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The meaning of the eighteenth century Cape farmstead

Yvonne Brink

Introduction

When Jan van Riebeeck’s band of about one hundred mostly poverty stricken, illiterate and unskilled men (a few with wives and children) had splashed ashore in Table Bay one of their first tasks was to erect a canvas covered shelter of planks. Thus began the architectural history of the Cape settlement.

Work on a more substantial structure, the four-bastioned Fort, began immediately, and on 3 August 1652 Van Riebeeck was able to enter in his Journal: “This day we all moved from the beach to take up our abode inside the Fort” (Thom 1952:54). It must have been a happy day after four wet, wintry months in the tent. By the later 1660s the earthen Fort had been replaced with the stonewalled Castle.

As a historical archaeologist my particular field of interest is the material culture of the Cape settlement from its founding until the liquidation of the VOC (Dutch East India Company) was set in motion in 1795. The main focus of my research is the unique form of rural architecture that is traditionally referred to as “Cape Dutch”.

The interest in Cape Dutch architecture can be said to have begun in 1900 when Alice Fayne Trotter’s Old colonial houses of the Cape of Good Hope was published with an Introduction by Herbert Baker, to whom the first use of the term is attributed. Numerous works have since appeared, for example De Bosdari (1953), Biermann (1955), Pearse (1959), Van der Meulen (1962), Trefois (1968). All of these contribute to our knowledge of Cape colonial architecture, but I want to single out the three works that I have found most useful. First, Walton’s Homesteads and Villages of South Africa (1965), because by focusing on the humblest of Cape dwellings rather than the grand mansions Walton was able to propose a hypothesis for the development of the Cape Dutch house. Second, Fransen and Cook’s The old buildings of the Cape (1980) in which the authors recorded as
many of the extant buildings as they could find in order to save them for posterity on paper if not on the ground. What is more, Fransen and Cook populated the houses with owners, so that the dwellings no longer appear as isolated entities that have little to do with human habitation. We are reminded that the history of houses is actually the history of people. Third, Obholzer, Baraitser and Malherbe’s *The Cape house and its interior* (1985) offers a twofold contribution by comparing early Cape houses with those in other Dutch colonies; and by taking into account the social framework within which the architecture developed. The latter focus, especially, is of crucial importance for historical archaeologists. In many earlier works emphasis fell sharply on the gables, which have been classified and reclassified several times. At the same time a whole variety of “origins” for the Cape gable have been suggested.

James Deetz, who is considered to be the founder of historical archaeology as a sub-discipline, has defined archaeology as “the study of past peoples based on the things they left behind and the ways they left their imprint on the world” (Deetz 1977:7). Deetz’s method of studying the past was based on a form of linguistic theory known as structuralism. Structuralists believe that all forms of cultural expression are governed by cognitive rules akin to the grammatical rules of languages and their aim is to uncover the rules that generate cultural forms within the communities they study (Johnson 1999). Because adherence to rules results in patterning, pattern recognition and description form an important part of structuralist research strategies. According to Johnson the questions structuralists will ask are: “What are the underlying rules governing this structure? And what do those rules tell us about the way this culture sees the world?” (Johnson 1999:92).

While structuralism has by no means been thrown out of the window in archaeology, we have moved on from pattern recognition and description in order to satisfy a desire to make sense of, or to find meanings in, the material culture of the past. Structuralism falls short in this regard as it is unable to explain why certain patterns were chosen rather than others, or why patterns changed through time. Furthermore, structuralism does not concern itself with meaning at a fundamental level.

In order to deal with the more complex questions archaeologists of the nineties and the new millennium ask of their data, a growing group of researchers who refer to their work as “interpretive archaeology” (Hodder *et al.* 1995) resort to a body of theory known as “post-structuralism”. This includes hermeneutics, or interpretation theory, which explains the ways in
which human beings interpret the things they encounter in their worlds. The aim of interpretive archaeology is to gain a deeper understanding of the meaning of material cultural objects for the people who created and used them, and of the social practices in which meaning was embedded. Although much of hermeneutic theory deals with the interpretation of literary works, it has also proved useful for interpreting writing in general (including historical writing), works of art, social action, ethnographic information, and so forth.

In endeavouring to make sense of Cape architecture, I share the architect’s interest in built structures, but I am less intrigued by detail of design than by what the building meant for its owners. At present I am not terribly interested in the intricacies of gable classification and description, in whether a gable is holbol or bolbol, in whether it originated in Eastern Europe or Amsterdam. Rather I want to know who built Cape gables in the first place; why excessive gableing was so important; and what kind of social advantage gables achieved for the owners. I see buildings in relation to people, their actions, their society, and the discourses in vogue at the time they were built. This is, perhaps, a rather different way of looking at Cape architecture to that of most architects.

The aim of the rest of this paper is to discuss some of the questions my research has raised about Cape colonial architecture and to explain how I have tried to discover something of the social meaning of the Cape rural dwelling and the voorhuis in particular (Brink 1992). In pursuit of evidence for finding out what people were doing in the past archaeologists use a variety of data. For historical archaeologists this includes written texts and documents. In my own work I have extended the use of writing to include all manifestations of language: speech, rhetoric, written texts, discourses of all kinds – even the coming into being of the Afrikaans language itself.

**Research questions**

James Deetz has argued that when colonists move into a new territory they build their dwellings in the style of those in the homeland. I needed to find out whether this happened at the Cape, and if so, when and how homeland architecture changed. Walton (1965) suggests that the traditional style was firmly established at least by the beginning of the eighteenth century. He believes that the earliest Cape house was a one-roomed structure with a
hearth at one end. It was later divided into two, first by a curtain and then by a wall. Next came separation of the kitchen from the living area, and finally the building on of an extra room or *buitekamer* with its own exit. For Walton, all of these homes were rectangular structures, what we in historical archaeology, rightly or wrongly, call longhouses. All were transverse dwellings (that is, the long side formed the façade) and none had a *voorhuis*. Sometimes, but not always, the kitchen was at one end.

