collection of shells for the lime-kilns, commenced in 1655 [7]. Lime-burning was also undertaken on the island [Fig 245], but not on a regular basis [8]. An experiment in stone quarrying using convict labour was initiated in 1657, but proved to be unsuccessful. However, slate was quarried on a regular basis from 1671 [9].

The erection of a "lighthouse" at the entrance to Table Bay, as proposed in the original instructions of the Seventeen to Van Riebeeck in 1651, was finally addressed in 1657, when a beacon fire was first lit on the island [10]. Lastly, the pig-breeding activities were transferred there from Table Valley in 1659 [11].

Robben Island was the most valuable of the Company's outposts described here, being used for stock farming, the provision of building materials, and the protection of the roadstead. Significantly, it was the only one of the three outposts to be occupied continuously from 1653 to 1710.

10.2.1 THE HOUSES AND THE ANIMAL SHEDS

Robben Island was first inspected on the 11th September 1652 [1], but a negative report was submitted suggesting that no fresh water was available. This misconception was corrected by Van Riebeeck's own visit on the 15th, when a number of streams were discovered [2].

The availability of water made it possible for sheep to be placed on the island for breeding purposes, the first consignment being taken over on the 14th May 1653. This was necessary as there was a high mortality rate amongst the sheep in Table Valley, caused by disease and the depredations of wild animals [3]. Since the sheep were increasing in number, it was decided on the 18th March 1654 to transfer all of them to the island, with four or five men to guard them. Orders were therefore given the same day for a well to be sunk [4], and for a shed to be erected to shelter the men and the sheep and for the storage of sealskins. Reeds and timber would be sent over for the purpose [5], and the task of setting up the sheep station was given to the book-keeper Frederick Verburgh.

The shed had already been erected by the 30th March, but it was mentioned that the building would soon have to be enlarged to cope with the natural increase in the number of animals [6]. Constructed of timber and reeds, it sheltered the sheep from the rain, while the men lived "at the side of it". This suggests that men and animals were accommodated under the same roof, an example of the North European "einhaus" or "longhouse" which was to continue into the 18th century as an alternative plan type [7].

Its structure was probably similar to the first temporary shed erected in Table Bay, except that it was roofed with reeds instead of timber, and to another contemporary example at Dassen Island. The latter resembled the vernacular "kapsteilhuis" in some respects, with rafters extending down to the ground [8].

The next building to be erected was a kitchen, and reeds and spars for its construction were sent over on the 10th May 1654 [9]. It is not clear, however, whether this was attached to the shed or whether it was a separate building.

Following an inspection by Van Riebeeck on the 12th July 1655 [10], it was decided that improved sheep sheds should be erected, and timber for the purpose was sent on the 17th August [11]. Van Riebeeck made another inspection of Robben Island on the 21st September 1655, and found that the number of sheep was now sufficient for the production of cheese [12].

It was therefore decided that a small milk cellar would be erected, and a shipment of "clay or loam" for the building was sent over on the 8th October [13]. This was followed on the 11th October by bricks, prefabricated door-frames and other timbers, together with a carpenter and a mason [14]. More bricks for the milk cellar were sent on the 14th and 15th October [15], and by the 25th October the cellar had been completed [16].

Although there is no further mention of the milk cellar, and no verbal or visual description, the building is significant in two respects. It was the first brick building on the island, in contrast with the shed and kitchen built of reeds, and was the first to make use of prefabricated door-frames. This is another illustration of the increasing sophistication of building technology at the Cape, and the concomitant move towards more permanent structures [17].

On the 15th October 1655 some timber stakes were also shipped to the island for the construction of lambing sheds [18], and more timber was sent on the 25th for extending the sheep shed [19]. This extension, however, was evidently not sufficient, as it was noted on the 12th December that a larger shed was required [20].

The house on the island was first mentioned on the 29th December 1655, when the post-holder was instructed that the lame sheep should be kept close to it, and all were to be trained to return to the stable every evening [21]. It is not clear, however, whether a separate house is being referred to, or whether it was still attached to the stable.

As the stable was not large enough to accommodate all the sheep, a circular enclosure

of branches and bushes, similar to those of the Khoi, was to be erected as a temporary measure. Once the old "corps de guarde" in the Fort had been broken down, the materials would be sent over for a larger stable [22]. The specific mention of Khoi precedent in the design of cattle enclosures is again instructive, revealing a willingness to absorb indigenous practices [23].

Robben Island was circumnavigated on the 25th February 1656 in order to take soundings and make a chart of the whole island [24]. This chart is probably M1/11 [Fig 243], the 1656 map which shows a single building situated close to the well. Its location and form suggest that this was the house and sheep shed, rather than the brick milk cellar, which is not shown. The building (which was probably the improved shed erected in 1655) was rectangular with the doorway in one of the gabled ends [25]. The roof was thatched and the side wall appears to be of timber cladding, agreeing with a description of the "permanent" shed which replaced it in 1659 [26].

Although the new sheep shed had still not been commenced, the construction of an enlarged sheep kraal was undertaken in 1657, the first consignment of the required timber having been sent on the 8th September [27]. The new structure was finally completed on the 16th February 1658 [28]. It was of timber construction, with laths used to join the poles, as the nails requested by the post-holder on the island were considered to be too expensive [29].

On the 9th April, however, word was received that the sheep kraal had been damaged and that a hundred poles were needed to repair it [30]. The required timber and equipment were sent on the 5th May, the latter including "3 lengths of old rope for making rope yarn to be used in building the kraal instead of using nails, which are too expensive". It was stated, moreover, that the poles would be fixed more securely with yarn than with nails, as was the practice in Table Valley [31].

On the 8th May a letter was received from Robben Island acknowledging receipt of the materials sent on the 5th, and stating that the carpenter would be kept there to construct a new sheep shed. This would be built adjoining the kraal, and would be used for storing the hay and accommodating the lambing ewes [32]. The carpenter was recalled from the island on the 23rd May, the shed presumably having been completed [33].

On the 16th June 1658 the house, shed, kraal and cellar were referred to, suggesting that these were now four individual buildings [34]. A request for a herdsmen's hut was also made on the 13th July, as the two shepherds who were presently sleeping in the shed made fires at night, thereby putting the building and the animals at risk [35].

On the 21st July the supervisor on Robben Island, Rijck Overhagen, reported that a larger shed would be required [36], and it was decided on the 30th November that a permanent sheep shed would be erected. The previous year more than 120 sheep had died of exposure because the existing shed was too small to shelter all of them, and it was essential to provide proper accommodation for the remaining 474 sheep before winter.

Orders were therefore given for the wood-cutters to prepare sufficient timber for a new shed, 100 feet long by 18 feet wide. The timber required comprised the following: 35 poles six feet long and five by six inches thick; 500 feet of rafters, ribs and ridges; 200 spars fifteen feet long; two frames and doors wide enough for the dung to be removed by wheelbarrow; and rough planks for cladding [37].

The first load of timber was sent on the 12th December 1658 [38], and instructions were given on the 16th that stone for the supports was to be found on the island, to save the expense of sending it from Table Bay [39]. It was also mentioned that Van Riebeeck would be coming over with the last load of timber to select the site for the new building, which he did on the 18th December [40].

Following a number of shipments of timber, word was received from Rijck Overhagen on the 20th January 1659 that still more was required. He was under the impression that the walls were now to be built of poles instead of planks, and that the western side was to be constructed of wattle-and-daub, as it was the most exposed to the rain [41]. However, the master carpenter was instructed on the 24th to clad the western wall with planks and the eastern side with wattle-and-daub [42]. Straw and laths for roofing the structure were shipped over on the 15th February [43], and the thatching had been "practically completed" by the 7th May [44].

On the 16th June, however, word was received that the building had blown down in a storm. The master carpenter was therefore sent over at once with two assistants to

attempt to re-erect it [45]. They reported on the 20th that "the posts had parted from their stone supports", causing the collapse of the roof [46]. By the 9th July 1659 the woodwork of the shed was sufficiently repaired for the carpenters to return, but the thatching still needed to be completed [47].

This description suggests that the structure of the shed was of timber posts resting on stone bases or pedestals [48]. It seems strange that a "permanent" shed for valuable livestock should be built of such impermanent materials as timber and wattle-and-daub, particularly given that the milk cellar had been constructed of brickwork four years previously. However, the manufacture of bricks was an expensive and time consuming process, particularly for a building of this size, and all the bricks available were required for the buildings within the Fort and elsewhere on the mainland [49]. The use of timber construction was thus logistically preferable and explains why the shed on Robben Island reverted to earlier building practices at the Cape.

It was mentioned on the 24th November 1659 that pig breeding was being undertaken on the island [50], and timber for the pigsties was sent over on the 7th January 1660 [51]. There is only one further reference to this activity, however (see Chapter 10.2.2), and no indication is given as to where the pigsties were located.

On the 7th August 1660 it was decided that vines were to be planted at the north-west corner of the shed and house [52]. This entry again suggests that these two functions were part of a single composite structure [53].

It was reported on the 17th December 1660 that the structure and roof of the sheep shed had been badly damaged in a storm [54], but no further entries were made in this regard until the 21st August 1662, when Commander Wagenaer inspected the island in order to undertake certain unspecified repairs [55]. Further enlargements and improvements to the sheep shed were begun on the 13th November 1663, when timber, planks and spars were sent to the island [56], followed by reeds and twine ("schiemans gaeren") on the 21st [57]. There is, however, no description of the extent of the building operations undertaken.

The house at Robben Island is shown again in M2/6, a plan of Table Bay dating from 1663 [Fig 244]. Here it is depicted as a rectangular hip-roofed building, with a small

asymmetrically placed gable-ended structure in the immediate foreground [58].

During an inspection of the island on the 11th January 1664, Commander Wagenaer selected the site for another dwelling-house [59]. This was erected by two of the ships' carpenters, assisted from the 5th February by the master carpenter, suggesting that this small house ("huijsken") also maintained the Robben Island practice of timber construction [60].

Further building works were carried out from April 1664, when 12 000 locally-baked bricks were sent over on the 28th, together with two masons to "complete the recently begun house" on the island [61]. Another 5000 bricks were subsequently sent in three shipments, to be used for the erection of other unspecified new buildings. These works had been largely completed by the 12th June, when they were inspected by Commander Wagenaer [62]. More materials were sent from the 21st June for repairs to the existing buildings on the island, one of which was the old kitchen [63]. These included a shipment of clay on the 10th July, presumably for use as mortar or plaster [64], as well as timber and bricks between the 15th and 31st July [65].

Although there is no description of the form or location of these buildings, it is noteworthy that bricks were again being used for construction on the island. This indicates a move towards more permanent structures, following the practice on the mainland.

Maintenance work was carried out on the sheep shed and other buildings in July 1665, following an inspection by Commander Wagenaer on the 2nd [66]. However, the sheep shed had lost its roof again by the 13th May 1669, necessitating reeds and spars to be sent over for repairs [67]. It was mentioned on the 24th July that sheds for the sheep and lambs had recently been built on the island [68]. Whether this entry refers to the recent repairs is not clear, particularly since more timber for animal sheds was sent over on the 27th September 1669 [69].

The reversion to timber construction could well have been because the buildings in question were for animals and not for human habitation. It appears that brickwork was by now a minimum requirement for the houses of the post-holder, the other Company's servants, and possibly even the convicts on the island. Timber, however, was sufficient

for the animals, and had the advantage that buildings of this kind could be more easily enlarged as the flocks increased in number and more accommodation was required.

Indeed, the sergeant-superintendent Jan Zacharias wrote on the 9th May 1670 that the sheep sheds were still too small, and should be extended by about 30 feet. The master carpenter was therefore sent over to investigate, and the necessary timber, reeds and straw were sent on the 24th May and the 27th June [70].

Walton illustrates a view of Robben Island in 1672 [Fig 245] [71], but this is too small to depict the buildings with any clarity. All that can be seen with certainty is that the main buildings appear to be situated in front of the rectangular wall surrounding the garden, which was possibly aligned with the rear walls of these structures, and that copious amounts of smoke are emanating from a more distant structure, which Walton suggests was the lime-kiln.

On the 12th May 1672 it was reported that a gale had caused considerable damage to the buildings on the island. The kitchen had been "blown down" and the dwelling-house and sheep shed so badly damaged that it was thought that they would have to be moved to a more sheltered position [72]. The Fiscal inspected the damage on the 13th June, and reported that the superintendent's house and the men's kitchen had been covered with sand up to the window sills. This had been caused by violent south-east winds blowing against the gables of the buildings. He confirmed that it was necessary to relocate them, and recommended a site on the northern side of the island [73]. This entry suggests that the walls of both the house and the kitchen were of brickwork, as there is no indication in the Fiscal's report that either building collapsed under the weight of the sand piled against it.

Timber was shipped to the island on the 2nd July 1672 for repairs to the sheep shed [74], and clay for repairing the kitchen was sent on the 12th September [75]. However, it was mentioned on the 15th June 1674 that a new sheep shed was urgently required [76].

It was not until the 12th September 1674 that the matter of the post-holder's house was addressed again, when the Fiscal reported that it had been almost buried by the drifting sands and that collapse was imminent. Given that it could no longer be occupied

without danger, it was essential that it be relocated. The superintendent on the island was therefore ordered on the 21st September "to send over a ground plan of the rickety building and how it bears by compass; also the height and breadth of the walls, that we may consider where another might best be placed" [77]. Unfortunately this plan, which could have revealed so much about the building, does not appear to have survived.

There is no further mention of the relocation of the house, but it was noted on the 15th January 1676 that the Governor had visited the island and selected the stone for a new "kraal". This was probably the sheep shed urgently required in 1674 [78]. The mention of stone, as well as the lime shipped over on the 28th March for repairing the "kraal" and dwelling-houses [79], completed by the 13th April, suggests a change in construction methods on the island. The move to masonry walling for the animal enclosures could well have been due to the increasing denudation of the forests on the Peninsula.

Further damage to the sheep shed was reported on the 1st May 1676, half of the structure having been blown down in a storm. A decision was made at the time that a small house would be built instead [80], but there is no further mention of this project, which did not address the problem of the accommodation for the animals that was no longer available. After the other half of the shed was also blown over, more appropriate action was taken on the 3rd June, when the superintendent was instructed to make repairs with the materials sent for the purpose. These had been partly completed by the 10th, the original reeds having been used for re-thatching the roof [81].

Two more descriptions of the buildings on Robben Island were provided by John Bonnel and William Erle. Bonnel described Robben Island in 1689 as having "two or thre (sic) houses where they hoist Dutch colours" [82], but Erle referred to only one building in 1696, stating that the island had "in the midst a small house, where they spread the Dutch colours" [83].

Further damage to the house was alluded to on the 10th December 1698, when it was mentioned that it would be repaired [84], but it was not until the 27th August 1699 that men were sent over for the purpose [85]. These, and repairs to other buildings on the island, had been completed by the 22nd September 1699 [86].

This final entry on Robben Island illustrates the difficulties of building in such an exposed position. Irrespective of whether timber, brick or stone were used for the walls of the buildings, the roofs could not withstand the gale-force winds encountered. Continual and costly repairs were therefore required, as can be seen from the documentary evidence outlined above.

10.2.2 THE GARDEN

On the 18th March 1654 the book-keeper Verburgh was given the task of investigating the possibility of establishing a garden on the island [1]. His opinion that this was not practicable, owing to the sandiness of the soil [2], was disregarded by Van Riebeeck, but vindicated by a failed experiment in grain production later that year, as reported on the 2nd October [3].

Nevertheless, another garden had been established on the island by the 19th July 1657. It was located on the north-western side and was 100 feet by 60 feet, surrounded by a ditch three feet deep [4]. This appeared to be no more successful than the first, as was discovered by the Fiscal during an inspection on the 28th March 1658 [5].

By the 14th August 1659 the garden had been enclosed by a wall, and instructions were given for trees to be planted around its inner edge. These, it was hoped, would provide an effective windbreak [6]. The wall was mentioned again on the 7th August 1660, when vines were sent over to be planted within its periphery [7]. It was explained in an entry of the 20th December 1660 that the garden was now being used for the cultivation of vegetables for the pigs on the island, and that the wall had been built with the express purpose of protecting the growing crops from these animals [8].

There is no further mention of the garden in the contemporary records, but a walled enclosure behind the house was depicted by Cortemünde in 1672 [Fig 245], suggesting that it was still in existence.

The entrenchment and walling of the garden on Robben Island was an unavoidable necessity, given the exposure of the site to gale-force winds. However, it followed the Company's practice already established on the mainland at the gardens in Table Valley and at Rustenburg.