For Walton, all of these homes were rectangular structures, what we in historical archaeology, rightly or wrongly, call longhouses. All were transverse dwellings (that is, the long side formed the façade) and none had a *voorhuis*. Sometimes, but not always, the kitchen was at one end.

Walton sees the beginning of the eighteenth century as bringing changes in Cape architecture, which he ascribes to free burgher prosperity. The first step was the removal of the kitchen from the main rectangular block to a point at the rear of the house, giving a T-shaped plan. Such a house had an entrance hall or *voorhuis*, flanked by a bedroom on each side and with a doorway leading to a kitchen at the rear (Walton 1965:7). This development was confirmed during excavations at the site of Paradise in the Newlands Forest where evidence for several building phases was unearthed (Hall *et al.* 1983). It was also revealed, however, that alterations yielding the T-shape occurred considerably later than suggested by Walton. Was the beginning of the eighteenth century too early for the formal T-plan?
Further research was called for to answer this question, and also to check whether Walton’s belief was correct, that the earliest Cape dwellings were rectangular transverse houses to which extensions could easily be added behind the façade, as this notion leaves no space for Deetz’s observation about homeland architecture. Since research on probate inventories had highlighted the value of these documents for informing us about interiors of dwellings (Woodward, 1982, 1983; Malan, 1986, 1990), I decided to see for myself whether inventories could also shed light on early floor plans.

In summary, what I found (Brink 1990, 1992) was that although many dwellings of the first three decades of the eighteenth century confirm Walton’s claims in that they appear to be three to four roomed houses with no voorhuis, far too many cannot be squeezed into this pattern. Unlike Walton’s earliest types, many dwellings did indeed have a voorhuis, but this internal space was not placed between two other front rooms. Instead it had only one other room either to the right or to the left. This speaks very strongly of a Dutch urban floor plan, that is, a longitudinal house with its narrow end to the street and rooms arranged one behind the other – the
type of house, in other words, that cannot easily be converted to a traditional Cape house. A third observation was that only from about the late 1730s on do we find significant numbers of dwellings that are most likely symmetrical transverse structures with a central *voorhuis* and a kitchen at the rear – the T-plan, in other words.

![Dutch plan: voorhuis (1) sijkamer (2) binnenhaard (3) (Sadiq Toffa).](image)

What this means is that at first Cape colonists did indeed build houses with a narrow, asymmetrical façade like the town houses in the Netherlands – as they did in other colonies. Interestingly, Obholzer *et al.* (1985) illustrate a colonial house in Batavia that can be matched to a Cape inventory of the Dutch urban type in all its essential features. It also means that from early on, and increasingly through the century, longitudinal Dutch urban dwellings were turned through ninety degrees to become transverse houses with their long ends to the street and rooms adjacent to one another. It is from these that the traditional Cape plans could develop (Brink 1990, 1992). Hall (1991) calls the rectangular longhouse the “core form” of the Cape house.
From roughly the 1740s onwards the T-plan was further developed by lengthening the back extension. Interestingly as the T-house grew larger, rear extensions followed a longitudinal pattern with rooms such as the *galdery / agterkamer* and kitchen arranged longitudinally one behind the other. So the Cape T-plan appears to be an innovative combination of Dutch and Cape building principles. When the T was extended to the H, the kitchen frequently shifted to the side. Dynamics rather than stasis is thus a feature of Cape colonial architecture. Part of the dynamics was undoubtedly the provision of ever more potential space for ornate gables: three on the rectangular house; four on the T; and no less than six on the H.

*Extended T plan: voorhuis (1) galdery (5) kitchen (3) (Sadiq Toffa).*
The question is, why was all of this grandification, especially heavy gableing, going on in the built environment of the Cape when gables in themselves add nothing by way of extra dwelling space? Why was it only happening at the Cape and not in other colonies? What did the owners hope to achieve by developing their farmsteads in this particular way?

In endeavouring to answer these questions I do not look at the dwellings individually, although I do on occasion isolate examples to examine something in more detail or to illustrate a point. However, the architecture is always examined within the social and historical context of its production.

My first task was to devise ways of integrating studies of form, from which descriptions of the floor plans emerge, and hermeneutic studies, which enable interpretation of the architecture. I found that looking upon the architecture as a body of works, a chunk of creative production, enabled such integration. Again, this way of looking is rather different to that of most architects. But then, architects design buildings. I design models for understanding material culture production.

**Settler society at the Cape**

In order to understand Cape colonial material culture we need to understand a great deal about Cape colonial society. A crucial point is that under the VOC Cape society was extremely hierarchical. Social stratification was already firmly embedded in the world-view of the Netherlands. It was anchored in the master narratives of the time (art, architecture, literature, and so on) and sublimated through the religious dogma of the Reformed Church. According to these beliefs, it was not blind fate that had chosen the rich and given them the power to rule. Rather, possessions and power were distributed by Divine Providence. Divisions between rich and poor were heavily stressed in European literature. Based on written sources of the time, Van Deursen says that the underclass (labourers, servants, the poor, the unemployed) were described as “vile and inferior people” and distinguished from the upper echelons (lords or regents, wealthy merchants, landowners), who were designated “people of quality” or “people fit to govern” (Van Deursen 1991:157).

Status differences were also visibly manifested in the art of the time, where the rich are depicted as neat, clean, well behaved and dignified, and the poor as ragged, dirty, dull and ugly. Stereotypical imaging of both the wealthy and the peasant included more than physical appearance only.
Regent families were often painted close to their solidly built mansions, standing solemnly together in upright and orderly fashion, their stark, black clothing offset by immaculate, white, heavily starched collars. Peasants, on the other hand, are depicted as lolling about drunkenly and in tatters outside decrepit wooden hovels, often in close proximity to farm animals. Interiors of the wealthy are characterised by large spaces containing solid furniture and costly ornaments, while the underclass huddle together in cramped, untidy and poorly furnished quarters. The contrasting imagery is extended to include demeanour: the wealthy stand tall and proud; peasants crouch, stoop, lean and squat.

Directors of the VOC chamber of Hoorn, J. de Baen 1682

It is interesting to note the role played by material culture as indicators of the “quality” of people. Pennington (1970:79) says that “it was costume, retinue and manner that made apparent a man’s (sic) degree” and assured him of the respect – or lack of it – that was his due. Sumptuary
laws were passed to ensure that people did not try to rise above their station by dressing too ostentatiously or using status objects such as parasols injudiciously. Each person thus had a fixed place in society. At the Cape a list by rank was drawn up in 1713 and updated in 1755. Beginning with the Governor-General of Netherlands-India at the top, it ranged all the way down to the lowly third mate on VOC ships.

Nothing, however, marked a person’s social standing as clearly as land – especially rural farmland. Substantial land ownership was exclusively associated with high status and social prestige: “No source of prestige could compare with the possession of land. Even the mighty Dutch townsman tended increasingly to acquire country estates when they reached the peak of success” (Pennington 1970:79).

People were thus marked and graded according to “quality” and treated accordingly in all walks of life. A real problem for the VOC was how to transport the established European world-view to the Cape in order to maintain order and control over underclass people and their activities. Quoting a contemporary source, which describes the characteristics of the type of person who enlisted with the Company, Van Deursen informs us that, “the worst reputation attached to sailors, soldiers and men of the great companies”. Such people were categorised as “rough mates” and “coarse companions”, known for their “unruliness, disobedience, recklessness and violence” (Van Deursen 1991:25).

I believe that clues to the way in which the VOC dealt with the problem can be found in a document, the Oath of Allegiance to the VOC, which all employees were made to swear before embarkation at Amsterdam. Analysis of the Oath shows it to be an identity-structuring document, which, through a series of rhetorical promises, ensured that those who swore were gathered together and through the process of swearing divided into High and Low. In taking the Oath underclass employees admitted that they were low status people and promised to remain forever in the position of inferior, obedient servants of the Company. Further analysis of VOC texts shows that the commitments made in the Oath were reinforced in a multitude of official documents. The Oath thus serves as a founding document in what I see as whole discourse of VOC oppression and domination. Through this discourse, issues of stratification and identity also became issues of language.

Tensions between officials and colonists, present from the beginning of the settlement, were heightened when certain employees were contracted out of Company service and given land on which they could farm independently. This intentional act on the part of the VOC was to have far reaching unintended consequences and led, inter alia, to the coming into being of Cape material culture.

Free burgher farms were larger than even the largest country estates in Europe. So when the burghers received land, their perceptions of themselves as the Low within Cape society changed. To them the mere fact of their having become landowners made them worthy of high status. They had, after all, achieved what Pennington’s (1979) “mighty Dutch townsman” had achieved in the Netherlands. In the eyes of the VOC, however, they remained nothing more than underclass peasants. Increasing conflict between VOC and burghers is thus tightly bound to issues of land,
status and personal identity and the institution of free burghership marked the beginning of a power struggle that was to continue until the end of Company rule.

Literacy – eloquence, writing, mastery of the word, language in all its forms and aspects – was an important factor in the ensuing power struggle. Most of the free burghers were at best semi-literate. Many could not even sign their names. Aware that language is a tool for violence and oppression, the VOC reserved a strict monopoly over the word for themselves. Free burgher writing, except for official business, was forbidden and severely punished when it occurred, for example in the case of Adam Tas and his cohorts. Long before Tas’s time, a free burgher rebellion and a petition to Jan van Riebeeck were summarily squashed and “the writers” blamed for the burghers’s misbehaviour and ingratitude towards the Company (Thom 1954:394).

Clearly, overt action such as rebellion and petitioning as a form of resistance to VOC oppression was not going to work. Forbidden to be “writing subjects”, the burghers had to find other ways of registering their discontent. I argue that land offered the free burghers a space for inscription from which they could begin to converse with the VOC. Their grants clearly stated that they could erect structures on their farms and I believe they snatched at this opportunity to make statements about their identity and status. They became “building subjects” (Brink 1992).

**Discovering meaning**

Gradually through the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries free burgher houses changed with a dramatic shift towards the Cape vernacular style around mid-century. Looking at Cape architecture as a body of works or creative production allows one to envisage it as having a major role to play in the development of a symbolic, emancipatory, counter-discourse of resistance, which could begin to nibble away at the all-pervading power of the VOC. The little peasant longhouse nestling against a hillside and melting in with its surroundings was enlarged, symmetrified, placed on a platform to be visible from afar, and given a perimeter wall of little value for keeping out marauders, but providing space for an impressive gateway. Beyond the gateway an avenue led to a stoep with its own decorative features, an imposing front door, and eventually to the voorhuis situated immediately beneath the main gable.
I see the Cape farm complexes, which came to dominate the rural landscape as the century wore on, as being structured within what I refer to as a “discourse of dwelling” (Brink 1992) which had the communicative potential to interrupt and undermine the VOC discourse of domination and to weaken its power. The free burgher plaats or place became a locus of tension where renegotiation of status could be discursively played out. The carefully contrived farmscapes of leading free burghers served as bases from which messages could be sent to all in Cape society contradicting the values embedded in the Oath. The solid, thick walled Cape country manor house with its towering gables proclaimed its owner a member of a landed elite instead of a mere obedient servant of the VOC. It demonstrated the working of a metaphor entrenched in an old Dutch proverb: *Toon mij uw huis en ik zal zeggen wie u bent* (Show me your house and I will tell you who you are) (Schuurman 1989). The owner of a Cape country estate almost thrust his house at all who passed that way so that the passer-by could not be left in doubt as to who he was. The gable lifted the little peasant longhouse out of hiding, turning mere house into mansion. As it raised the dwelling to a more noble status, the status of its owner was raised along with it.