10.2.3 THE BATTERY

The decision to erect a battery on Robben Island to protect the sheep-breeeding activities was first made on the 30th March 1654. This was to consist of two 6-pounders and would be manned by seven or eight soldiers [1].

No further action was taken until the 16th April 1657, when Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens gave instructions for the two English cannon on Dassen Island [2] to be transferred to Robben Island. These were to be positioned at the landing-place as a deterrent to the French and English, who were not permitted to set foot on the island [3]. However, it was not until the 16th October that orders were given for these instructions to be implemented [4].

Word was received on the 23rd December that the cannon had been delivered from Dassen Island, but they could not be mounted because they were not equipped with carriages [5]. There also appear to have been other problems with these English cannon, as they were replaced by a single 6-pounder on the 16th February 1658 [6]. This was finally mounted on the 5th May, when a carpenter was sent over with sixteen beams for the erection of a cannon-platform [7].

Van Riebeeck inspected Robben Island on the 18th December 1658, and gave orders for another battery to be erected in the Sand Bay. He was critical of the site selected by the "commissioners" on the 20th October [8], stating that they had either inspected the island superficially or had little knowledge of strategic matters [9].

There is no further mention of the battery until 1672, when the Fiscal made a report on the 18th June. Pointing out that the only possible landing-place was the small "sand bay" on the eastern side, he suggested that a small battery should be constructed there without delay. This should be armed with a few small guns "which could command the whole roadstead", together with two large guns further to the north and south. His intention was that this battery would serve not only to protect the island, but also to reinforce the defences of Table Bay as a whole [10].

It is not recorded whether the erection of this battery was ever carried out. The only other reference to cannon on the island was on the 21st January 1699, when it was

reported that the 6-pounder used for signalling purposes was defective [11]. This gun was also referred to by Kolbe in his brief description of the island [12].

However, a battery is recorded on an undated French map of Table Bay [Fig 246] [13], where an earthwork is shown on the eastern side of the island, close to the signal beacon and to the south of the house. This suggests that the instructions of 1672 were in fact implemented.

10.2.4 HARBOUR FACILITIES

The good anchorage at Robben Island was first mentioned on the 21st February 1654 [1], but it was not until the 8th March 1658 that any facilities were contemplated. The initiative came from the free Saldanha traders, who requested permission to build a timber shelter to be used when adverse weather conditions prevented them from sailing [2]. This was followed on the 13th July by a request from the post-holder for reeds to make a shelter to protect the boat from the sun [3]. A tarpaulin for a boat shelter was sent over in response on the 18th [4].

The last reference to harbour facilities at Robben Island was on the 17th August 1666, when the necessary timber was taken across for the erection of a small jetty. This would allow the shells for the lime-kilns to be loaded directly into the boats [5].

It is surprising firstly that a jetty was erected on the island only as late as 1666, and secondly that there is no subsequent mention of harbour facilities. Repairs to the jetty must have been required, but perhaps they were included in the generalized building operations recorded in the unfortunately unspecific documentation that characterized the periods following those of Van Riebeeck and Wagenaer.

10.2.5 THE BEACON FIRE AND THE FLAGSTAFF

Despite the fact that Van Riebeeck's instructions from the Seventeen had specified the erection of a lighthouse, the matter of a beacon fire on Robben Island was not addressed until the 16th April 1657, when it was raised in the report of Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens [1]. However, it was only on the 6th August that a site was selected by Van Riebeeck. This was on the "Vuijrberch", the highest point of the

island, which could also be seen by day [2]. A request was made on the 23rd December for reeds to build a watch-house next to the beacon fire, for protection against the elements [3]. This had been completed by the 16th February 1658, and is another example of the impermanent buildings that were characteristic of this early period [4].

It was also decided on the 4th November 1661 that a flagstaff would be erected on the beacon hill for transmitting secret signals. This was done by the 6th, the Fiscal having been responsible for the supervision [5].

There is no further detailed visual information on the island, but the location of the house ("logie") and well ("waterput") are shown on M1/1181 [Fig 162], a map dating from 1691 extending as far north as Saldanha Bay, and on M1/1162 [Fig 163] and M1/1163 [Fig 117], maps of the settlement and the Cape District dating from the early 1700s. The house is on the eastern side of the island next to the anchorage, with the well slightly to the north. As mentioned earlier, the beacon fire ("baak") and the battery are also shown on M1/1164, a French map of Table Bay [Fig 246]. The signal beacon is to the south of the house, not far from the battery, which was located in a south-easterly direction.

Robben Island was clearly the most useful of the Company's outposts, and continued to be occupied throughout the VOC period at the Cape. Although its early buildings were of little aesthetic importance, the detailed descriptions of their construction methods give a clear indication of the technology available at the time. In fact, the necessity for shipping materials over to the island probably explains why the descriptions were more exhaustive than for most buildings on the mainland.

10.3 DASSEN ISLAND

Dassen Island, originally called Elizabeth Island [1], was also used for a number of purposes, but less intensively than Robben Island, with many of the activities being undertaken by freeburghers.

Seal hunting was commenced as early as 1652 [2], but the skins were not as profitable

as originally supposed, and the activity was abandoned in 1657 [3]. However, the hunting of seals for train-oil was undertaken by the freeburghers [4], and the burning of oil on the island continued throughout the period of this thesis [5].

Shells for lime-burning were first collected in 1653 [6], but the reserves were not as extensive as those on Robben Island, and the last recorded shipment was made in 1655 [7]. A garden was established in 1654, and a grain field and citrus orchard were attempted, but these activities failed because of the aridness of the ground [8]. However, pig breeding was successfully undertaken from 1659, the animals causing less damage on the island than at the Cape [9].

The anchorage was recommended in 1662 as being superior to Saldanha Bay for ships which had been blown past Table Bay [10]. The island was also used by the Company for sheep breeding from 1668 [11], the freeburghers already having raised sheep there, but war between Holland and France necessitated their removal and the temporary abandonment of the post in 1673 [12]. However, the animals were returned after the cessation of hostilities, and it was decided on the 11th March 1680 that the island would continue to be leased to the freeburghers for this purpose [13].

10.3.1 THE HOUSES AND THE SHEEP-SHEDS

The decision to explore Dassen Island was made on the 24th September 1652 [1], and a report was submitted by the skipper Sijmon Pieterssen Turver and the book-keeper Fredrick Verburgh on the 14th November. They had found a number of sandy inlets which were inhabited by a large number of seals. Three or four huts were also found in one of them, constructed of whale ribs and covered with sealskins, together with a "wooden contraption" used for removing the hair from the skins. These were believed to have been erected by the French, and suggested that seal culling could be profitable enough to recover the Company's expenses at the Cape [2].

As a result of this discovery it was resolved on the 26th November 1652 to establish a post at Dassen Island, where sixteen men would be stationed to catch and flay the seals [3]. Permission having been received from the Seventeen, the men were sent over to the island on the 6th October 1654, together with sails and spars for erecting tents [4].

On the 15th October it was decided to erect a shed on the island. This would be used for storing the sealskins and providing better accommodation for the men. Orders were therefore given for reeds and timber, including planks, to be sent over [5]. A report was received on the 12th November 1654 that a house (sic) was under construction. As good stone and clay had been found on the island, these materials were being used for the walls [6]. The house or shed had evidently been completed by the 5th January 1655, as a letter was received on the 6th signed: "In the shed St. Elizabeth on the Dassen Island" [7].

It appears, however, that both a shed and a house had been erected at Dassen Island, as two buildings are shown on a chart of 1656 [Fig 247], prepared at the same time as that of Robben Island [Fig 243] referred to above.

The shed is similar in most respects to the later vernacular "kapsteilhuis", with a pitched roof rising directly from the ground, and a doorway located in one of the triangular ends. It differs in detail, however, in that the rafters cross over above the ridge, in contrast to the later type where the roof timbers are concealed beneath the thatch [8]. The house resembles the example at Robben Island in having a rectangular plan and a pitched roof with gabled ends. Again, the entrance is located in the end wall instead of on the transverse axis as in later buildings. The "Rijpermonde" rock, which had been carved with the Company's monogram, is also shown on the 1656 plan of the island [9].

The seal industry was not successful, as the skins did not sell profitably enough. Instructions were therefore sent on the 11th February 1657 for the seal hunting to be terminated and for the men to return to the Cape [10].

On the 1st September further instructions were given for "all the thatch, slats and rafters" from the house to be brought back to the Cape [11]. These were taken to Robben Island on the 15th, where they would be used to build a new sheep kraal, 127 pieces being received [12]. The house was mentioned once more on the 16th October, in connection with the location of two English cannon which were also to be taken to Robben Island. It is probable, therefore, that its masonry shell had been left standing [13].

Dassen Island had been re-occupied for the purpose of pig breeding since 1659 [14], but it was not until 1668 that any further buildings were mentioned. These were to facilitate the sheep-breeding activities which had been introduced on the island [15], and a report outlining the necessary structures was received on the 30th October. These comprised a loose timber enclosure for the sheep at night, which was to be moved every day to the best pastures; a shed to protect the lambs and pregnant ewes from the cold, and isolate them from the rest of the flock; and a hut for the shepherds [16].

The shepherds' hut was the first structure undertaken, Sergeant Cruythoff and six men being sent over on the 20th December for the purpose, and also to dig a well for the sheep. It was not necessary to take any building materials, as the Company had secured the use of those of the freeburghers already on the island [17].

The shed, however, had still not been commenced by the 17th May 1669, when a report was received that the sheep were dying of exposure [18]. An inspection of the island on the 24th July revealed that the shepherds' house was in good condition, but that the kraal needed repairs (unlike that of the freeburghers, which had been newly erected). A shed for the lambs, moreover, had not yet been built and was urgently required [19].

It was finally decided on the 17th October 1669 that a sheep shed would be erected, and instructions were given for the necessary timber to be shipped over to the island [20]. The structure had evidently been completed by the 21st November when the thatcher returned, the carpenter having already completed his work on the 1st of that month [21]. The fact that there is no mention of a mason suggests that this shed followed the Robben Island practice of timber construction for the protection of livestock.

Following news of a state of war with France, however, orders were given on the 4th August 1672 for the sheep to be removed from Dassen Island [22]. It was further resolved on the 11th January 1673 that the Company's post would be temporarily abandoned, owing to the imminent threat of an enemy attack [23], and orders were given on the 13th that the lodge should be set on fire if hostilities were commenced [24]. This mention of the lodge cannot be a reference to the shepherds' hut or the sheep shed, and must have referred to the post-holder's house. Since there is no mention of

such a building having been erected, it is likely that the shell of the old house partially demolished in 1657 had been rebuilt.

A decision was made on the 11th March 1680 that Dassen Island would continue to be leased to the freeburghers for the breeding of sheep [25], and further reference to their buildings was made on the 13th December 1684, when it was mentioned that the Company's seal hunters were occupying the house erected by the leaseholder [26].

The last building mentioned on Dassen Island during this period was the "station house" (probably a new post-holder's house), which was under construction in 1706. Built of local clay of poor quality, it was necessary to protect the walls with whitewash, particularly on the north-western side which was the most vulnerable to storms [27]. It was estimated that the structure would be ready for its roof beams by the 27th November, and by the 10th December it was almost ready for thatching, but spars, laths and planks were still required [28].

There is no description of the planning of this house, and no visual records survive to provide any clues. However, the requisition for planks at the thatching stage suggests that the building would be provided with a ceiling, and the use of lime for protecting the walls follows the precedent established in the Fort as early as 1663. In terms of internal comfort and external appearance, then, this building on Dassen Island seems finally to have been conforming with the Company's practice on the mainland.

The last mention of this house was on the 20th October 1709, when an edict was promulgated forbidding the freeburghers to cause damage to the Company's house on Dassen Island [29].

The buildings on Dassen Island are only shown twice more in the visual records of this period. The first instance is in M1/1181, a map of the settlement extending as far north as Saldanha Bay, dating from c1700 [Fig 248]. Here the house ("logie") is indicated on the northern side of the island, in the same position as the first structure depicted in M1/9, the 1656 map described earlier [Fig 247]. The second is M1/1176, half of an accurate survey extending from False Bay to Saldanha Bay, dating from the time of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel [Fig 249]. The house is again the only building annotated, and it appears in the identical location.

10.3.2 THE BATTERY

A battery on Dassen Island was first suggested in a letter to Amsterdam dated the 13th October 1653. It was proposed that a small fort should be built, armed with two or three cannon to deter the French from returning to their seal industry on the island [1].

Following a further motivation on the 21st August 1654 to the Hon Hulst, Visiting Commissioner, for authority to erect "een baterij off cleijn redoutken" [2], it was resolved on the 15th October that two cannon would be placed on the island [3]. By the 12th November these had been mounted in a stone battery, complete with loop-holes [4].

There is no further description of the stone battery, but the cannon must have been the two English pieces which were ordered to be removed on the 11th February 1657, when the island was temporarily abandoned [5]. These were described on the 31st August as having been buried on the beach slightly to the north of the house, while their carriages were to be found in the veld behind it [6]. The fact that the cannon had been buried and separated from their carriages suggests that this had been done for security reasons, and that the stone battery had been demolished.

No further mention was made of fortifications on the island, but instructions were given on the 25th June 1669 for it to be reinforced to prevent an attack by pirates [7], and a corporal and four soldiers were sent over on the 6th July [8]. There is no indication as to whether another battery was erected for their use, but it is interesting that Dassen Island predated the more useful Robben Island in the provision of a stone fortification as early as 1654, illustrating the importance attached to the sealskin industry.

10.3.3 HARBOUR FACILITIES

The anchorage at Dassen Island was first mentioned on the 14th February 1653, when it was described as well suited for the use of galiots [1]. However, although the island was used as an alternative anchorage for ships that had failed to reach the roadstead in Table Bay, and was considered superior to Saldanha Bay in this regard [2], its harbour facilities remained rudimentary throughout the period under discussion. A jetty was not even contemplated, and all that was provided were some posts for securing the ships'

boats. These were described on the 1st September 1657 as being close to the well [3].

Dassen Island was of less use to the Company than Robben Island, but the partial demolition of the house there in 1657 seems to have been premature. The decision to erect a beacon later in the same year [4], and to commence pig breeding in 1659, suggests that a more permanent VOC presence would have been desirable.

10.4 SALDANHA BAY

Saldanha Bay was used on a less permanent basis than the islands, and no Company's buildings were erected there until 1669 [1].

The potential for seal hunting was noted in 1652 [2], and train-oil was being produced there by 1661 for the tannery requirements in Batavia [3]. Shells for lime-burning were collected from 1653, but much less intensively than on Robben Island [4], and reeds for the brick-kilns and for thatching were gathered from 1654, but only for a few years [5].

The bay was used as an alternative anchorage from 1653 [6], and for ship repairs and careening from 1654 [7], the latter being its most important use. Firewood for the ships was in short supply, although there was sufficient in the bay for them to be supplied in emergencies [8], but the major shortcoming was a lack of fresh water [9].

10.4.1 ESTABLISHMENT, BUILDINGS AND FORTIFICATIONS

Saldanha Bay was first mentioned on the 24th September 1652, when it was decided to send an expedition to explore the bay [1], and a report was submitted by the skipper Turver and the book-keeper Verburgh on the 14th November [2]. Although the bay was well sheltered from all winds, there was a lack of good drinking water and firewood for the ships [3]. The land was reported to be unsuitable for cultivation, being very dry and barren. However, a great number of seals lived on the islands in the bay, and on one of these a large number of dried sealskins were found. These had evidently been left by the French, and were taken back to the Fort [4].

The hunting of seals for their fur was undertaken until 1657, when this activity was

abandoned and the Company's men were recalled to the Cape [5]. Seal hunting was later resumed by the free Saldanha traders, as a source of train-oil [6]. The seal hunters were accommodated in tents, since seal hunting was a seasonal activity, as was first mentioned on the 31st January 1656 [7]. This was confirmed on the 27th January 1657, when instructions were given for six large spars for tents to be shipped to the bay [8].

Instructions were given by Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens on the 16th April 1657 that a pole bearing the Company's arms was to be erected at the northern end of the bay. The VOC monogram was also to be cut on the largest and most visible rock [9], and both orders had been carried out by the 23rd December [10].

The surveyor Pieter Potter was sent to Saldanha Bay on the 29th July 1659 to make a detailed investigation of the coastline [11], and submitted his report on the 7th November. He disagreed with the 1652 findings, stating that the Oliphantshoeck was well supplied with water and firewood, and was particularly suitable for farming. He also proposed that a redoubt should be erected to protect the area [12].