But how, in the practice of everyday life, could a country mansion work its magic of a silent language? Explaining how people interpret things – material culture, literature, art, architecture, human action, whatever – involves a great deal of theory. I shall do my best to avoid this as far as possible, but it is difficult to avoid it entirely.

First of all we need to realise that creators of “works” of whatever nature (art, literature, buildings) can never be sure that interpreters of their work will arrive at the meaning they, as creators, intended. People interpret pretty much in their own way according to their own skills, background, education, and so on. The creative person, whether author, painter, architect, film-maker, photographer, or whatever, is thus very much at the mercy of those who engage with her or his work. In interpretation theory this concept is encapsulated in the phrase “the death of the author” (Barthes 1988), that is, the author and his or her meaning are absent from, or dead to, the work. However, I have argued (Brink 1992) that creators can and frequently do attempt to counteract this lack of control over meaning by quite simple social action of some kind, frequently involving face-to-face encounters. An interview with a journalist about the work is one example. A lecture explaining the work is another.
As creators of their dwellings, the free burgher farmers did not escape the “death of the author” dilemma. How could they, then, be sure that their intended messages were being transmitted? I have suggested how this was done, but without maintaining that mine is the only possible answer to the question (Brink 1992). I offer it as one way – and, I think, a plausible way – of interpreting eighteenth century Cape rural architecture.

Analysing the concept of the hospitality for which the early Cape colony was renowned offers us a way of gaining insight into the meaning of the architecture. Cape hospitality is usually explained in terms of the isolated lives people led on their farms, their eagerness for news of the outside world, their plain and simple kindheartedness, and so on. While there is certainly a measure of truth in all of these explanations, we should not let them blind us to the hidden dimensions of hospitality. It is the hidden dimensions on which I focus here.

The free burghers needed visitors, first to act as interpreters of their works – receivers of the messages the buildings were communicating. Second, to give the owners the opportunity of meeting people in face-to-face encounters during which “incorrect” interpretations of the free burgher world could perhaps be adjusted. Third, to act as informal reporters of what the free burgher world was about in a land without news media. I see visiting as playing an important social role at the Cape to the extent that it became an essential strategy in the free burgher discourse of dwelling as it sought to contradict and reformulate the oppressive VOC discourse.

What I am saying with all of this is that the rural country mansion had acquired symbolic meanings. Anthropologists have established that two conditions are essential for an artefact to be effective as a symbol: it must be visible; and it must be striking enough to somehow cause viewers to stop in their tracks, to be arrested, or made to pause, in order to ponder the meaning of the object. The design of the Cape country dwelling fulfills these conditions. In contrast to the peasant longhouse, the Cape house on its platform stood out against the skyline. With its tall gables, its ringmuur and its orderly arrangement of outbuildings, all emphasised with white paint, it was highly visible from some distance away and made a decisive impact on the natural landscape.

That visibility was consciously striven for is clear from a letter written by Hendrik Cloete to Hendrik Swellengrebel Jr. in 1780, shortly after Cloete had purchased Constantia. Describing changes he had already wrought, Cloete says: “All the oaks and chestnuts which grow in profusion
here have been pruned, so that the farm, which otherwise had not been visible when one rode towards it, can now be seen from very far away” (Schutte 1982:111). [I have used my own translation of the original as Boeseken’s condensed English summary does not do full justice to the importance of the farm’s visibility from a distance].

The Cape opstal also fulfills the second condition in that it provided visitors with an exceptionally striking image – striking enough to have made them stop in their tracks and contemplate the vista before them, even had the gateway not acted as a physical barrier.

However, there are also requirements for beholders of works, who must actively participate in their interpreting role. A certain social knowledge and skill in applying this knowledge is necessary among beholders. Art historian Baxandall explains that some of the mental equipment with which people order their experience is picked up from daily living within their social milieu. Writing of fifteenth century Italian religious paintings, he says they acted as visual invitations to reflection on the truth of Christianity: “Faced with an arresting image of the Annunciation … or the Passion, the beholder was to complete it by reflecting on the event as he knew it and on his personal relation to the mysteries it recorded” (quoted by Geertz 1983:104, emphasis added).

What Baxandall is saying is that when people interpret a work according to their own cultural knowledge they make, as it were, the world of the work their own by putting something of themselves back into the work. They interact with it, so that the work begins to stand in a relationship to their own personal world.

Considering the longstanding Dutch association of property and manorial dwellings with high status, colonists at the Cape would have been well equipped with the cultural knowledge and skill for evaluating a dwelling. From the moment visitors arrived at the gate of a Cape farm complex, this “work” would have taken hold of their senses, thoughts and emotions as they were made to gaze upon the full vista of the symmetrical, gabled façade at the end of a tree-lined carriageway. The impact of this image called into play their socially acquired skills of evaluation. Beholders had time to think the house in words, to create their own fiction about the place, to discover the “truth” of the house, and to wonder about the world this “work” was opening up.