As a result of this favourable report, the Fiscal Gabbema and two of the skippers were sent over on the 24th November to make further investigations [13]. As far as defensibility was concerned, they were to see if the Oliphantshoeck could be protected from the Khoi by erecting a defensive fence constructed of stakes at its narrowest point, or by digging trenches, thereby preventing the livestock from being driven off. They were also to consider the selection of a site for a redoubt to provide defence against European powers. However, their report on the bay submitted on the 14th December 1659 was again negative with regard to the agricultural potential of the bay, and no mention at all was made of the projected redoubt [14].

On the 18th June 1660 a letter was sent to inform the authorities in Batavia that the French were intending to use Saldanha Bay as a refreshment station en route to Madagascar and the Far East [15]. This was followed on the 21st August by orders from the Directors in Amsterdam for a site to be selected at once for a redoubt or fort, garrisoned with ten or twelve men [16].

Van Riebeeck made an inspection of Saldanha Bay on the 3rd December 1660 [17], but reported when he returned on the 9th that its only usefulness was for the quarrying of

stone, an activity which was mentioned only once again [18], and as a haven for Company's ships which had been blown off course [19]. This information was communicated to the Seventeen in a letter of the 4th May 1661, suggesting that the erection of a fortification would be a wasted effort [20]. The Directors also appear to have reconsidered their proposal, as instructions from Amsterdam to abandon the project were received on the 30th September [21].

The situation changed dramatically at the end of 1666, when word was received that the French had been ordered to take possession of Saldanha Bay and erect a fort there. A sergeant and eleven men were therefore sent to garrison the bay on the 16th December, and to make an appearance of "throwing up" a fort at the watering place. This resolution clearly stated that there were as yet neither a residence nor a fortification in the bay [22].

Moreover, it appears that this was only a temporary occupation, as it was decided on the 22nd April 1669 to reoccupy the bay with a sergeant and four soldiers. They were to encamp at "the upper and lower watering-places", the fact that there was more than one being mentioned for the first time [23]. This decision followed rumours that the French were about to abandon Madagascar and use Saldanha Bay instead as a refreshment post [24].

Further instructions were given on the 1st May 1669 that a permanent post was to be established at Saldanha Bay, and that more VOC beacons were to be erected. Some of the land was to be cultivated and sheep were to be grazed on the islands, in order to maintain a Dutch presence. Fourteen men would be sent to the bay for this purpose, but there was no mention in the Journal or Resolutions of any plan to erect a building for their accommodation [25].

Schrire, however, has discovered a document in the Algemeen Rijksarchief referring to the erection of the "lodge". This document, sent to Holland in 1669, mentioned that the "initial supplies for setting up the post include wooden beams, poles, planks, rafters, slats and stakes, as well as bundles of rattan that might have served as roofing" [26]. This description suggests a timber lodge rather than the stone structure which was excavated, as will be discussed below [27].

An ambiguous letter from the Fiscal dated the 6th July 1669 mentioned the "second and original station" [28], and his report of the 8th referred to three locations where men were stationed. The first was the "upper watering place", the second was "the original settlement higher up", and the third was the "post" at Hoetjes Bay [29].

The Fiscal made no reference to buildings on any of these sites, but did mention gardens at the first two, suggesting a permanent presence which would have required proper accommodation. His wording also suggests that the garden at the "upper watering place" had only recently been prepared, whereas the one at the "original settlement" was already producing vegetables. It could therefore be construed that the "original settlement" comprising the stone walls excavated by Schrire had been built in 1666, and that the timber house was erected at the "upper watering place" in 1669. However, the soldiers sent in April would not have needed to "encamp" had any such structure been erected in 1666.

The first firm reference to a building having been built was on the 28th August 1670, when a letter was received from the Company's house at Saldanha Bay (called the "House de Rust"), reporting the arrival of a fleet of French ships [30]. A further report of the 2nd October 1670 revealed that the "residency" had been captured by French soldiers [31], but their occupation was short-lived, as they had left the bay by the 10th October. A boat was sent on the 30th to retrieve the goods which the French had left in the "lodge" on their departure [32], but it was only on the 16th February 1671 that a decision was taken for the post to be re-occupied [33].

A corporal and five soldiers were sent over for the purpose on the 27th March [34], and timber was shipped on the 29th April for repairs to the "dwellings" (sic). This suggests that there could have been more than one house, as speculated above, although subsequent entries refer to the "lodge" in the singular [35]. The lodge was now also used as a trading post for bartering sheep and cattle from the Khoi, and kraals for the livestock were first mentioned on the 14th September 1672 [36].

On the 11th January 1673, however, it was again resolved that the post would be temporarily abandoned, owing to the imminent threat of a French attack. Only the corporal and two soldiers would remain, with orders to set fire to the house on the

appearance of the enemy [37]. The French do not seem to have reappeared, but the post was attacked by the Khoi on the 14th July 1673, resulting in the death of two of the three Company's servants and two of the freeburghers. The "Company's house" was also plundered [38].

The first mention of Saldanha Bay having been reoccupied was on the 10th May 1676, when orders were given for provisions to be sent [39]. However, it was only on the 3rd August that the bay was officially repossessed, when stones carved with the arms of the United Netherlands and the VOC monogram were sent to be erected. These were to prevent foreign nations from making use of the facilities there, and also to protect the free Saldanha traders, who continued to use the bay on a regular basis [40].

These precautions against foreign powers did not prevent further hostilities from the Khoi, as mentioned again on the 27th October [41], and the post was reinforced once more on the 26th April 1689 to withstand the possibility of another attack [42]. It was only from 1693 that conditions had become sufficiently stable for the Company's outpost at Saldanha Bay to be occupied on a permanent basis [43].

There are no visual records of the buildings at Saldanha Bay, but their location is indicated on maps dating from this period. An unidentified redoubt is shown on the southern shore of Saldanha Bay in M1/1180 [Fig 250] an undated map of the whole settlement. It is shown again on M1/1182 [Fig 251], a French map dating from about 1708 [44], where it is described as "Fort Francois". This intriguing caption is explained by M1/1193 [Fig 252], another French map of the same period extending from St Helena Bay to Mossel Bay. Here the redoubt is described as "Fort et Etab des Francois abandonne".

This suggests that the fort excavated at "Oudepost 1" had in fact been erected by the French, and would explain the absence of any descriptions of the collection of materials for the construction of the building, which could have been expected in the Journal and Resolutions.

Moreover, the fort excavated between 1985 and 1987 [45] has little resemblance to any other Dutch defensive works at the Cape, before this time or later [Fig 254]. Its plan is irregularly shaped, without conventional angular bastions, and there is an unusual spur

wall [46] situated less than a metre outside the main enclosure. The irregular width of the stone walling could also be explained by the haste with which the structure would have been erected if the French were responsible, given the brevity of their occupation of the bay.

The Company's post is depicted on an undated map of Saldanha Bay, M1/1176 [Fig 253], almost certainly from the time of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel [47], in the same position as the fort shown on previous maps. Two springs are indicated to the north of it, and the watering place to the south. Further southward, at the end of the lagoon, was another spring, next to the post of Hendrik Mol. The area used for ship repairs was directly across the lagoon from the Company's post.

The "lodge" has also been excavated, and comprised a long and narrow two-roomed structure, 63 Rhineland feet long by 18 wide [Figs 254 & 255]. The rooms were not of equal size, one being three times as long as the other. The larger room was entered from the short side of the building, its doorway appearing to be protected by a curved screen wall. The smaller room was roughly square, and was entered off the long side of the structure next to the subdividing wall [48]. This resulted in an asymmetrical exterior, with its main entrance on the long axis, as opposed to the centrally located transverse entrance characteristic of the later Cape Dutch buildings dating from the mid-18th century.

There was no evidence of a floor, nor were there any chimneys, although there was evidence that fires had been made in both rooms [49]. The absence of floors and chimneys is reminiscent of the so-called "Posthuijs" at Muizenberg, although this building, which was probably erected in 1700, was far more formally planned and solidly built [50].

A third structure, named "GCL" by Schrire, was situated alongside the spur wall of the fort [Fig 254]. The identity of this small structure, which is only 3,55 by 2,85 m, has not yet been firmly established. Suggestions that it was "a privy, or a small storehouse" have been rejected, and Schrire dismisses the more likely theory "that it was a platform on which an insignia or flag may have stood", on the grounds that it "stems from an imaginative aesthetic sense rather than any confirmatory evidence" [51]. This last does

appear to be the most plausible suggestion, however, as it is unlikely that a three-dimensional structure would have been built so close to the fort unless it was a sentry box, for which the dimensions are too large. Moreover, it could also have been used as a look-out platform [52].

The "building" designated "GCL" thus remains an enigma, but the fort and the "lodge" are firmly recorded in the documentary sources. The question is whether or not the latter two structures were contemporary. The contrast between the irregular construction of the fort and the precision of the "lodge" (despite its asymmetrical planning), strongly suggests that the latter was built after the former.

The fort was probably hastily erected by the French in 1666, explaining its marked difference from contemporary Dutch practice at the Cape, or else was the structure "thrown up" at the end of that year by a non-commissioned officer of the VOC who was unlikely to have had any training in military engineering.

Schrire acknowledges that the "lodge" excavated on the site was the second structure there, on the basis of the foundation of a previous subdividing wall [53]. However, she does not adequately reconcile her quoted list of materials with the masonry structure in question. She suggests that the roof "might have rested on low walls, in much the same way that it does in the traditional kapstylhuisie" [54].

Such a structure, however, would not have required the planking sent over in 1669, as a building with such a low roof could not conceivably have had a ceiling. The materials described, on the other hand, correspond in all respects with those used in the contemporary timber-framed structures at Robben Island, Dassen Island and Hottentots-Holland. It is unlikely, therefore, that the stone "lodge" excavated by Schrire dates from as early as 1669 [55].

Without firmer documentary evidence, the dating of the VOC post excavated at Saldanha Bay cannot be established accurately. However, the excavations of the "lodge" provide firm evidence that the characteristic features of Cape Dutch architecture, the symmetrical three-roomed cell in particular, were not present in this building, which is probably representative of many of the more utilitarian structures erected by the VOC during the proto-Cape Dutch period.

10.4.2 HARBOUR FACILITIES

Despite the lack of fresh water and firewood mentioned in Chapter 10.4.1, Saldanha Bay was suggested as an alternative anchorage on the 14th April 1653 [1]. By the 31st March 1654 the shortage of water had been partially addressed by the digging of a well [2], but the bay was later considered to be unsuitable as a refuge for ships which had been blown past Table Bay, as was first noted in a resolution of the 13th December 1660 [3]. Nevertheless, it continued to be used by ships' captains in emergencies.

Saldanha Bay was first suggested as a venue for ship repairs and careening on the 27th April 1654 [4], and it was resolved on the 28th January 1656 that all major ship repairs would be undertaken there, as Table Bay did not have suitable facilities for beaching the vessels [5]. This became the chief activity in the bay during the period of this thesis, the last entry regarding ship repairs being made on the 4th February 1710 [6].

Moreover, it continued to be used for this purpose, as is revealed in Mentzel's account of the 1730s: "...Saldanha Bay is, therefore (on account of the protection it offers against storms), admirably suited for all vessels that need overhauling or repair, and is in fact utilised by the Company for this purpose. A great handicap is the absence of fresh water in the vicinity, and the coast around the bay is practically uninhabited. Normally only small boats frequent this bay; yet to provide for emergency, should a big ship be compelled to take refuge there, a small outpost of four or five men is maintained..." [7].

The area allocated for ship repairs was directly across the lagoon from the Company's post, and therefore under constant surveillance. This is shown on M1/1176 [Fig 253], where it is described as the "Bodems Timmerwerf".

Despite the importance of Saldanha Bay for the maintenance of the Company's ships, no harbour facilities were erected during this period. Materials for repairs and the ships' carpenters who effected them were sent when required from Table Bay, and were not immediately available. The soldiers referred to in Mentzel's description were there merely to protect the bay and inform the authorities at the Cape whenever a ship required assistance.

11. CONSTRUCTION METHODS AND MATERIALS

The construction methods and the materials utilized at the Cape followed Dutch practice initially. However, they were gradually adapted to their new environment, not only because of climatic constraints, but also because of the Directors' insistence that the Cape was to be self-sufficient. Significantly, almost all the innovations and adaptations were first introduced in buildings erected by the Company itself. Many of these construction methods, moreover, were later enforced on the freeburghers through the promulgation of building regulations.

11.1 TIMBER

11.1.1 TIMBER CONSTRUCTION

The first buildings at the Cape were constructed entirely of timber brought from Holland, as was recorded on the 20th April 1652 in connection with the temporary timber shed erected on the shore [1]. Even the roof of this combined dwelling and storehouse was made of planks [2].

However, structural problems were encountered on the 17th May, as the timber was under-sized [3]. Water-proofing problems were also experienced in the house and store on the 23rd May 1652, because the planks with which it was roofed were not sufficiently watertight [4].

The impermanence of the original light timber dwellings was mentioned again on the 24th March 1654, when it was stated that they were in the process of being replaced by permanent brick buildings [5]. It appears, however, that this had not yet been done by the 11th September 1655, when it was reported that the timber buildings were in a state of collapse, and would have to be replaced with more permanent structures of masonry [6].

The manufacture of door-frames at the Fort was first mentioned on the 11th October 1655, when these were shipped over for the milk cellar on Robben Island [7].

It was mentioned on the 2nd October 1658 that the freeburghers were accustomed to

plait the walls of their houses with bushes. This probably referred to a wattle-and-daub construction, and therefore confirms the use of timber as the structural component of the walls of the earliest buildings at the Cape [8]. Further reference to the use of timber in the construction of walls of the freeburghers' houses was made on the 23rd December 1658 [9].

It was decided on the 9th August 1659 that the watch-houses for the defence of the Peninsula would be constructed of timber [10], and orders were given on the 13th August for their frameworks to be prefabricated at the Fort [11]. This is the first mention of large-scale prefabrication at the Cape, and illustrates the level of technological sophistication that had been achieved at this early date.

On the 7th January 1660 it was resolved that the thatched roofs of all the Company's buildings would be replaced with tiles. This required the provision of laths, and the contract was awarded to the free sawyer Leendert Cornelissen. They were to be no less than one inch square, and 13 guilders would be paid for every 100 foot of planking from which they had been cut. The width of the planks was not stated, but it was probably not less than 10 inches, the standard specification in Batavia [12].

An ordinance was introduced on the 27th January 1663 to regulate the prices of the timber supplied by the free sawyers, following widespread complaints. This provided a detailed account of the sizes and uses of structural timber. The prices outlined referred only to yellow-wood, as "Elsen, bouken en hasegaijen hout" would be sold for a third less [13].

Instructions were given on the 26th April 1679 that all the doors and windows in the Castle were to be painted, to protect them from the sun and prevent expensive repairs. This is the first reference in the Resolutions to the painting of woodwork [14].

The dimensions of a window frame ("bolle casijn" - ie a double casement) contemporary with the period of this thesis were given as 4½ feet high by 3½ feet wide, and costing four guilders, on the 3rd April 1691 [15]. By this time windows were also being manufactured outside Cape Town, as exemplified by those for the drostdy and church at Stellenbosch, which were made on site in 1686/1687 (see Chapter 9.3.1).

The practice of using timber supports ("wandpalen") for the walls of buildings has already been referred to with regard to the first structures in the Fort and the houses of the freeburghers at Rondebosch. Framed timber structures were also used in the early buildings at Robben and Dassen Island and at Hottentots-Holland, and evidently continued to be used by the freeburghers until the last decade of the century.

However, a regulation was promulgated on the 12th February 1691, forbidding the use of structural timber as a system of walling, in order to conserve the diminishing reserves. From now on all buildings, whether houses, out-buildings or kraals, would have to be built with masonry walls [16].

The Company's recognition of a practical necessity thus brought to an end the first structural system employed at the Cape, one that survived for almost forty years and continued to be used in the vernacular buildings of the outlying districts. This edict could, therefore, have had a significant influence on the later development of architecture at the Cape, which might have taken a very different course if left to the freeburghers alone.

11.1.2 SOURCES OF TIMBER

The availability of timber and firewood at the Cape was of the greatest importance to the Company. Timber was necessary for building work and ship repairs, while firewood was required for the brick- and lime-kilns, for supplying the fleets in harbour, for the beacon fire on Robben Island, and for domestic use. The forests on the Peninsula, however, were limited in extent and the timber was not easily accessible. This led to a constant shortage throughout the period under review, despite the initiation of tree-planting programmes from an early date.