The tale these farm complexes told about their owners differed vastly from the ragged, dirty, dull and ugly version in European master narratives.
Symmetry, extensive gableing and other ornate features such as embellished front doors, scrolling and decorative plasterwork told how the ragged could put on grand new clothes. The large expanse of white paint against black thatch spoke of cleanliness. Reflection of sunlight off many-paned windows added a gloss to the dull. The Cape dwelling showed how the ugly could be transformed into the beautiful by the artful use of material things.

By forcing visitors to pause, the ringmuur and its gateway thus induced reflection, evaluation, critique – an interpretive process which hermeneuticist Paul Ricoeur (1982a) calls “distanciation”. Distanciation continued during a second pause at the front door. Like gateways, front doors were important in free burgher architecture and were often embellished with decorative carving and metalwork – things to admire, to reflect upon and criticise. There was a final pause inside the house, in the voorhuis. Here visitors could complete their own story of the house before meeting the owner face-to-face.

*The approach to Schoongezicht in Jonkershoek (Lanzerac), Stellenbosch (reconstruction by Willem Malherbe, see Obholzer et al. 1989, p.35).*
It is through the individual fiction beholders themselves create that they appropriate a work, making what was at first strange to them their own, that is, part of their own world of experience, to use Ricoeur’s terminology once more.

People might think this is pure speculation or idle philosophising rather than argument. But psychologists such as Peter Martin (1978) have studied the ways people experience phenomena empirically and confirmed their findings by means of practical experiments. This enables one to ground one’s proposals in reality rather than grabbing them out of the air.

According to Martin, experiencing phenomena happens in four main ways and it can all happen within the space of a few seconds. First, people perceive the facts. Second, they think about them, consider them carefully, piece the data together logically. Third, they develop feelings about their observations, make value judgments, adopt viewpoints. Finally, they look beyond the facts to certain possibilities which might be true or untrue, possible or impossible.

If we transpose the four stages of the experiencing process onto the situation under discussion here, I suggest that the process began when visitors paused at the gateway and continued until they were joined by the owner in the voorhuis.

It is possible to use one’s archaeological imagination to elaborate a little on Martin’s four ways of experiencing. He says: “Perceiving the facts means doing just that and no more: registering what is there and what is not” (Martin 1978:21). So visitors in the voorhuis would note the furniture, the objects enshrined behind glass cupboard doors, the screen blocking the voorhuis off from the less formal depths of the house, the orderly symmetry of the room, and so forth. They might also note what is missing.

The basic facts will then be thought about. Logic will make visitors classify, analyse, synthesise, trace the reason for this and the cause of that. The oriental porcelain on top of a kast probably means that the kast itself, into which you cannot see, contains costly goods. The owner must be a man of means.

Next, feelings about these material cultural objects come into play. Visitors adopt views and make value judgments in which worth becomes more important than logic. Decisions are made about what is liked and what is not liked, what is good and what is bad. Visitors might begin to feel that it must be good to own a farm and live in such a well-ordered
The owner must be an orderly, capable person. It must be good to be a free burgher farmer.

Finally they will look beyond the facts to certain likely or unlikely possibilities. They might fantasize, seeing themselves in a role similar to that of the owner. They might even become a little like the owner. As Martin (1978:21-23) says, looking beyond the facts is like pondering the imponderable, projecting the self into an imaginary situation in a possible future. This, I believe, is how Ricoeur’s theoretical concept of “appropriation” works in practice: “What I appropriate is a proposed world, the world of the [work] into which I can project one of my ownmost possibilities” (Ricoeur 1982b:142). For Ricoeur, works should not be thought of only in terms of specific and detailed meanings. Rather, they “open up a world” which the reader or beholder can accept unto her-/himself. This acceptance is appropriation, which follows the interpretive activity of “distanciation”. The latter, as we have seen, involves pausing, standing back to scan, criticise and evaluate.

Carolyn Woodward (1983) has described the voorhuis as resembling a doctor’s waiting room. Its use must have changed through time and would have been different when only the kitchen was immediately behind it, but its precise function has remained uncertain. Nevertheless, as a waiting room in the fully developed T- or H-house, I see it as a room of carefully contrived displays and I argue that its purpose was largely discursive and symbolic. It served as the space where appropriation could be fulfilled, where visitors could reflectively address the material cultural objects in terms of their European background and their experience in Cape society and, as Martin (1978) has stated, it could be accomplished in no more than a few minutes.

The material contents of the room gave visitors a good conceptual hold on what the world of the free burgher farmer was about, and the fiction created by visitors crystalised around these objects and the people who owned and displayed them: people who live such a life must be moneyed people, capable people. They are people who control the land by making it work for them. They also control other people, since they make them work for them too. Freeburghers are therefore not “vile and inferior” but as close to being “people of quality” as many VOC officials and it is not reasonable that they should be labeled as inferior by the Company.

The voorhuis was the place for shiny bright objects and their setting behind glass enhanced their value. Many cabinets were gabled like the
house and carved like the front door. Polished wood, porcelain, glass, brass, and silver in larger houses, created an impression of wealth, order and cleanliness. Mirrors, favoured objects in the voorhuis, doubled it all, made the brightness seem brighter, enhanced, not only the importance of the artefacts, but the gloss and gleam as well. Cleanliness was an important factor in the discourse of dwelling. A clean, glossy display contradicted the oppressive VOC discourse in which time and again connotations of dirt were attached to the person of the free burgher farmer to accentuate his low status and otherness. This was particularly insulting, because as a nation the Dutch were renowned for their cleanliness (Schama 1991). Being clean thus meant being Dutch, civilised and of high status.

A grandfather clock often stood in the voorhuis where it told its own story as well as the time. It spoke of an owner who appreciated the value of time. The ability to organise and regulate his own time made him fit to command simpler people and to regulate their time in simpler fashion, summoning them to work, to rest, to eat by the ringing of a bell at the appropriate hours. The slave bell, of course, is a regular feature of the Cape farm complex.

**Conclusion**

In modern hermeneutic theory it is commonly accepted that meaning does not reside with the author; nor is it somehow encapsulated for all time within the work itself. Rather, it is readers or viewers who generate meaning in the works with which they become engaged and I have tried to give some idea of how visitors to an eighteenth century Cape farm could have generated meanings during the process of visiting. Repeated visits would have consolidated such meanings and it was important that visiting occurred frequently in order for such possible meanings to become embedded within the matrix of meanings in eighteenth century Cape social life. As people met and mingled in the course of everyday life it was inevitable that visits to farms and the significance of the opstallen and their owners would enter the discussions. Views about the free burgher way of life thus became common knowledge.

An impressive voorhuis appears to have been a necessary backdrop against which this kind of social activity could occur. While it is probably correct, then, to say that the voorhuis resembled a waiting room it was also more than simply that. It was the primary space where visitors absorbed
the meanings, not only of the dwelling itself, but also of the whole free burgher way of life.

Visitors to these old Cape farms today continue to generate meanings when they wander through the rooms. Perhaps this article will encourage readers to look at Cape rural architecture a little differently as they interact with the buildings during future visits. Although it is impossible to really get into the minds of long-dead people, I believe it is important to at least wonder about the ways in which the houses worked for their eighteenth century owners, who, after all, left an imprint on our world – an imprint so significant that we can still enjoyably engage with these “things” they left behind.
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The South African Orphan House
Lost but not forgotten

David van den Heever

The Orphan House was established by a benevolent widow, Mrs M.A. Möller (1743–1815), who pledged 2000 guilders over a period between 1808 and 1811. Her stated intention for the orphanage was to “take charge of fatherless and motherless children of both sexes without any exception, they being left by parents who have possessed the protestant Religion; to provide them with food and clothes, enable them to enjoy a moral and Christian education and finally make them industrious and useful members of Civil Society”. While the religious convictions of the parents were the qualifying consideration, race or colour was of no significance.

Watercolour of Orphan House (SA College) by H.C. de Meillon (William Fehr C96).
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The building was opened in 1815 and was of considerable architectural importance, being attributed to L.M. Thibault, South Africa’s first “professional” architect, who was very prominent at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. It was also historically significant as the first home of the South African College, the future University of Cape Town. Unfortunately, today nothing remains of this very interesting and little known building, although only 20 years ago significant sections were still clearly visible. Efforts to save these remains and an attempted bid at reconstruction of the building, finally failed in 1981.

Orphan House (Weeshuis School) shown on Walter Thom’s survey (1898), Long Street on left.
The address of the Orphan House was 238 Long Street, Cape Town, occupying a block bounded by Orphan Street, Orphan Lane and Loop Street. It is marked 19 on George Thompson’s “Plan of Cape Town and its Environs”, at the southernmost end of Long Street (see centerfold). The site, granted as a gift in 1808 by Governor George Yonge, was intended for an asylum for widows and old women. It appears as though foundations were immediately cast for a new building, with no idea of what the final form of this building would be. It took a good deal of negotiating by Mrs Möller to have the site made available for the Orphan House, as its original title condition had reserved its use solely for the asylum.

Plan of Orphan House (David van den Heever).
The strange plan form of the completed Orphan House can probably be attributed to the fact that it was built directly on top of the foundations already cast for the proposed asylum. In turn, the asylum plan was reputedly based on that of the original Seamen’s Hospital in Wale Street, Cape Town.

The main feature of the plan is the large cruciform shaped central room extending the full length of the building. This room, ±35m long, 6m wide and 8m high, must have been functionally very awkward, and used possibly for communal activities such as dining or recreation. It was lit by a series of clerestorey lights.

The comparison of the façade of the Old Supreme Court in Adderley Street, Cape Town, the documented work of L.M. Thibault, with that of the Orphan House is interesting. There are striking similarities. The Old Supreme Court had originally been a slave lodge and was converted into a court and government offices by Thibault from 1809 to 1814. Ronald Lewcock in his work *Early Nineteenth Century Architecture in South Africa* observes:

The elevation of the Orphan House showed some points of similarity with the rest of Thibault’s work of this period. There was the same horizontal grooving of the plasterwork of the wings, and, more significant, their horizontal form was contrasted with a tendency to vertical movement in the central bay. The latter was terminated at the top by a semicircular pediment, a similar composition on a smaller scale to that of the main façade of the Old Supreme Court, which was finished at about the same time. A delightful touch was added to the façade by the coupling of the pilasters between the windows, and a slightly more perverse one by the addition of guttae to add a stronger modulation to the cornice over the columns. In this, as in the whole treatment of the Classical Order, the building was more subtly and successfully handled than the Supreme Court façade. The design of the entrance is however, a disappointment; its pediment was oversimplified and given inadequate visual support. Instead of a decorative fanlight, a rather bizarre circular clerestory light with a cartwheel pattern was inserted high in the wall above the entrance (Lewcock 1963:70).
In comparing the two buildings there seems little doubt that Thibault had a hand in the design of the Orphan House.
In 1828 the first moves were made towards the establishment of the South African College (Zuid-Afrikaansch Athenaeum). At a meeting on 14 October of that year, chaired by the Chief Justice of the Cape Colony, Sir John Truter, a committee was formed to investigate the possibility of establishing a college of higher learning. After negotiations with the Orphan House Committee, the South African College was granted use of the front rooms of the building. Certain minor alterations were required, including a partition across the long central space, to provide space for the new college. On 1 October 1829, the new South African College was officially opened in the Orphan House.