11.1.2a IMPORTED AND SALVAGED TIMBER

Timber was first requested from Batavia on the 13th May 1652, as well as bamboo for huts or "pondoks". This was necessary as the only suitable forest discovered to date was at Hout Bay, six Dutch miles from the Fort. This was too far for the timber to be transported without carts and draught animals [1]. However, no more was requested

(until the end of the 17th century) after the 13th August 1653, following the persistent refusal of the Batavian authorities to be of assistance in this regard [2].

The possibility of using salvaged timber was first raised on the 20th May 1652. An inspection of the Haerlem wreck near the Blaauwberg revealed good supplies, but again the transport difficulties rendered it unusable [3].

The first request for timber from Holland was made on the 14th April 1653, Norwegian deals being required for lofts, and spars for rafters [4]. The Seventeen were more generous than Batavia, and a number of shipments were made until the 12th April 1656, when a letter was received informing the Cape that it was to depend on its own resources [5]. Timber of a specialized nature continued to be sent, however, as exemplified by the woodwork for a barley mill shipped on the 18th November 1656 [6].

A request was also made to Mauritius on the 8th May 1654 to be supplied with some of the deals which had apparently been "saved" on the island [7]. However, there is no mention of these having been received, perhaps because of the uncertainties on the island which resulted in its temporary abandonment in 1657 [8].

Permission was requested from Batavia on the 27th July 1660 to use a French ship wrecked at the Salt River mouth as a source of timber [9]. However, the wreck was destroyed in a fire on the 5th March 1662 [10].

Van Riebeeck instructed his successor Wagenaer on the 5th May 1662 that it was no longer necessary to requisition timber from Holland, as the free sawyer Leendert Cornelisz had contracted to supply all that was required [11].

Following the re-establishment of the post at Mauritius in 1664 [12], it was mentioned that an abundance of timber for building purposes was available on the island [13]. This was exploited only to a minor degree, however, and was shipped to the Cape on an irregular basis from 1667 [14] to 1709 [15], together with the ebony which was regularly sent as the island's main export.

It appears that the Directors had agreed to send timber from Holland for the erection of the Castle, a large quantity being landed from a ship in harbour on the 29th January 1670 [16]. Another three shipments for this specific purpose were delivered between

1672 and 1673 [17], but instructions were received on the 28th November 1684 that no more timber would be sent out from Holland. It was therefore proposed that a sawmill should be erected at the Cape, but this project never materialised [18].

By the 28th March 1699 the shortage of timber had become so acute that no accommodation could be provided for the freeburghers who continued to arrive from Holland. It was therefore decided to send a maritime expedition to the islands "Dina" and "Maarseveen", which were reputedly well stocked with forests [19]. However, the expedition returned on the 13th June, having failed to find the islands in question [20].

The Company's initial reservations about the establishment of a colony at the Cape were justified on the 30th October 1699, when the requirements of the freeburghers in the expanding settlement necessitated further shipments of timber from Holland [21]. These continued to be sent, in the form of Norwegian deals, the last consignment being referred to on the 15th April 1707 [22].

A requisition for 3000 teak planks to be used for ceilings was also made to Batavia, but was turned down in their reply of the 20th January 1700, on the grounds that none were available [23]. Nevertheless, they had managed to supply 350 of them by the 29th May 1700, and had also written to the Directors requesting that the Cape be supplied with timber from Holland instead [24].

The supply of timber from Holland was irregular, however, and it was mentioned on the 27th May 1705 that none had been received for two years. This had resulted not only in the retardation of the Company's works, but also in the impossibility of completing many of the freeburghers' houses [25].

It was therefore resolved on the 10th November 1705 that an expedition would be sent to "Terra di Natal" to look for alternative sources [26]. The trip was unsuccessful, however, as was recorded on the 24th June 1706. Although large forest reserves had been discovered, none of them contained any timber suitable for structural purposes [27].

The shortage of timber continued to be critical, and requisitions were made again to Batavia [28] and Holland [29] in 1708, but no response had been received by the end of

1710. However, "eight or nine hundred" teak planks ("jatij plancken") were requisitioned from a ship in harbour on the 11th June 1709 to complete the loft of the Company's hospital [30].

Throughout the proto-Cape Dutch period the supply of imported timber had been irregular and insufficient. It was therefore necessary to rely on the local forests, at first on the Cape Peninsula and later further afield as the closer reserves became exhausted.

11.1.2b THE FOREST BEHIND TABLE MOUNTAIN

The forest behind Table Mountain was first discovered by Van Riebeeck and the carpenter on the 18th September 1652. This was only about one and a half (Dutch) miles from the Fort, and therefore more convenient than the one previously inspected at Hout Bay [1].

This forest (now described as being two Dutch miles away) was inspected again on the 1st August 1653, when it was realized that the timber could be brought down from the mountain without too much difficulty. It was therefore decided to commence wood-cutting and to prepare a better wagon road between the forest and the Fort [2].

The roadworks were begun on the 4th August [3], and by the 11th October six wood-cutters were stationed in the forest, living in tents [4]. However, their isolation made them vulnerable during Khoi hostilities, and on the 9th December all their tools were stolen. It was therefore decided to send a corporal and four soldiers to protect them [5], followed by another two soldiers on the 3rd January 1654 [6].

The forest was described on the 16th November as being two and a half to three (Dutch) miles from the Fort, further than in previous entries. This suggests that the timber reserves were being rapidly depleted [7]. The difficulties of procuring timber were described on the 4th October 1655, when Van Riebeeck made an inspection of the forest. The trees were cut high on the slopes of the mountain and had to be dragged a full (Dutch) mile "across stony hills and valleys" to the wood-cutters' tent, which was half an hour distant from the wagon road [8].

It was mentioned on the 27th October 1655 that fourteen or fifteen men were stationed

in the forest for the sawing of timber. As this is the first mention of sawyers, it is possible that this was done in order to alleviate the transport problems described above [9].

The first mention of men from the fleet assisting in wood-cutting was on the 21st March 1657, when forty wood-cutters were sent to the forest to prepare beams for the jetty under construction. They were followed on the 26th by 200 men to drag the beams from the forest to the wagon road [10].

The first grant of a forest to a freeburgher was made on the 26th October 1657. This was at the Bosheuvel, which had been discovered by the person in question, Leendert Cornelis of Zevenhuijsen, a carpenter who had taken his discharge from the Company [11].

Timber conservation measures were first introduced on the 6th November, as a result of damage to the forests incurred by the indiscriminate tree-felling of the freeburghers and free carpenters. The former were forbidden to cut timber in the Company's or free sawyers' forests, and the latter were ordered to confine their activities to carpentry alone [12].

Further regulations were promulgated on the 2nd October 1658, owing to the continued destruction of the unproclaimed forests. In future, neither Company's servants nor freeburghers would be permitted to cut any timber at all, but would be compelled to purchase their requirements from the free sawyers [13].

The conservation of yellow-wood, described as the scarcest of timbers in the Peninsula forests, was addressed on the 12th October. This was used wastefully for beams and posts, although other trees more appropriate for the purpose were available in the forests. It was therefore resolved that yellow-wood would only be permitted to be cut for use as planks, for which it was most suitable, and only in the Company's and free sawyers' forests [14].

The location of the Company's forests and the wagon road leading to them is shown on M1/14 [Fig 110], a 1656 map of the Peninsula, beyond the cultivated lands at Rondebosch. The site of the forest of Leendert Cornelissen does not appear on the later

1660 map of the settlement, which shows only the arable lands granted to the freeburghers [Fig 113]. It is indicated, however, on Boeseken's reconstructed map [Fig 120] [15] in roughly the same position as the Company's forest [16].

A report on the Peninsula forests was presented on the 27th November 1663, following an inspection the previous day by the Fiscal, the agricultural supervisor, the master carpenter and the master wood-cutter [17].

The furthest of these was the "Houtbhaeijs Clooff Bos", located immediately before the pass to Hout Bay, which contained beech ("boecken"), pear ("peeren") and "assegay" ("hasegaije") trees, as well as a great deal of brushwood ("creupelhout"). A little closer towards the Bosheuvel was the "Balckenbos", containing a variety of trees suitable for beams and ribs. A third forest, on the Fort side of the Bosheuvel and referred to as the "nieuw gevonden bos", contained good reserves of yellow-wood trees on the slopes and other kinds of timber in the valleys. Further towards the Cape was the "nieuwe sparrenbos", containing straight spars suitable for all building purposes. The next was called the "kreupelbos" (thicket), as it consisted mainly of brushwood. These new forests were accessible to wagons as a road had been opened up by the freeburghers, who had already been exploiting them for their own requirements.

The "Leenenbosch" (formerly the forest of Leendert Cornelissen) was also examined, but no yellow-wood was found. It did however contain "elder" ("elsen"), beech, pear and "assegay" trees, and could also supply a large number of spars. Yellow-wood was available in the small forest ("cleijenbos") adjacent to it, but the terrain made it difficult to extract the timber. However, there were enough trees of other varieties to last for another six years. The new Company's forest ("nieuw Comps. bos") next to the river also contained a large number of yellow-wood and other trees, but the old forest ("out Comps. bos tegenover de schuer") had been practically exhausted. Nevertheless, the report concluded that there should be no shortage of timber for the next four or five years if the forests were properly managed [18].

However, the free sawyers were instructed on the 1st December 1663 to supply yellow-wood to the Company alone, as it was becoming very scarce. The freeburghers would have to be content with "elder", almond, beech and other timber [19].

Another edict was promulgated on the 1st/4th July 1671, which prohibited the cutting or removal of timber between the Lion and Devil's Mountains and the Company's house at Rustenburg [20]. Further restrictions on the cutting of yellow-wood were introduced on the 8th April 1680. Despite a previous order that this wood was only to be cut for use as planks, the free sawyers had been using it for door-frames, rafters and laths, and selling these to the freeburghers. As this practice was exhausting the reserves in the forest, it was resolved that no yellow-wood could be cut at all without the express consent of the Commander [21]. This regulation was expanded on the 25th December 1687, when the use of alderwood ("elsen-hout") was also forbidden for anything other than planks [22].

Further restrictions on wood-cutting were introduced on the 22nd October 1689, as the freeburghers and Company's employees continued to disregard previous orders prohibiting them from cutting timber in the Company's forest, despite having been given free access to the forest at the Steenberg. The chief wood-cutter Jan Voslo (sic) was therefore given the position of supervisor, with authority to prevent anyone from cutting timber without written permission [23].

A number of forests are shown on M1/17, a map of the settlement probably dating from 1691 [Fig 114] [24]. These were all above the cultivated lands and comprised, in sequence, the following:-

A. The Schaakenbosch, providing heavy timber and firewood.
B. The Company's old forest, providing heavy timber and firewood.
C. The Raamhoutsbosch, providing firewood.
D. Paradijs, providing heavy timber and firewood.
E. The Geelhoutsbosch or Lendenbosch, providing ships' masts and wagon-makers' timber.
F. Kleinklaasjensbosch, extending from above the Koolbrandershoek to the top of Table Mountain, and providing a variety of timber.
G. The Hemelryksbosch with heavy "peereboomen" and "asegijn hout", providing timber for ships' masts.

The demand for timber was by now much greater than in Wagenaer's time, when the

forests were last described, but it appears that the timber industry was still subsisting mainly on the Peninsula reserves.

It was mentioned on the 7th September 1693 that a new forest had been planted between Papenboom and the Company's granary [25]. However, this could not immediately address the shortage of timber and firewood, and it was resolved on the 2nd November 1695 that another forest would be planted at the Wolvegat, behind the Wijnbergh [26].

The trees planted by the Company were not immune to vandalism, as it was reported on the 6th August 1709 that those along the roads of the Cape, Stellenbosch and Drakenstein districts had been wilfully damaged. It was therefore resolved that anyone found guilty of such an offence would be flogged [27].

The naming of the Company's forests "Paradise" and "Hell" is explained by Mentzel. Timber from the former could be easily taken to the wagon road, but the latter was situated high in the mountains towards Hout Bay, and the wood could be removed only with great difficulty [28].

11.1.2c THE FOREST AT HOUT BAY

The forest at Hout Bay was the first to be discovered at the Cape, having been found by the Assistants Van den Helm and Verburgh on the 6th May 1652. Following their favourable report on its potential, the forest was inspected by Van Riebeeck on the 9th June. However, although he agreed that it was suitable as a source of structural timber, it was situated too far from the Fort ("about 6 Dutch miles") to be economically viable. The difficulty of transporting the timber over this distance would have rendered its exploitation more costly than importing timber from Holland or Batavia [1].

Nevertheless, it was decided on the 1st October to investigate the bay and forest more closely [2], and Van den Helm and Verburgh submitted their report the following day. They had found the trees more suitable than those elsewhere on the Peninsula, and that the forest was located about 5500 paces from the shore. The timber could thus be transported to the beach in wagons or carts along an existing pathway, or floated down the river which traversed the valley, for shipment to the Cape [3].

The possibility of shipping timber from the Hout Bay forest was raised again on the 11th July 1653 [4], and Van Riebeeck made another inspection on the 29th. His conclusions were again less favourable than those of the two Assistants. Although acknowledging that the trees were the best available at the Cape, he noted that they were one and a half miles from the beach, and that the route was too difficult for the timber to be transported to the shore [5].

Firewood had been found close to the shore, however, and instructions were first given on the 26th July for a ship-load to be collected for the lime-kiln [6]. In fact, the Hout Bay forest was exploited solely for firewood during Van Riebeeck's period, and only until the end of 1654 [7], when the dangers of the anchorage became evident [8].

The exploitation of the Hout Bay forests was recommenced by Wagenaer on the 13th June 1662, when it was decided that a ship would be sent for timber and firewood [9], and instructions for the purpose were issued on the 17th [10]. A letter was received from the Fiscal on the 20th, however, stating that although firewood was available close to the beach, the trees suitable for timber were too far from the shore to be transported without wagons [11].

Following the discovery of a new forest at Hout Bay, thirty men were sent out on the 24th October 1666 to drag the timber which had been cut there to the wagon road [12]. The shortage of timber had evidently become so critical that overland transport was now economically feasible. This is confirmed by the entry of the 22nd August 1667, when the freeburghers were contracted to deliver it to the Fort at the rate of three guilders for every 100 feet of planking [13]. The Company further divested itself of its commitments at Hout Bay on the 16th July 1668, when the forest was granted to the free sawyer Theunis Dirksz van Schalckwijck for a period of three years [14].

Hout Bay was inspected in 1669 by the Visiting Commissioner van den Brouke, who was informed by the master wood-cutter that the forest could provide timber for another thirty years. However, the Commissioner believed that the cost of transporting it to the shore and shipping it to Cape Town would be prohibitive [15]. Nevertheless, it was mentioned on the 21st June 1674 that draught oxen had been sent to Hout Bay "to hasten the conveyance of wood to the beach", suggesting that the timber was now being

transported to Cape Town by sea, rather than over land as in the past [16].

A proposal was made on the 8th April 1680 that a sawmill should be erected at Hout Bay. This would be used for cutting yellow-wood, which would be transported by sea to Cape Town. It was also suggested that the Company should repossess the forest there [17], but this proposal was not carried out and it was leased again on the 17th February 1683 [18]. The conditions of the leasehold were expanded when it was renewed on the 3rd April 1691. As timber was in short supply, the lessees were obliged to plant 3000 oak saplings every year, supplied from the Company's nurseries, in order to restock the forest [19].

It was resolved on the 18th October 1692, following reports of indiscriminate wood-cutting at the Steenberg, that firewood could only be cut in the forest at Hout Bay [20]. Given the isolation of the bay from the town and the farms on the Peninsula, this order was probably successful in conserving the forests [21].

The forest at Hout Bay appears in contemporary visual sources only on M1/17 [Fig 114], a map of the settlement dating probably from 1691 [22]. It is indicated as being situated some distance up the valley, thus corresponding with the written records.

11.1.2d FORESTS IN THE INLAND DISTRICTS

Apart from the brief use of Saldanha Bay in 1660 [1] and False Bay in 1673 [2] as sources of firewood, the first instance of wood-cutting beyond the Peninsula was at Hottentots-Holland, where timber was extracted from 1672 [3] to 1674 [4]. The timber was difficult to transport from the forest, and was initially used only for the buildings of the Company's post which was under construction there. However, the forests of Hottentots-Holland were also to be used for the provision of the roof beams of the Stellenbosch church in 1687 [5].

Moreover, Abraham Bogaert mentioned in 1702 that timber from the forests of Hottentots-Holland had been used in the building of Vergelegen [6], and Kolbe (1713) claimed that good supplies had been available until they were denuded by Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel [7].

It was mentioned in the "Korte Deductie" (1708) that the freeburghers were allowed to extract timber from the following forests, on condition that permission had been obtained from the Governor: the "Simonsbergh", "Albert Holden's Hoek", and "Jan de Jonker's Hoek" (all near Stellenbosch, the last being by far the most popular), and the "Great Berg River", "Weymers Hoek", and the "Twenty-Four Rivers", all in the Drakenstein district [8].

However, the most promising long-term sources of structural timber were beyond the Hottentots-Holland mountains, some 25 or 30 Dutch miles from the Cape. This was revealed in a written report by the Landdrost Samuel Martini de Meurs and the chief gardener Jan Hartogh, submitted to the Council of Policy on the 11th March 1710 [9].

This information was confirmed by the written report of the freeburgher Andreas Finger, who had travelled far inland on cattle trading expeditions. He stated that there were three places where timber for building purposes was available, and where a sawmill could be erected. The first was at the "Rivier Sonder Eijnde", eight days' journey from the Cape and one day from the coast, where the timber could be shipped from the "Klijne Riviersvalleij" bay. The second was at the "Houtenicquasland", thirty days from the Cape but not far from Mossel Bay. The third was in "Gamtouerland", also thirty days from the Cape, and near to the coast. He pointed out, however, that he had not visited the bays in question.

It was therefore decided that an expedition would be sent to establish the extent of these reserves, to inspect the possibility of transporting the timber over land or by sea, and to investigate whether there was a river in the vicinity suitable for propelling a sawmill. The reason for the mill was that sawn timber, being lighter in weight, would be considerably easier to transport [10]. Nothing, however, was to come of the proposal for a sawmill, and there was no mention of the results of the expedition during the remainder of the period of this thesis.

It was stated in the "Contra-Deductie" (1712) that the timber for the buildings at Vergelegen had been cut in the Company's forests at Hottentots-Holland and "Soetendaalse Valley", as well as at "Paradys" on the Peninsula [11]. The "Zions Berg" in the Stellenbosch district was also mentioned as a source of timber for the

freeburghers, together with the others referred to above in the "Korte Deductie" [12]. A number of inland forests were also mentioned by Valentyn (1714), when describing the shortage of firewood. These were at Hottentots-Holland, at Stellenbosch, along the Olifants River, and along the Berg River at Drakenstein [13].

It is interesting that although the Knysna forests were not exploited on a regular basis until the late 18th century, when a timber shed was erected at Plettenberg's Bay in 1788 for storage prior to shipment to Cape Town, these reserves were not unknown by the end of the proto-Cape Dutch period. The exploitation of these forests must therefore have been prevented by a lack of resources during the years of economic constraint following the excesses of the Van der Stel period.

11.1.2e REAFFORESTATION

The planting of trees for timber was first referred to on the 11th October 1656, when it was mentioned that the oak and ash trees were growing well. There is no information, however, on when and where they were planted [1].

The cultivation of trees from seed in the Company's orchard at Rondebosch was first mentioned on the 4th May 1661, when the alders, oak and ash trees there were reported to be growing well [2]. These, presumably, were the trees first referred to in 1656.

Although the planting of trees to restock the Company's forests was initiated during Van Riebeeck's period at the Cape, it does not appear to have been carried out on a large scale. It was only in the Van der Stel period, when the forests had already been seriously depleted, that this issue was addressed as a priority.

The depletion of the forests was noted again on the 4th March 1670, when it was decided that trees would be planted in Table Valley to serve as a future supply of timber. Two plots of land were selected for the purpose, both twelve morgen in extent. The first, to be planted with brushwood ("kreupelbosch"), extended from behind the Company's garden towards the kloof between Lion's Head and Table Mountain. The second, to be planted with alders ("elseboomen"), stretched from the garden towards the eastern corner of Table Mountain [3].

The arrival of Simon van der Stel was ostensibly responsible for the more comprehensive afforestation to alleviate the chronic shortage of timber and firewood. However, Boeseken reveals that Commissioner van Rheede was not convinced by Van der Stel's positive reports on the growth of the trees that had been planted, and made a personal inspection. His findings were that the trees were few in number and no larger in diameter than the thickness of a man's arm.

He therefore gave instructions for experiments in tree planting to be made everywhere, and that the freeburghers were to be ordered to plant new trees and conserve the existing forests. Indigenous trees were to be planted as well as European ones. He was also the person to order the Landdrost and Heemraden to ensure that every freeburgher planted at least a hundred oaks each year on his lands, once he had been in possession of them for four years [4].

Simon van der Stel's implementation of this policy began only after Van Rheede's departure, suggesting that the credit for the initiative should go to the Visiting Commissioner rather than to the Commander. In fact, Van der Stel's response to these recommendations was not demonstrated until the 18th July 1689, when it was resolved that all the freeburghers would be instructed to plant a hundred oak trees on their lands every year [5].

Rustenburg, the Company's orchard at Rondebosch, was mentioned again on the 1st August 1696 as the location for the cultivation of young trees. These were distributed to the freeburghers, and were also used for the planting of new Company's forests [6]. This had been delayed by the procrastination of the Burgher Councillors at the Cape and the Heemraden of Stellenbosch and Drakenstein. However, following orders of the 2nd November 1695 for tree planting to be commenced at once at the Wolvengat, behind the Wijnbergh, 3000 young oaks had already been planted. It was also mentioned that "some thousands" of oak saplings had been planted in the Company's forests [7].

The planting of trees was also mentioned in Simon van der Stel's instructions to his successor Wilhem Adriaen. Over the past nine or ten years, sixteen thousand young trees had been planted in the old Company's forest behind Table Mountain. Of these,

ten to twelve thousand had survived, some of which had already reached a height of 36 feet and a diameter of seven to eight inches [8].

Those planted by the freeburghers at Stellenbosch and Drakenstein were not growing so well, however, having been planted on unsuitable ground. The freeburghers were therefore to be assisted in replanting them elsewhere, a large number of oak saplings being available in the Company's orchard at Rustenburg [9].

The new Governor, Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel, made an inspection of the forests on the 15th July 1699, and gave orders for another 30 000 young oaks to be planted in the Company's forests behind Rondebosch [10]. Instructions were also given on the 29th August for another 20 000 oaks to be transported from Rondebosch, 12 000 of which were to be planted at Stellenbosch and 8000 at Drakenstein [11], but the wagons to collect them had not yet been sent by the 19th July 1700 [12].

This was the last definite mention of tree planting for the procurement of structural timber. However, a resolution of the 1st August 1709, stipulating penalties for wilful damage to trees, stated that a number of saplings had recently been sent to Stellenbosch [13], where they had been planted "as an ornament to that Colony" [14].

It is instructive that the decorative qualities of the oaks at Stellenbosch should have been mentioned, but that their usefulness in providing shade for the streets was not. This indicates a change in attitude from pragmatism to aesthetic appreciation, which can probably be attributed to the influence of Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel. The precedents for formal gardens which he established not only at Vergelegen and Nieuwland, but also through his embellishments to the Company's garden in Table Valley, were now beginning to be disseminated.

11.2 REEDS AND THATCHING

11.2.1 REED CONSTRUCTION AND THATCHING METHODS

Thatching at the Cape was first mentioned on the 11th June 1652, when sufficient reeds had been collected for roofing the timber dwellings within the Fort. However, the first

thatcher was so incompetent that his work had to be dismantled [1]. Another craftsman took over on the 13th, with more promising results. Although not the most professional of jobs, the roofs would be more waterproof than the coverings of planks and tarpaulins which the thatch replaced [2].

Reeds on a timber framework were also used for the entire structure of buildings in the early years of the settlement, as in the later "kapsteilhuis". The first example was the sheep shed on Robben Island, reeds for which were sent over on the 18th March 1654 [3]. Others were the sheep shed on Dassen Island [Fig 247], the reed watch-house next to the beacon fire on Robben Island [4], the water-mill in Table Valley (the machinery of which was still housed in a shelter of straw on the 27th October 1659) [5], and an old gardeners' and slaves' dwelling built of straw in the Company's orchard at Rondebosch, referred to on the 5th July 1662 [6].

Reeds were also used as partitions, as revealed on the 1st June 1655, when it was mentioned that partitions of rushes were used to separate the hospital from the stable behind the Fort. These two functions were both accommodated under one roof [7].

The dangers of the thatched roofs on the buildings within the Fort were first noted on the 9th February 1659, following a potentially disastrous fire [8]. A resolution was therefore made on the 7th January 1660 that the thatched roofs of all the Company's buildings in town would be replaced with tiles, to minimize the risk of fire. The thatch would be sold to the freeburghers to defray expenses [9].

A detailed description of the thatching process was given by Mentzel (who was at the Cape from c1732 to 1741), as follows: "...It would be a mistake to assume that the thatched roofs spoil the appearance of the town. On the contrary, they look quite neat and cannot be compared to the straw-covered roofs in German villages or farms. The reeds used for thatching resemble rye-straw, but are filled with sap and are not hollow as the other. The thatch roofs are laid quite differently to the straw roofs, which are arranged in layers of stacks that overlap one another, giving the roof the appearance of a ladder with steps about 7 inches high. The thatch is much more skilfully laid: the reeds are placed on the laths and are tied to them by tarred twine or wire, but before the ends are tightened up the thatch-layer pulls out the ends of the stalks with a special

wooden board that is perforated with hundreds of holes half-way through its thickness, in such a manner that only one straw overlaps another. This gives the roof a smooth surface. The reed when dried takes a brown colour which is rapidly transformed by wind and rain into black. The finishing process is given by applying a coat of lime and whitewashing the wooden frame at the slope of the roof and at the ends to a width of about a foot. The result is shapely and agreeable to the eye. Reed is much more durable than straw, and a roof of this nature can last 50 to 60 years. It is, however, very inflammable. It has more combustible material than straw and thus burns even quicker..." [10].

Mentzel also described the preparation of straw for thatching: "When the farmer needs some straw for thatching his buildings, he chooses such a part of the land where the longest straw grows. There the reapers have to bend a bit lower and cut the straw close to the ground, so that it remains quite long. These sheaves are kept apart and stored separately until all the other grain has been threshed. Then a couple of scaffoldings like two long tables are made on the threshing-floor; the slaves take from the sheaves only as many stalks at a time as they can hold in their hand and beat the grain out of the ears on the tables; put the straw aside neatly and bind it in bundles, no thicker than can be spanned by both hands. In this way the straw remains unbroken, is not crushed as with a threshing flail and yet is cleanly threshed out..." [11].

11.2.2 SOURCES OF THATCHING MATERIALS

Reeds for thatching were first collected on the 7th June 1652, having been found behind the rump of the Lion Mountain [1]. More thatch for building purposes was discovered behind Table Mountain on the 4th October 1655 [2], and the first of a number of shipments of thatching reeds was ordered from Saldanha Bay on the 29th May 1656 [3]. The cutting of reeds was also mentioned in the vicinity of the Tygerberg ("towards the Leopard Mountain") on the 21st June 1658 [4].

Reeds were not the only material used for thatching, however, as straw for roofing the sheep shed was first sent to Robben Island on the 15th February 1659 [5].

Reed-cutting behind the Boscheuvel was mentioned on the 10th April 1666 [6], at the

Tygerberg again on the 13th October 1666 [7], and at the "Riet Vallei", where 1000 bundles were set on fire by the Khoi, as reported on the 31st January 1674 [8]. The cutting of thatching reeds at "de Duinen" and at the "Buffels Valley" was mentioned in the "Contra-Deductie" [9], and confirmed by Valentyn (1714), who also made reference to the dunes and the Buffels and Riet valleys near the Salt River in this regard, as well as to the Company's post at "Visschershock" [10].

A number of edicts concerning the conservation of thatching reeds were also proclaimed. The first of these was on the 3rd/6th December 1670, when the cutting of reeds under the "Tijgersbergh" and at the "Rietvaleij" was prohibited [11]. The second was on the 13th January 1696, when the cutting of reeds without permission was disallowed [12], and the third was on the 1st December 1702, when the burning of fires in the "duijnen" was prohibited in order to protect the reeds from damage [13].

11.3 LIME

11.3.1 LIME AS A BUILDING MATERIAL

Lime was first mentioned on the 14th April 1653 in connection with water-proofing, as the tiles roofing the buildings within the Fort were blown off in storms. It was suggested that lime mixed with imported plaster should be rubbed over a layer of clay resting on planks, thereby creating watertight roofs for the stores [1]. Although this roofing method was not adopted in the 17th century, and tiles were persevered with as an early roofing material, this is an extremely interesting entry as it anticipates the flat-roofed technology of the 18th century.

It was only on the 2nd January 1663 that instructions were first given for the buildings in the Fort to be plastered with lime, owing to the inadequacies of the local bricks [2]. This was a significant change, as the face-brick buildings of Van Riebeeck's period were now to be replaced by the smooth white walls characteristic of the Cape Dutch architecture of the 18th century, and is another instance of innovations instigated by the Company's buildings.

The inadequacies of face-brick buildings were emphasized on the 19th August 1663,

when a gable in the Fort collapsed because of the use of insufficiently baked bricks and clay mortar. It was therefore decided on the 22nd August that lime would be used for mortar instead when rebuilding the structure [3].

Reference to the use of lime for protecting the brick walls was made again on the 19th April 1665 in a letter to the Seventeen, when it was mentioned that the buildings in the Fort were being plastered, inside as well as outside [4]. Given that the inner surfaces did not need protection from the weather, this suggests a concern for improving living standards within the Fort.

Further instructions were given on the 7th May 1679 for the walls of the Company's garden and all the buildings in the Castle to be plastered with lime. Here, however, the rationale was to protect them from the wind and the rain [5].

11.3.2 SOURCES OF LIME

Lime was first requested from Batavia as early as the 13th May 1652 [1], but after repeated appeals a letter was received on the 8th March 1654 stating that none would be sent, on the grounds of impracticability: the Cape would have to fend for itself [2]. Requests for lime and cement were also made to Holland from the 14th April 1653 [3]. However, the only reference to its delivery was on the 16th May 1672 [4], and a letter was received on the 10th October 1673 stating that it was too scarce and costly to be shipped over [5].

The major local source of lime was Robben Island. The first shipment of shells to be burned for the purpose was ordered on the 13th May 1653 [6], and this continued to be a major industry throughout the period of this thesis [7]. Thirty-eight shipments of shells were made in 1664 alone, including six each in the months of February and July [8]. The shells were collected by the convicts on the island, assisted at times by Khoi "volunteers" (who were paid a pittance), and occasionally by sailors seconded from the ships in harbour [9].

Shells were also collected sporadically in Table Bay, as first noted on the 31st May 1653, and behind the Lion Mountain [10], but these sources were only used when supplies on Robben Island were unobtainable. Shipments were also made from Dassen

Island [11] and Saldanha Bay [12], but not on a large scale. Three other sources of shells were mentioned on one occasion only: Hottentots-Holland on the 11th July 1676 [13], "Vissersbhaij" on the 27th October 1676 [14], and Hout Bay on the 11th March 1710 [15].

The availability of lime at Mauritius was first mentioned on the 11th November 1666 [16], but the first shipment was recorded only on the 13th January 1674 [17]. Shipments continued on a regular basis until the 31st October 1679, when it was reported that lime was in short supply on the island as a result of a hurricane and a fire [18]. Further instructions were sent on the 18th June 1699 for limestone to be shipped to the Cape, but no more entries are recorded [19].

Stone for lime-burning had also been discovered on Robben Island by the 28th February 1667, and it was reported on the 4th March that this "white earth" was suitable for mortar if mixed in equal proportions with the lime burned from shells [20]. Another sample of "limestone" was brought from the island for a trial on the 4th November 1672 [21], but the results of this test were not disclosed, and its use from this source was not mentioned again.

Another experiment with "limestone" was made on the 4th December 1673. This was a "white spongy coral like stone, which, having been burnt and slaked, fell to pieces like ashes or meal". It was obtainable in Table Bay "near the sea shore in the West high sanddunes", and was found to be superior to shells in the quality of the lime produced, and less wasteful of firewood as it burned more quickly [22]. Again there is no further mention of the use of this material in the Resolutions [23].

"Limestone" was also shipped once from Saldanha Bay, on the 21st April 1674, but the boat transporting it was wrecked while leaving the bay [24].

11.3.3 LIME-BURNING

There was a constant shortage of firewood for lime-burning, the first reference to its collection having been made on the 27th May 1653 [1]. The forests at Hout Bay, however, were discovered on the 30th July 1653 to have useful reserves [2], and continued to be used intermittently as a supply of fuel for the kilns throughout the

period of this thesis.