The Contractor for the alteration work was Herman Schutte, prominent at the Cape and a contemporary of Thibault. Schutte himself was a trained architect, drew the plans and quoted 1850 Ryksdalers for the work.

The South African College, after several years of wrangling over rentals, moved out in 1841 to occupy their own first building, the Egyptian Building in the Gardens.

Later photographs of Orphan House show the addition of an arched entrance over the street gate.

*Orphan House (Lewcock 1963, p.70).*
In 1923 the South African Orphan House was sold to the Bechuanaland Dairies for £4,500.00. From that time on, the building was altered on a regular basis to suit the changing needs of the dairy. Eventually it was totally unrecognizable, the whole front having been replaced with a golden brown facebrick addition and the rear portions totally changed with only sections of the original walling visible.
In 1978, Architect John Rennie, during his survey for the Buildings of Central Cape Town (a CPIA publication), identified sections of the Orphan House still surviving, hidden in and around a motor body repair workshop. This discovery inspired me personally to investigate the history of the building further.

At that time, the City Council proposed widening the intersection on the corner of Loop Street and Buitensingel. As compensation for land lost in the widening, the Council proposed handing a portion of the original Orphan House site to the Lutheran Church. The Council had expropriated the whole of the Orphan House site shortly before in order to carry out the road widening scheme. I saw this as an opportunity for closing Orphan Street completely between Long and Loop Streets, in order to consolidate the Church and Orphan House sites, which could have provided the impetus for an integrated development. This development would have included some attempt at reconstruction of the Orphan House, even if only the façade. In the early 1980s, façadism was more acceptable than it is now.

Discussions were held with both the City council and the Lutheran Church and the latter showed great interest in constructing a Sunday School facility on the Orphan House site. They were quite open to the idea of a reconstruction of the Orphan House whether in whole or in part. The City Council was interested and encouraging, but in the end felt that the few remains of the Orphan House did not justify preservation.

In November 1981 all the buildings on the site were demolished and this act put an abrupt end to a dream and a vision of what might have been. The Lutheran church acquired the vacant site, including the closed section of Orphan Street, and constructed a new Sunday School complex, without any references to the Orphan House.

The Elliot photograph, which captures the very essence of the Orphan House in its heyday, shows two little orphan girls playing with their dolls in the care of the “huisvader”, intently reading his newspaper. It is winter and the bare branches of two large oak trees contrast with the finely worked façade of the Orphan House. This touching scene of humanity in a beautiful urban setting is now all lost, but fortunately to some not forgotten.
Orphan House photographed by Elliott in the early 20th century.
LOUIS-MICHEL THIBAULT

Born in 1750 in Picardië, France, he studied at the world-renowned Royal Academy of Architecture in Paris, where he was the best student in his class. The Director of the Academy was Jacques Ange Gabriel, builder of the Petit Trianon in Versailles. Thibault arrived at the Cape in 1703 with the Regiment de Meuron, part of a group of French mercenaries. He was appointed Inspector of Government and Military Buildings and served the British authorities after the First and Second Occupations of the Cape, i.e. 1795 and 1806, as well as the short lived Batavian Republic in the intervening years. He died in 1815 at the Cape. Thibault’s best known works include the Lodge de Goede Hoop, Tulbagh Drostdy, the façade of Koopmans de Wet House, Papenboom at Newlands, and Saasveld on Kloof Street.

HERMAN SCHUTTE

Born in Bremen Germany in 1761, he came to the Cape as a soldier in 1790. After release from service he worked as an architect and contractor. He was appointed as Inspector of Town Buildings and built many early lighthouses. His best known works include the Groote Kerk, Cape Town, 1836 and the Mouille Point lighthouse. He also co-operated with Thibault on parts of the Castle and the Goede Hoop Lodge. He died in 1844.
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George Thompson’s residence and business premises in Long Street, Cape Town, circa 1825

Antonia Malan

Many of us are familiar with the street map of Cape Town drawn by George Thompson (see centrefold). Thompson prepared a “Plan of Cape Town and its Environs” to mark the main places of interest to illustrate his *Travels & Adventures in Southern Africa* (first published in 1827, republished 1968). What we seldom notice are the two vignettes in the top corners – one is a fanciful view of Table Mountain, flanked by Devil’s Peak and Lion’s Head and Rump, and the other a “house in Long Street”. The house drawn in the top right-hand corner of the Plan is the building that was once on lot 1 of Block O, at first number 58, then renumbered 88, and now numbers 68 and 64 Long Street, Cape Town. The property is presently occupied by Shaps Cameraland and the lobby of Park on Long. This is the story of how the connection was made between the house on the map and its location on the ground.

In 1997 Tim Hart and Dave Halkett of the Archaeology Contracts Office at the University of Cape Town were commissioned by J. Bruce Burmeister Associated Architects (on behalf of Vision Projects) to inspect and assess the probable impact of proposed developments on 64 Long Street (erven 2266 and 2267), in accordance with National Monuments Council regulations (ACO 1997; Burmeister 2000). At number 64 were the business premises of Bremridge Hall, locksmiths.

During their investigations Hart and Halkett discovered traces of eighteenth century fabric embedded in the depths of the much-altered building. There were remnants of a reed ceiling beneath a *brandsolder* (fire ceiling) at first floor level, and they recorded simple “flat” roof beams on the floor above. The non-flammable clay *brandsolder* above the reeds prevented burning thatch from setting fire to rooms below. Because of a series of fires (some set by unhappy slaves but mostly resulting from small accidents spread by our notorious winds), thatched roofs were discouraged
in central Cape Town and what became typical Cape townhouses were built with flat, tiled roofs behind low parapets. These architectural features, and their positions relative to the modern street level, indicated that at some time there had been a single storey thatched building, and then a double storey building on the site.