A commencement was made on the 19th September 1653 with the packing of the firewood for the first lime-kiln. This was a difficult operation owing to the irregularity of the available fuel [3]. Nevertheless the kiln, "9 fathoms in circumference", was fired on the 1st October 1653, with successful results [4]. A "second lime-kiln" was fired on the 27th May 1656 [5], but it is not clear whether this was the second that year or the second in total. It appears, however, that lime was usually burned only once or twice a year, owing to the labour of collecting shells and the difficulty of procuring firewood.

In 1664, however, five lime-kilns were fired between April and July, the last being a large new kiln erected outside the Fort ("onder 't Fort staende") and set alight on the 19th July [6]. Large-scale lime-burning was resumed in 1665 in order to provide a supply for the new Castle. Instructions were given on the 26th August for all the workmen and artisans to be employed for this purpose, as well as on breaking the stone required for the walls of the fortress [7].

A large new lime-kiln had also been erected ("opgemetselt") between the Fort and the site of the Castle by the 15th October 1665 [8]. This was described on the 22nd May 1666, in a letter to the Seventeen, as being next to the beach and close to the western moat of the Castle, which had already been marked out. It was 20 feet wide and 12 feet high, and had already been fired three times [9].

Lime was also burned on Robben Island [10], at the "Brackevlei" near "Cape Falso", where the freeburghers had a kiln [11], and at Hout Bay, as resolved on the 11th March 1710 [12].

Mentzel (1741) described the lime-burning process as taking place on an open fire, instead of in a closed kiln as in the case of brick-making, and therefore resulting in a greater consumption of firewood [13].

11.4 STONE

11.4.1 STONE AS A BUILDING MATERIAL

The use of stone for building work during the proto-Cape Dutch period was limited mainly to foundations and fortifications, once bricks had been introduced for masonry work in 1654 [1]. However, stone continued to be used for walling wherever it was readily available, and slates for smaller building elements were quarried at Robben Island on a regular basis.

Stone construction at the Cape was first mentioned on the 5th July 1653, when rocks were collected for the masonry of the new storehouse in the Fort [2]. This work was continued on the 23rd, when men were brought ashore from a ship in harbour to assist with the stone-breaking [3]. Difficulties were encountered in transporting the stone on the 20th October, however, following the abduction by the Khoi of most of the Company's cattle [4].

A suggestion was made on the 6th October 1654 that a fort should be erected at Hout Bay, stone being available in the vicinity, but there was no further mention of the project or of any stone quarrying at Hout Bay [5].

Stone was also used for the foundations of the timber jetty, as first mentioned on the 24th July 1655, when a request was made to Batavia for men to be seconded from the fleet to assist in the collection and transporting of the stones [6].

It was suggested on the 4th February 1656 that the freeburghers, about to be granted land at Rondebosch, could use stone for the construction of their houses [7], but timber was used instead. Stone was also proposed on the 6th May 1656 for the projected Rondebosch redoubt and Peninsula watch-houses, as it was available in the vicinity [8].

Instructions were given on the 19th October 1657 for a redoubt of stone, collected on site, to be erected at the proposed inland trading post [9], but this project never materialised. Local stone was also to be used for a new "stable" (actually a sheep shed) on Robben Island, as instructed on the 16th December 1658 [10].

The reservoir was constructed of stone, and the first of many references to its collection

was made on the 16th May 1663 [11]. Stone was also employed in the hornwork of the Fort, where thick rectangular slabs were used to support the breastwork or battery facing the sea, as mentioned on the 1st August 1664 [12].

The largest building constructed of stone was the Castle, and orders were given on the 3rd August 1665 for supplies to be collected on Robben Island [13]. Stone-breaking for the walls was first mentioned on the 6th [14], the soldiers employed on this task being given extra wages from the 8th [15]. Further orders were given on the 26th that all the workmen and artisans were to be used in stone-breaking and lime-burning for the new Castle [16].

The Visiting Commissioner Isbrand Goske noted on the 27th August 1665 that although sufficient stone was available, it was difficult to break [17]. Nevertheless, a large quantity had been accumulated by the 28th March 1671 [18]. The transporting of stone for the Castle was also difficult and time consuming, and it was decided on the 27th February 1672 that this activity would be handed over to the freeburghers [19]. An agreement on payment was finally reached on the 4th June, and the first wagons were put to work the following week [20].

As the breaking of the "incredibly hard" stone continued to be unmanageable with hammers and crowbars, an experiment was made with blasting on the 21st April 1673 [21]. This appeared to be successful, as noted on the 12th May [22], but no more references to the blasting of rock were made after the 29th May 1673 [23].

It was mentioned on the 11th December 1673 that the slate from Robben Island was used for "door posts" [24]. Further reference was made on the 13th and 21st September 1674 to its use for "door surrounds", and as flagstones for flooring and thresholds [25].

Instructions were given on the 12th December 1674 that the Company's house at Hottentots-Holland was to be built of stone [26], and similar orders were given regarding the redoubt there on the 11th July 1676 [27].

A final reference in the Resolutions to the use of stone was made on the 22nd February 1679, in connection with the recently laid foundations of the slave lodge under construction [28].

11.4.2 SOURCES OF STONE

Apart from the unexploited reserves at Hout Bay mentioned previously [1], stone for building purposes was first discovered on the 4th October 1655, behind Table Mountain [2]. However, it appears to have been used only for buildings in the vicinity, and not as a major supply for the town and fortifications [3].

Another source of building stone was discovered by Van Riebeeck on the 23rd December 1656 "in the sandhills behind the Lion's Rump". He described it as a "very fine white corallite, soft and easily cut and in quality equal to that found in Batavia" [4]. The only further mention of this source was on the 11th June 1657, when it was decided to investigate the possibility of exploiting the stone in the dunes at Table Bay. This followed reports concerning the difficulty of transporting stone from the quarry on Robben Island [5].

The Robben Island quarry had been opened on the 29th May 1657, where a "beautiful white stone, soft and easily worked" had been found [6]. Instructions were given that the cut stones were to be "no larger than 18 inches long and 9 inches broad and high" and that the smaller ones should be "one foot in length by half a foot thick and high" [7]. It was reported on the 19th July 1657, however, that the stone crumbled while being quarried, and disintegrated in the rain [8]. It was therefore decided on the 6th August, following an inspection by Van Riebeeck, that the quarry would be abandoned [9].

Instructions were given on the 24th November 1659 that Saldanha Bay was to be investigated for the availability of stone [10]. A favourable report was received on the 9th December 1660, stating that stone suitable for masonry was obtainable, following an inspection by Van Riebeeck [11]. However, there is no further mention of stone quarrying at Saldanha Bay, suggesting that Van Riebeeck's assessment was over-optimistic.

The quarrying of slate ("blaeuwe steenen") on Robben Island was first mentioned on the 16th February 1664, when a gravestone was prepared and brought to the Fort [12]. Following an inspection of the island by Commander Wagenaer on the 27th November 1664 [13], this became a major activity, forty-one shipments being recorded between

1664 and 1676 [14]. The importance of this industry is indicated by the fact that a stone-cutter was sent to the island on the 16th November 1673 to dress the slates, thereby making them more manageable for shipment [15]. Robben Island was also briefly used as a supply of stone for the breastwork in the hornwork of the Fort, three shipments being recorded between August and October 1664 [16].

It was first revealed on the 22nd May 1666, in a letter to the Seventeen, that the stone for the new Castle was being quarried "beneath the mountains in Table Valley" [17], and further mention was made on the 24th October 1672 of stone quarrying "near the old fort and the freemens' houses" [18]. Abraham van Riebeeck was more specific in 1676, when he described the stone for the Castle as having been quarried "from or near the Lion Hill" [19].

Dampier (1691) [20] and Valentyn (1714) [21] also refer to a quarry in Table Valley, but are no more specific about its location. Mentzel (1741) merely refers to the fact that the valley had been "strewn with rocks", which were collected for use in the Castle [22]. Johannes Heydt (1741), however, describes two stone quarries at the foot of the Lion's Rump, between the "Water-Casteel" and the town [23].

A source of stone at Hottentots-Holland was also mentioned on the 11th July 1676, when it was noted that stone for the redoubt there had already been quarried in the vicinity [24]. Kolbe (1713) and Valentyn (1714) also make reference to the quarries at the Steenbergen, where a stone similar to marble was extracted for use in steps and floors [25], and on the Paarl Mountain, where millstones were quarried [26].

11.5 BRICKS AND TILES

11.5.1 BRICK AS A BUILDING MATERIAL

The first of a number of requisitions for bricks from Batavia was made on the 13th May 1652. These were needed for the proposed oil furnaces, two thousand bricks being required for each [1].

Another two to three thousand bricks were requested on the 9th April 1653 with which

to build fire-proof storehouses. These would replace the inflammable timber structures in the Fort, the only brick building erected to date being the powder-magazine [2].

Clinkers were also requisitioned from Holland on the 14th April 1653, for constructing underground train-oil tanks [3]. Bricks for the cisterns were requested again on the 24th February 1654 [4], and it was mentioned on the 21st April that four thousand Leyden clinkers had been sent on a ship which had missed the Cape and sailed on to St Helena [5].

Another request for bricks was made to Batavia on the 5th August 1653. Although supplies had been sent from Holland, the bricks were stored below the cargo as ballast and therefore could not be off-loaded without delaying the departure of the vessels [6]. However, a letter received from Batavia on the 8th March 1654 stated categorically that no bricks would be sent from Batavia, in order not to inconvenience the return fleets. Instructions were therefore sent that brick-making was to be undertaken at the Cape instead [7].

This was promptly taken in hand, and the first brick-kiln was successfully fired on the 24th March 1654. It was therefore decided that all the buildings in the Fort would be reconstructed in brick. This would not only make them more fire-proof than the existing timber structures, but would also reduce the maintenance required [8].

The first Cape bricks were laid on the 11th June 1654, and were described as "fine red bricks, just like Leyden brick" [9]. This first impression, however, was later found to be deceptive.

It was only a little more than a year later that the first brick building was erected outside the Fort. This was the milk cellar on Robben Island, the first shipment of bricks being made on the 8th October 1655 [10]. Bricks were also sent to Rondebosch from the 3rd February 1657 for the erection of a redoubt there [11].

The inadequacies of the local bricks were revealed on the 2nd January 1663, when it was noted that they were being hollowed out by the rain. It was therefore decided that all the buildings in the Fort would be plastered with lime [12]. These shortcomings were repeated in a letter to the Seventeen, dated the 16th May 1663, which stated that

the building to the left of the "Cat" of the Fort was about to collapse because of the use of permeable bricks and clay mortar [13]. Indeed, this prediction was realized on the 19th August 1663, when the gable of the "Secretariat" collapsed, owing to the use of clay mortar and insufficiently baked bricks [14].

Clinker bricks were requested from Holland again on the 21st November 1663. These were needed for the gate of the new hornwork and for drainage works, as the local bricks were not durable enough [15]. Bricks for the cavalry guard-house at the Liesbeeck River were burned on site, however, as noted on the 24th October 1664 [16].

Brick vaulting at the Cape was first mentioned on the 28th December 1665, when it was noted that the locally-made bricks were too friable for use in the proposed vaulted powder-magazines and drains [17]. It was also reported on the 10th February 1671 that local bricks were not durable enough for lining the water channel. Dutch clinkers would therefore be used instead [18], a shipment of one hundred thousand being received on the 27th May [19].

A further reference to the defectiveness of Cape bricks was made on the 14th July 1671. It was stated, in connection with an inundation of the buildings in the Fort, that the "causes of this great destruction are partly the bricks baked here, and partly that they have been laid not in lime, but in clay, so that they draw water into them like sponges..." [20].

Two further shipments of Dutch clinkers were received in 1672 [21], and the use of stock-bricks ("grauwe moppen") from Holland was first mentioned on the 22nd August 1673, in connection with the "corps de guarde" under construction. This was the first of a number of shipments for the buildings in the new Castle [22].

Stock-bricks continued to be imported throughout the VOC period at the Cape, as revealed by the inventories of damaged materials, thus contradicting the common misconception that only clinkers were sent from Holland. Moreover, the popular term "klompjes", used for the latter in the secondary sources, does not appear in the VOC records of this period.

The use of brickwork was made compulsory on the 12th February 1691, when an edict

was promulgated requiring all the freeburghers' houses, out-buildings and kraals to be built of brick or clay. This was done in an attempt to conserve the limited supplies of structural timber [23].

Another two to three hundred thousand yellow clinkers were requisitioned from Holland on the 7th December 1699, for the Company's use and for sale to the freeburghers [24], and the price of imported clinkers was fixed at three and a half rixdollars per thousand on the 29th August 1705 [25]. These prices were adjusted on the 18th November 1710. Clinkers from Amsterdam would be sold for four rixdollars per thousand, while the inferior ones from Zeeland would continue to be sold at three and a half rixdollars [26].

By now the Cape was capable of producing enough bricks for the smaller buildings of the Company and those of the freeburghers [27]. However, Dutch bricks were still required for larger structures and for exposed situations where local bricks were insufficiently durable.

11.5.2 TILES AS BUILDING MATERIALS

Both roof tiles and floor tiles were imported to the Cape, and both were also manufactured locally. For this reason they will be dealt with together, following the chronology of their contemporary descriptions.

Roofing tiles were first mentioned on the 13th May 1652, when a consignment was requested from Batavia to replace the temporary roofs constructed of planks [1]. It is instructive that Van Riebeeck opted for tiles rather than thatch, which he was later compelled to use. Although thatching reeds were locally available, tiles had the advantage of being fire-proof, a matter of central importance in a fortification stocked with gunpowder and other inflammable substances. He was also perpetuating the use of Dutch and Batavian roofing methods, but out of context and without reference to local climatic conditions.

Their unsuitability was already noted on the 14th April 1653, when it was reported that the tiles were blown off the roofs in strong winds [2]. Nevertheless, a further shipment was referred to on the 4th May, but many of the 1800 tiles received were broken, and

there were not enough to roof more than a small store-room [3].

By the 9th February 1659 there was still only one building in the Fort with a tiled roof. This was the "old magazine", the tiles having been brought to the Cape in 1653. The others were all roofed with thatch, and the dangers of this practice had recently been emphasized by a potentially disastrous fire in the Fort [4].

It was therefore decided on the 7th January 1660 to replace all the thatched roofs of the Company's buildings with locally baked tiles, following their successful use on the new water-mill [5]. These would be manufactured by the free brick- and tile-maker Wouter Cornelissen Mostaert, and delivered at a price of forty guilders per thousand, each tile being 6 inches wide and 12 inches long. The Company would transport the tiles from the kiln, and the laths required would be prepared by the free sawyer [6].

Floor tiles were first mentioned on the 23rd May 1663, when it was resolved that the floor of the "Cat" of the Fort would be paved with tiles, as a fire precaution for the cellar below [7].

The inadequacies of the locally-manufactured tiles were mentioned on the 16th April 1666, when it was necessary for the roof of the rice loft in the hornwork of the Fort to be covered with tar. Although the tiles had been whitewashed above and below, they still allowed the rainwater to soak through [8]. An interesting corollary of this entry is that the tiled roofs in the Fort must have been white, and not red or earth-coloured.

Another instance of tiles being blown off the roofs was recorded on the 21st December 1672, as a result of strong south-easterly winds [9]. This was followed on the 12th June 1673 by a report that the "tile factory" was being repaired, following storm damage. Leibbrandt is unspecific about the nature of the damage, but it is tempting to speculate that the roof tiles were blown off their very place of manufacture [10].

Floor tiles ("tichelsteentjens") were also imported, although there is no mention of their place of origin [11]. Their importation is revealed in the records of building materials written off from the accounts of the "negotie pakhuisen". These include tiles damaged in transit and in the warehouse itself, five entries occurring between 1702 and 1707 [12], and another two in 1709 and 1710 [13].

Valentyn (1714) and Mentzel (1741) both (incorrectly) describe the slave lodge as being flat-roofed [14], and Mentzel states that the buildings in the Castle were roofed "in the Italian manner", with flat square tiles [15].

These two references are extremely important in establishing the precedent for the flat-roofed town house aesthetic of the later 18th century, the first recorded example of which was built in 1732 [16]. However, they also appear to have been responsible for the common misconception that all the early tiled buildings at the Cape had flat roofs. Most of the secondary sources refer to the flat "tigel-steentjes", but ignore the "pannen" (pantiles) mentioned in the Journal and Resolutions [17]. These required "latten" to support them [18], a clear reference to the battens found in a pitched roof as opposed to the planks used in a flat roof.

Verbal evidence of pitched tiled roofs is provided by Mentzel, describing the old equipage warehouse. This "had an exceptionally high roof covered with very old-fashioned tiles, which were shaped like an S but placed horizontally" [19]. Visual evidence, moreover, is provided as late as 1762 by Johannes Rach in his view of Greenmarket Square [Fig 66]. The house to the right of the Burgher watch-house has a tiled and pitched roof, corresponding with Mentzel's description.

11.5.3 LOCAL MANUFACTURE OF BRICKS AND TILES

The possibility of making bricks and tiles at the Cape was first raised on the 13th May 1652 [1]. The availability of clay in the vicinity was mentioned on the 9th April 1653, but firewood for the kilns was in short supply [2].

However, following instructions from Batavia that the Cape was to supply itself with bricks [3], the first kiln was successfully fired on the 24th March 1654, suitable clay having been found close to the Fort [4]. A second kiln, containing 60 000 bricks, was fired on the 12th May [5], followed by a third on the 14th August, producing another 6000 bricks [6]. The kilns were controlled by a supervisor, Jan van Harwaerden, as was mentioned on the 8th August 1654 [7].

Reed mats were needed for the brick-kilns, and the collection of suitable reeds was first mentioned on the 16th October 1654 [8]. A ship was also sent to Saldanha Bay for the

purpose on the 22nd October 1654 [9], returning with 700 bundles of "fine long reeds" on the 12th November. These were off-loaded the next day, when firewood was ordered from Hout Bay [10].

The new kiln, fired on the 27th December 1654, was the largest to date. It was 60 Rhineland feet long, 30 wide and 13 high, and contained 437 000 bricks [11]. Another brick-kiln, half the size of the last, was fired on the 2nd April 1655 [12], followed on the 31st December by a kiln of 400 000 bricks [13].

Only one kiln containing 250 000 bricks was fired in 1656, on the 7th February [14], but more reeds for matting were ordered from Saldanha Bay on the 18th October [15]. The next kiln was fired on the 27th January 1657. Although it held only 200 000 bricks, it had required 84 wagonloads of firewood which had taken three months to collect from the forest, which was two and a half Dutch miles away [16]. This is a graphic illustration of the difficulties of procuring firewood, which had first been mentioned by Van Riebeeck in 1653.

It was decided on the 26th July 1658 that the manufacture of bricks and tiles would be handed over to the free miller Wouter Cornelissen Mostaert. The bricks were to be 8 inches long, 4 inches wide and 2 inches thick. They were to be delivered to the Company at five guilders per thousand, but he could sell them to the freeburghers for six guilders. The price of roofing tiles would be determined once a specimen had been inspected [17].

Brick-burning was also briefly undertaken at the Liesbeeck River, for the cavalry guard-house to be erected there, as mentioned on the 29th October 1664 [18].

Following complaints about the quality of the local bricks, a new brick-field was selected in Table Valley on the 18th December 1665, behind the Fort and to the east of the Company's garden. It was hoped that the clay here would produce better bricks and tiles than those manufactured by Wouter Mostaert [19].

A further report on the defectiveness of Mostaert's products was made on the 5th January 1666. The use of inferior clay which was insufficiently burned had resulted in tiles which leaked and bricks which were too friable. These would not be strong enough

for the three powder-magazines about to be built, or for the other arches and vaulted drains required, so it was decided that the Company itself would erect a kiln using clay from the newly discovered brick-field [20]. Mostaert was granted a plot of farmland the following day, in compensation for his loss of the brick and tile business [21].

The new Company's kiln, containing 120 000 bricks, was fired on the 16th February 1666 [22], and was followed by another of 300 000 bricks on the 1st June [23]. It was resolved on the 4th March 1670, however, following a proposal by the Visiting Commissioner van den Broeck on the 25th February [24], that the production of bricks and tiles would again be leased to the freeburghers [25].

This decision was made as the Company's brick-kiln had been unprofitable, and a new contract was signed with Wouter Mostaert on the 23rd June. He was to supply between 70 000 and 80 000 bricks in the first three months, to be followed by another 200 000, at the price of six guilders per thousand [26]. Mostaert's contract was re-negotiated on the 30th December 1675, resulting in a price increase. Bricks would now cost seven guilders per thousand, while 8-inch floor tiles would be sold at thirty guilders per thousand [27].

The first mention of a brick-kiln outside the Peninsula (apart from the one established in 1686/1687 to fire the bricks for the Stellenbosch church and drostdy) was also at Stellenbosch, as recorded in a letter from the Landdrost requesting firewood from Klapmuts on the 26th October 1708 [28]. This suggests that the country districts were beginning to become self-sufficient, and were no longer competely reliant on Cape Town.

The shortage of clay for bricks and tiles was raised in Council on the 11th March 1710. It was therefore resolved to search for new reserves in Table Valley, on the flats near the Steenbergen, and at Stellenbosch and Drakenstein [29].

Valentyn (1714) made reference to the Company's brick-kiln next to the gardens [30], and to that of Abraham Hertog on the flanks of the Lion Mountain, close to Table Mountain [31]. Hertog had been granted the land in loan on the 30th January 1707, and was given full ownership on the 28th February 1710, on condition that he allowed the Company access to the clay-fields [32].

Two detailed descriptions of the brick-making process, as practised by the freeburghers, are provided by Mentzel (1741). The first describes the kilns: "...To produce these (bricks) more economically large field-ovens have been constructed, containing six orifices, each four feet apart, and forming a long vaulted passage; this oven can burn 120,000 bricks at a time..." [33].

The second describes how the bricks were formed: "...The clay soil is then dug up, well-watered and reduced to a powdery state by the grinding hoofs of a team of horses that are driven over it again and again. When the clay is reduced to a pulp, it is kneaded by hand into rough blocks which are then placed into moulds to receive the proper shape... The formed bricks have to dry in the sun for some time, hence the work can be undertaken during the dry season only... After the bricks are sufficiently sun-dried the process of baking in a kiln is gone through... Although all the work is done by slave-labour, bricks are not cheap: 10 Rds. per 1,000; this is mainly due to the scarcity of wood and its expensiveness..." [34].

11.6 OTHER CONSTRUCTION METHODS AND MATERIALS

11.6.1 EARTH AND SODS

Earth and sod construction was used for a number of fortification works at the Cape, but they were prone to collapse in heavy rains. The best known of these was the Fort de Goede Hoop, the earthen walls of which collapsed on the 2nd August 1654, the first of many such occurrences [1]. Although a number of remedies were tried over the years in an attempt to reinforce the walls, none of them provided a permanent solution [2].

Earth was suggested on the 1st May 1656 for a small redoubt at Rondebosch [3], but a proposal to protect the Peninsula with a permanent ditch and breastwork was abandoned on the 2nd August 1659, as the soil was too "loose and sandy" [4]. Sods were also sent to Robben Island on the 18th September 1659, although there is no mention of their intended use [5].

A resolution was made on the 21st February 1671 that the incomplete Castle would be temporarily enclosed with an earth wall and palisades [6]. This efficient construction

method continued to be used as a stop-gap solution until the walls had been completed, the last mention being on the 15th September 1678, when it was proposed that an outwork of earth and palisades should be built across the entire sea frontage of the Castle [7].

A breastwork for the Company's post at Hottentots-Holland was also constructed of sods on the 22nd July 1673, as palisades were not available in the vicinity [8]. This, however, was later rebuilt in stone, and there does not appear to be any further mention of earth and sod construction during the period of this thesis.

11.6.2 METAL

Although a smithy was established by Van Riebeeck shortly after his arrival at the Cape, it was still necessary to import ironwork, particularly in the early years of the settlement.

Nails for the timber houses under construction were requested from Batavia on the 13th May 1652 [1], and hinges for the doors and windows on the 30th May [2]. Equipment and raw materials were also required for the smithy itself, as they were not available at the Cape. Bellows and smiths' coals were requested from Holland on the 14th April 1653 [3], as was steel on the 13th October [4].

Locks were requested from Holland on the 5th March 1657. Although these were already being made at the Cape, their manufacture was too time consuming and prevented other more important work from being undertaken [5]. Another requisition for nails was made on the 22nd February 1658, to be sold to the freeburghers for the construction of their houses. Lead was also required, for gutters and pipes [6].

The salvaging of iron from ships wrecked in Table Bay was first referred to on the 9th April 1662 [7], although iron was also supplied from the ships in harbour, as mentioned on the same date [8].

Lead for the glazing of windows was first requested from Holland on the 10th August 1662 [9], and received on the 21st November 1663 [10]. Further references to the importation of iron and lead were made in 1671 and 1672, but it was not until the 15th

April 1707 that another requisition for metal was recorded, when lead pipes for the watercourse at the harbour were requested [11]. These were sent on the 14th May 1708 [12]. A requisition for copper water channels was also made to Batavia on the 4th February 1710 [13].

The first reference (in the official sources consulted) to a smithy outside the Peninsula, apart from those of the Governor at Vergelegen and the Secunde at Elsenburg, was on the 4th April 1708, when it was mentioned that the ironwork for the new council house (the second drostdy) at Stellenbosch would be prepared locally by the free smith Hans Jacob Conterman [14]. This reference again illustrates the growing independence of the inland centres, which were no longer solely dependent on Cape Town.

11.6.3 GLASS

The first suggestion that the windows of the buildings in the Fort should be glazed was made on the 10th August 1662, when it was stated in a letter to the Seventeen that it would be desirable if the "Guinea linen" used for window panes were replaced with glass [1]. Word was received from Amsterdam on the 22nd December that glass and lead would be sent over [2], and the delivery of these materials was acknowledged on the 21st November 1663 [3].

Glass for window panes continued to be imported throughout the period of this thesis, as there were no facilities for its manufacture at the Cape. However, there are no further references apart from those concerning the regulation of prices [4], and those in the inventories describing the number of broken panes written off from the accounts [5]. One of these inventories, dated the 3rd October 1704, mentioned a difference in size of the window panes ("84 groote" and "108 klijnd." having been broken), but unfortunately no dimensions were given [6].

11.6.4 PAINT AND OTHER PROTECTIVE FINISHES

These materials were all imported from Holland and Batavia, as they could not be produced at the Cape. Paint and linseed oil were first requested from Batavia on the 13th May 1652, for preserving the wooden buildings under construction. Pitch was also

needed, presumably for water-proofing the plank roofs [1]. A requisition for paint and linseed oil was made to Holland as well on the 13th October 1653 [2], and for pitch and tar for the timber roofs on the 29th October 1655 [3].

By this time brick buildings had already been erected in the Fort, and whitewashers' brushes were requested in the same letter "to keep the houses made of brick properly clean" [4]. This suggests that the walls, although unplastered, were intended to be whitewashed and not left in their natural colour. The whitewash could have been obtained locally as a by-product of the lime-burning process. The use of whitewashing was mentioned again on the 23rd November 1706, when lime and brushes for the purpose were sent to Dassen Island [5].

A last formal request for paint and linseed oil was made to Holland on the 8th April 1656 [6], but paint continued to be imported, as revealed in the inventories of damaged materials from 1704 to 1710 [7]. Unfortunately, the inventories do not reveal the colour of the paint written off from the accounts.

The evidence presented in this chapter reveals that by 1710 the Cape was largely self-sufficient with regard to building materials. Stone for foundations, bricks and lime for walls, timber for the roof structure and reeds for thatching were all either available or produced at the Cape. Doors, windows and their ironmongery were also manufactured locally. However, iron, glass and paint were still imported, as were bricks for specialized purposes, and floor tiles and timber for large-scale projects, such as the hospital on the Heerengracht.

12. ARCHITECTS AND CRAFTSMEN

During the period of this thesis, variations in spelling of the first names and surnames of the Company's employees were common. Those provided here reflect this inconsistency by following the spelling of the original documents consulted.

12.1 ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS AND SUPERVISORS OF VOC WORKS

There are no specific references to architects during the proto-Cape Dutch period, but surveyors and engineers were equally conversant with the discipline at this time, and the supervisors of the Company's buildings were also influential in their design. It is also probable that the plans of some of the more imposing structures were influenced, if not designed in outline, by the Commanders and Governors of the period.

The documentary evidence for the designers of buildings, as opposed to minor or temporary fortification works, concerns only two such structures. These were the granary at Rondebosch designed by the Commander Jan van Riebeeck [1], and the first parsonage in the gardens above Cape Town designed by the surveyor Joan Wittebol [2].

Attempts to attribute the more sophisticated buildings of this period to individual craftsmen are anachronistic [3]. These people would not have had access to the proportional rigours of the architectural treatises, the application of which has been revealed in the analyses of these buildings. The masons and carpenters would probably have been responsible only for the physical erection of structures such as the church, the hospital and Vergelegen, which were almost certainly designed by persons with at least an amateur knowledge of the theoretical principles of the Renaissance.

Although the persons responsible for architectural work at the Cape were not specifically trained in the field, they did have access to architectural treatises from an early date. An unmarked case in one of the store-rooms in the Fort was opened on the 8th January 1661, and contained the following three volumes, amongst other non-architectural works: the "Architectura of Hendrick de Keyser" and "Architectura of Jacob Barozzio" in folio, and "Marcus Petruvius Pollio de Architectura, Librj 10", in quarto [4].

Hendrick de Keyser (1565-1621) was the foremost architect in Holland during the first quarter of the 17th century. In fact, one of the buildings attributed to him is the headquarters of the VOC in Amsterdam, the "Oostindisch Huis" built in 1605. The volume described as the "Architectura of Hendrick de Keyser" was almost certainly "Architectura Moderna", written and published by Cornelis Danckerts in 1631 [Fig 256]. This volume was a vindication of De Keyser's reputation, following a publication after his death attributing his own work to another architect [5].

The likely influence of "Architectura Moderna" on the design of the church in Cape Town has already been discussed [6], and this provides strong circumstantial evidence that the treatise was indeed used as a reference work at the Cape. It is therefore not improbable that it influenced other buildings as well.

"Jacob Barozzio" was almost certainly Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola (1507-73), whose treatise "Regole delle cinque ordini d'architettura" was first published in Rome in 1562 [7]. Vignola's treatise, the introduction of which dealt with harmonic proportions [8], was published in Holland with a multilingual text in 1617, 1629, 1640 and 1642 [9].

It is even more interesting that a copy of Vitruvius (to spell his name correctly) should have reached the Cape less than ten years after its founding. His "Ten Books" constitute the earliest surviving architectural treatise, and formed the basis of those written during the Renaissance.

The existence of such works creates a direct link between the early architecture at the Cape and that of Holland a few decades previously. This could well be an explanation for the relatively sophisticated architecture of the VOC and its officials during the proto-Cape Dutch period, as exemplified by the proportioning systems used in Simon van der Stel's hospital and at Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel's Vergelegen.

To return to the period of Van Riebeeck, the first supervisor of the Company's buildings was Jan van Harwaerden of Zeventer, who had previously served under Prince Frederick Hendrick, where he had gained experience in fortification works [10]. He arrived at the Cape on the 10th August 1653 as a corporal, with a salary of 14 guilders a month, but was promoted to captain of arms on the 8th August 1654, when his salary was increased to 20 guilders. This was in recognition of his services as

foreman on the fortifications and supervisor of the brick-kiln [11]. He was confirmed in the rank of sergeant on the 10th April 1657, with a further salary increase to 32 guilders a month, and given command of the militia and responsibility for the supervision of all the Company's public works and agricultural activities [12]. He was also given permission on the 15th October to open an inn and boarding-house, to be run by his wife [13].

On the 6th September 1658 he was promoted to the rank of ensign with a salary of 36 guilders a month and the same duties as before. This promotion, however, was conditional on his relinquishing the inn and tavern which he had been permitted to open the previous year [14]. This activity was considered to be "too vile for a person of that rank", and he complied with this condition against the wishes of his wife [15]. He died soon after his promotion, on the 18th February 1659, following a short illness [16]. However, his widow again assumed responsibility for the inn after his death [17], this building being of central importance in the development of early architecture at the Cape [18].

After the death of Van Harwaerden, supervision of the building works was taken over on the 1st March 1659 by the Fiscal, Abraham Gabbema of 's-Gravenhage [19]. The next recorded supervisor of the Company's fortifications and building works was the ensign Pieter Evrart, who died in March 1664. He was succeeded in this capacity by Johannes Coon of Somelsdijck, who had recently arrived at the Cape. He was promoted to ensign on the 10th July 1664 [20], and was given responsibility for supervising the work on the Castle on the 13th March 1671, having already been promoted to lieutenant [21]. Abraham Schut, another recent arrival, was also employed as supervisor of the men working on the Castle (who were about to commence with site preparation) from the 4th June 1665, having been promoted from sergeant to ensign [22].

The first qualified engineer to be mentioned was Pieter Dombaer, who was sent out with Commissioner Isbrand Goske to assist in the erection of the Castle. He was referred to on the 22nd May 1666 as having marked out the Castle foundations, together with the surveyor Hendrick Lacus [23], and as having prepared a plan of the old Fort and the new Castle [24]. He was still at the Cape on the 14th March 1667,

when he was sent together with Lieutenant Schut to find suitable sites for signalling posts at Hout Bay and False Bay [25], but was not mentioned again.

Lieutenant Breijtenbagh and the surveyor Joannes Wittebol, together with Lieutenant Coon, were given responsibility for supervising the construction of the Castle on the 27th June 1672 [26]. Wittebol, whose activities as surveyor will be outlined in Chapter 12.2, was also the designer of the first parsonage in Cape Town, as mentioned on the 10th July 1670 [27]. This is the only mention of the name of a designer of a residential building documented in the sources consulted for the entire period of this thesis. Wittebol was also mentioned in his capacity as engineer on the 16th October 1677 [28]. Dirck Jansen Smient took over the task of supervising the Castle works on the 3rd January 1676, when he was promoted from lieutenant to captain [29].

A new post was created on the 13th January 1693, that of inspector of roads, streets, buildings and bridges. It was given to Hendrick Bernd. Oldenland, a man of many skills, being in addition a medical doctor, land-surveyor and chief gardener [30].

Valentyn, writing in 1705, mentioned the "fabryk" Lieutenant Jan Baptista Dubertino, who had been dismissed for building himself a large house using the Company's materials under his care. As the word "fabryk" denoted either an architect or a chief of public works, Dubertino could have been the first architect recorded at the Cape. However, given the nature of his misdemeanours, it is more likely that he was the supervisor of works [31].

The last person to hold this office during the period of this thesis was the ensign Kaje Jesse Slotsboo. He was first described by Bogaert in 1706 as an engineer and surveyor, with a wide range of responsibilities [32]. He was relieved of some of these in 1708 on the instructions of Commissioner C J Simons [33]. However, he was still being used as surveyor and as "fabricq" over the Company's public works and fortifications in 1710 [34]. He was also responsible for the supervision of the brick-kiln, the carpenters and masons, and the imported building materials. Although he had already been promoted to the rank of lieutenant, he was given a salary increase from 50 to 60 guilders a month on the 28th February 1710, in recognition of his services [35].

12.2 SURVEYORS

Despite the use of the term "surveyor" during this period, none of the persons who occupied this post were sworn surveyors, as revealed in 1708 by the Visiting Commissioner C J Simons [1]. Although he recommended that a qualified person should be sent out from Holland, amateurs were still being employed in 1710.

The first surveyor recorded at the Cape was Pieter Potter of Amsterdam, who arrived in 1655 as a cadet with a salary of 10 guilders a month. He was employed as a surveyor and cartographer, and was confirmed in that position on the 28th March 1657 with an increase in salary to 15 guilders [2]. He was also conversant with construction methods, being sent on the 27th May 1659 to instruct the free sawyer in the erection of palisades [3], and he accompanied an exploratory voyage to the (non-existent) island of St Helena Nova as chart-maker on the 5th May 1660 [4]. He was last mentioned in the muster-roll of the 1st March 1661 [5].

Potter was succeeded as surveyor by the "Adsistent", Hendrick Lacus of Wesel, as noted on the 25th March 1661 [6]. Lacus had been promoted to Secretary by the 3rd July 1662 [7], and to Fiscal by the 23rd May 1663, but continued to practise surveying as shown by his involvement in the setting out of new building works [8]. Lacus was responsible for setting out the foundations of both the Castle sites: the original one surrounding the old Fort, as mentioned on the 8th June 1665 [9], and the final site to the east (with the assistance of the engineer Pieter Dombaer), as recorded on the 22nd May 1666 [10]. Hendrick Lacus was not mentioned again in his capacity as land-surveyor, but achieved notoriety as the first high-ranking VOC official to be imprisoned on Robben Island, having been convicted of defalcation of Company's goods on the 7th March 1668 [11].

His successor was Joan Wittebol of Amsterdam, who arrived in 1668 as a soldier, with a salary of 10 guilders a month [12]. He was employed as a surveyor, however, and confirmed as such on the 6th March 1670, his salary being increased to 20 guilders [13]. He was promoted again on the 11th April 1672, this time to the rank of Junior Merchant [14]. He continued to act as surveyor, though, and had already accompanied an expedition to explore Hottentots-Holland and False Bay as official cartographer in

December 1671 [15]. He was also involved in the erection of a breastwork at Hottentots-Holland in July and August 1673 [16]. Wittebol, like his predecessor, was also found to have a deficit in his administration. He was demoted on the 28th December 1674, and "declared unworthy to serve the Company any longer at the pen" [17]. Unlike Lacus, however, he continued as surveyor, being mentioned on the 6th July 1676 in connection with the selection of a site for a redoubt at Hottentots-Holland [18].

Wittebol is best known for having produced the first accurate plan and perspective of the Castle (M2/22) [Fig 23], which predated the erection of the "cat" wall. He was also responsible for the detailed plan of the town dating from c1679 (M2/21) [Fig 45], but this has not previously been acknowledged [19]. He died in 1681, as recorded on the 15th September [20].

The next surveyor on record was Hendrick Bernd. Oldenland, as revealed in his will of the 27th December 1693 [21]. However, his only mention in this capacity in the Resolutions was after his death, when he was succeeded on the 26th February 1697 by Douwe Gerbrandse Stijn, who had previously been the chief mason [22].

The last of the surveyors during this period was Kaje Jesse Slotsboo, already mentioned by Bogaert in 1706 [23], but first recorded in the Resolutions as a surveyor only on the 20th August 1709 [24]. He was mentioned again on the 10th February 1710, in connection with a plan of the town which he had been commissioned to prepare [25], and in the "Contra-Deductie" (1712), where it was noted that he had drawn the plan depicting the subdivision of Vergelegen [26].

12.3 CARPENTERS, SAWYERS AND WOOD-CUTTERS

A large number of Company's servants and freeburghers were employed in the production of timber, as mentioned in the muster-rolls and lists of promotions and confirmations. However, only the Company's chief employees and the most notable free sawyer will be mentioned here.

12.3.1 COMPANY'S CARPENTERS

The first chief carpenter was Hendrick Janssen of Utrecht, who died on the 27th May 1652, shortly after his arrival at the Cape with Van Riebeeck [1]. He was followed in this position by Albert Claesz of Franiker in 1655 [2], Broer Andriessen of Medemblick in 1658 [3], Cornelis Cornelisz of Haerlem in 1659 [4], Pieter Hendricxssen of Odendael in 1663 [5], and Adriaen van Brakel in 1667 [6].

There is no further mention of chief carpenters in the Journal or Resolutions until 1703, but Bax reveals that Pieter Dircx van Dort appeared as "Baas-timmerman" on the muster-roll of the Company's servants in 1693. He was still on the muster-roll in 1696, but had been replaced by Jacobus van der Steen in 1699 [7].

Van der Steen was the last chief carpenter to be mentioned in the Journal and Resolutions, in connection with his inability to account for the shortfall of over 600 guilders' worth of timber imported from Holland. It was therefore decided on the 11th September 1703 that his salary would be halved until he had paid off the deficit [8].

12.3.2 COMPANY'S SAWYERS AND WOOD-CUTTERS

The first overseer of the wood-cutters and sawyers in the forest was Roeloff Sievertsz of Groningen, confirmed in that position on the 15th May 1655, with a salary of 22 guilders a month [1]. He was succeeded in 1656 by Gijsbert Andriesz of Langesont [2], who was followed in this position by Ammon Erickssen of Bergen in 1660 [3], Jaspar Andriessen of Langesont in 1661 [4], and Carel Tetherode of Den Haegh in 1670 [5].

The last of the Company's chief wood-cutters during this period was Jan Voslo (sic), first mentioned on the 22nd October 1689, when he was given responsibility for enforcing the timber conservation measures which had been introduced [6]. He was criticized on the 12th June 1700 for supplying firewood inferior to that collected by the freeburghers, with whom it was suggested that he was in collusion [7]. He also was ordered on the 24th May 1703 to be summoned before the Council of Justice for his failure to complete the mill at Drakenstein, for which he had already been paid [8].

Moreover, he was accused by the freeburghers of having supervised the cutting of the

Company's timber for the private use of Governor Wilhem Adriaen van der Stel at Vergelegen [9]. Indeed, he appears to have been dismissed from office, as he was referred to as the "geweesen baas houtkapper" on the 11th March 1710, when mentioned in connection with the selection of a site for a proposed powder-mill [10].

12.3.3 FREE SAWYERS AND WOOD-CUTTERS

The only free sawyer who appeared regularly in the VOC records was the first, Leendert Cornelis of Zevenhuijsen, who was granted the forest at the Bosheuvel on the 26th October 1657 [1]. By 1658 he had seven free carpenters in his employ [2] as well as twelve slaves, although the latter absconded as was mentioned on the 5th March 1659. He was described in this entry as "an industrious man, and of great benefit to the freemen and the Company" [3]. Indeed, he was elected to the Burgher Council on the 1st May 1660, and put in charge of the free sawyers' commando in the forest [4].

However, he was dismissed from the Burgher Council on the 5th October 1661 on account of his drunk and disorderly behaviour [5], and was accused on the 12th August of slandering the wife of the innkeeper Juriaan Jansen [6]. Leendert Cornelissen's dissoluteness continued, and he was reported on the 3rd June 1662 to be taking no interest in his wood-cutting business, neglecting to pay his workmen, and allowing his house in the forest to fall into disrepair. He was therefore permitted to leave for Batavia in his previous position of ship's carpenter [7].

12.4 MASONS

The first chief mason whose name was recorded at the Cape was Egbert Meijndertsz of Amsterdam. He was employed in this capacity after the death of his predecessor [1], and confirmed on the 15th May 1655, with a salary of 21½ guilders a month [2]. However he stowed away on a ship in harbour, as recorded on the 8th April 1656 [3].

His successor was Pieter Teunisz Mulder of Amsterdam in 1656 [4], followed by Gerrit Harmansz of Deventer in 1657 [5], Johannis Diel of Goedensburgh in 1659 [6], Niclaes Delbort of Arien in 1662 [7], Claes Pelen of Aernhem in 1664 [8], and Matthijs Weijts

of Augsborgh in 1666 [9]. The last chief mason recorded was Douwe Gerbrants Steyn, first mentioned in 1678 [10], and promoted to surveyor in 1697 [11].

Free masons at the Cape were first mentioned in 1659 [12], but their livelihood was threatened by the moonlighting activities of the Company's servants. It was therefore decided on the 6th September 1707 that the Company's masons would be forbidden to undertake any private work after hours. The free masons agreed to pay a fine of 10 rixdollars if they failed to complete their contracts. This, apparently, was a common occurrence [13].

12.5 BRICK- AND TILE-MAKERS

The first of these to be named at the Cape was the free miller, Wouter Cornelissen Mostaert of Utrecht, who was awarded the contract for the manufacture of bricks and tiles on the 26th July 1658 [1]. This was followed on the 7th January 1660 by another contract, for roofing the Company's buildings with tiles [2].

Mostaert was elected to the Burgher Council on the 21st June 1664 [3] but, following a report on the 18th December 1665 concerning the poor quality of his products [4], his brick-making business was taken over by the Company on the 6th January 1666 [5]. However, he was permitted to resume brick manufacture on the 23rd June 1670 [6], and his contract was renewed on the 30th December 1675 [7].

The only Company's servant mentioned as chief brick- or tile-maker was the "pannebakker" Hendrick Hendrickse Oijlam of Doccum, who was promoted to this position on the 4th February 1671, with a salary of 14 guilders a month [8].

The last reference to brick-makers was provided by Valentyn, who mentioned Abraham Hertog's brick-kiln on the flanks of the Lion Mountain, close to Table Mountain [9].

12.6 BLACKSMITHS

The first of the Company's blacksmiths to be mentioned was Hendricq Juriaensz

Hartman of Oldenburg, who arrived in 1653 as a locksmith, with a salary of 17 guilders a month. He was promoted to chief smith on the 1st May 1656, and his salary was increased to 30 guilders a month [1].

He was succeeded by Pieter Egbertssen of Den Dam, who died on the 11th November 1661 [2], Andries Andriesz of Gulijck on the 31st March 1663 [3], Arent Jacobsz of Barendrecht on the 7th May 1666 [4], Harmen Jansz on the 4th February 1671 [5], and Strien Simonsz Smit on the 14th September 1697 [6]. This was the last mention of the Company's chief blacksmiths in the Resolutions during the period of this thesis.

The only blacksmith directly referred to in connection with building work was Hans Jacob Conterman, a free smith involved in the rebuilding of the Stellenbosch drostdy or "Council House", as mentioned on the 4th April 1708 [7].

12.7 GARDENERS

Gardeners have been included here because the first of them was responsible for the layout of the Company's garden in Table Valley, which determined the later development of the town. The formality of the subsequent gardens at Rustenburg, Nieuwland and Vergelegen could also have contributed to the establishment of an orthogonal precedent at the Cape.

The Company's first chief gardener was Hendrick Hendricxs Boom, mentioned for the first time on the 17th December 1651, when embarking for the Cape [1]. His wife was granted permission to open the first tavern on the 18th May 1656 [2], and by the 25th September 1657 Boom had taken his discharge to become a freeburgher [3]. He did not settle permanently, however, and was permitted to return to Holland on the 23rd March 1665 [4].

His successor as chief gardener was Jan Bundervoet of Ghent, who was confirmed in this position on the 4th September 1658, with a salary of 14 guilders a month [5], but died on the 6th December of that year [6]. He was followed by Marten Jacobssen in 1659 [7], Jacob Huijbrechtssen van Roosendael of Leiden in 1661 [8], Harman Ernst van Gresnich of Uijtrecht in 1662 [9], Wijnandt Leendertsz. of Besuijenhouten in 1669

[10], and Leendert Jansz of Gijsselen in 1672 [11].

No further chief gardeners appear in the Company's records consulted until 1705, when Jan Hartogh was mentioned as having filled the post [12]. He was responsible for laying out the lands at Vergelegen and acted as manager of the estate [13], although receiving a salary of 30 guilders a month from the Company, whose interests he was ignoring as a result of these activities [14]. Despite the complaints levelled at him by the freeburghers, he was not dismissed. On the contrary, he was used in a number of responsible capacities, including the supervision of Vergelegen itself prior to its subdivision and sale [15]. He was last mentioned during the period of this thesis on the 28th October 1710 [16].

By this time the Company's main vegetable garden at Nieuwland also had its own chief gardener, Cent Jansz of Leyden, who was first mentioned on the 20th April 1707 [17].

One further gardener is worthy of mention, although the only time he appears in the Resolutions is on the 26th February 1697, when he was referred to as deceased [18]. He was Hendrick Bernard Oldenland of Lübeck, described by Valentyn as "a good botanist whom I knew here as Overseer of the Company's Garden". He had prepared a "Herbarius Vivus" of the flowers of the Cape, comprising "fully 13 or 14 volumes in folio, with a very fine description in Latin of each plant" [19].

12.8 COMPARATIVE SALARIES OF VOC PERSONNEL

The status of the Company's employees can be deduced from the monthly salaries which they received [1]. Those of the supervisors of VOC works are unrepresentatively high, as they were military officers who had a number of other duties to perform. Examples of these are Ensign van Harwaerden on 36 guilders, and Lieutenant Slotsboo on 60 guilders [2].

However, a relatively consistent pattern emerges amongst the other participants in the building process. The surveyors, surprisingly, seem to have been the lowest paid, Pieter Potter receiving only 15 guilders and Joan Wittebol 20 guilders [3]. The standard rate for chief masons was 20 guilders [4], for chief gardeners 25 guilders, although it

did rise as high as 36 in one case [5], and 30 guilders for chief carpenters [6]. The reason for the high salaries of the carpenters is that they were responsible for ship repairs as well as for erecting buildings.

These salaries should be seen in the context of the base level of 9 guilders for the common soldier or sailor, and the far higher figures received by those in control of the settlement. Jan van Riebeeck's salary was raised to 90 guilders when he was promoted to Commander on the 15th April 1654 [7], and again to 130 guilders on the 12th October 1656 [8]. Simon van der Stel received 200 guilders as Governor, according to Valentyn [9].

The hierarchical nature of the VOC, illustrated so clearly by its salary structure, was central to the development of architecture at the Cape during the proto-Cape Dutch period. It was only the people in power (the VOC officials) and those with sufficient capital (the wealthiest freeburghers) who were in a position to influence future developments. Without the precedent established by this elite class, existing within the Renaissance culture of the period, the Cape Dutch architecture of the later 18th century could not have emerged.

Fitchet, Rowallan Hugh
PhD Thesis

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2017

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.