During subsequent alterations to the building a massive yellowwood beam was revealed in the brick wall that now forms the right-hand side of the new parking garage lobby. The beam lies at such a height as to suggest that it once supported a floor slightly above street level.

At the same time that Hart and Halkett were excavating walls and ceilings, Harriet Clift was digging in the archives and deeds office. Historically the site was situated on the Bergdwarsstraat side of Block O (bottom left-hand corner of Block O on Wentzel’s “Planen Caart van ‘t Vlek aan Caap” below). Clift began tracing the history of the property from when the first grants were made (in 1699 Lot 1 to Jacob Paaschens, 1700 Lot 2 to Pieter Lens and Lot 3 to Jan Corelizen Stuck and in 1701 Lot 4 to J. Pitius), to its consolidation in the 1960s. Among the owners in the early nineteenth century was the firm of Borrodaile, Thompson & Pillans.

**Wentzel’s plan of Cape Town, c1750 (North is top right).**
George Thompson (1796-1889) lived in Cape Town from 1818 to about 1859, and married Johanna Maria Dirkina Denys (c1805-1872). He came to the Colony as a clerk for Messrs William Borrodaile Sons & Ravenhill, becoming a partner and eventually head of the firm. In 1824 Charles Stuart Pillans joined the business, and Thomas Hall joined in 1851 after the death of Pillans and retirement of Borrodaile. Thompson was a founder member of the Commercial Exchange, promoted silk cultivation, had mining interests in Namaqualand, and was a director of the Cape of Good Hope Bank and member of the Railway & Dock Company. He was involved in the erection of the first Cathedral in Cape Town and, in conjunction with Admiral Trotter, instituted the Sailors’ Home. Unfortunately there is no fully authenticated portrait of Thompson, but Robert Moffat paid a warm tribute to “his kind and generous disposition” and remarked that “the natives described him as a man on whom the light of day might shine” (Thompson 1967:xvii, xxi-xxii).

While in Cape Town Thompson amassed a fortune, “which he lost later in life through speculation of others”. He was also an inveterate traveler, in 1821 managing to attend Napoleon’s funeral on St Helena, make a trip to the eastern Cape to check trade opportunities with the 1820 settlers, and then visit the wreck of the Grace at Agulhas, before returning to Cape Town via Swellendam and George. Over the next few years he made sorties to the Eastern Frontier, the Orange River, and to Tulbagh and its passes. His journeying provided the material for a book, probably ghost-written by Thomas Pringle, which “stands high in the distinguished series of account of the Cape Colony and of its far frontiers that illumines our knowledge of those distant days” (Thompson 1967:ix-x).

In 1822 Thompson and Launcelot Cooke purchased a house at 58 Long Street, paying half the price themselves with the balance coming from London partners. Number 58 was his residence and also his place of business as a partner in Borrodailes, Thompson & Pillans, until they moved to 2 Heerengracht in 1832 (Thompson 1967:x). The 1830 street directory lists the Thompsons, the business, and “Jamilla of the Cape, seamstress”, at what by then had become number 88 Long Street.

Quite by chance, when leafing through Thompson’s Travels, I discovered that he had written:

Of the general appearance and topography of Cape Town I have endeavoured to give the reader a competent idea in the plates and wood-engravings inserted in different parts of the work. […] The
The plan of Cape Town (engraved on stone) is from an actual survey, and gives a most correct notion of the localities of the town: - in one corner is a small vignette engraving, showing the appearance of the town in 1709, taken from a plate in Kolben’s work, and which forms an amusing contrast to its present appearance; - in another corner is a view of my residence and house of business, which gives a very good example of the respectable class of houses in Cape Town, with the exception of its being one story higher than usual (Thompson 1968:141[my italics]).

The drawing shows a five bay three-storey building with steps leading up to a railed stoep and the front door on the ground floor, and wooden doors lead to the cellars half below street level. There is a small triangular pediment over the central bay and two urns are perched on the outer corners of the cornice.

‘House in Long Street’, Thompson’s plan, 1827.
The discovery of a direct link between a historical drawing and physical evidence is exciting and important because little remains of this period of Cape Town’s architectural history. Remarkably, yet another and corroborative source of information about the house came to light during archival research. In 1832 Thompson’s property was bought by Robert Reeves, whose estate was declared insolvent the next year. The house and premises on the corner of Shortmarket Street and Long Street was sold by public auction to Thomas Tennant for the sum of £1305 on 12 December 1833 (Deeds Office MOIB 2/424, 1833). It was described as a “very spacious and commodious 3 storied dwelling house and premises”. The advertisement of sale further specified the building as having:

- ground floor - a passage; spacious hall; 4 rooms some of them very large;
- first floor - 2 very large rooms in front communicating with folding doors; 4 others with a hall and pantry;
- second floor - 7 rooms and 2 closets.

There were two “spacious cellars under the ground floor” and the “offices” consisted of a kitchen and a wine(?) cellar … (text obscured by binding). The advertisement mentions two staircases, a back entrance and two principal entrances. The “outer walls and roof were supported by teak timbers and have been water-tight for the last 12 years”.

It would seem as if the house had been partly divided, as the “partitions could be removed should the buyer require”, and the “internal decorations were partially impaired when part of the house was appropriated for business”. The property was “well adapted for either an hotel or lodging house, a house of business or as the residence of a large family”. It could also “suitably be divided into 2 good-sized dwelling houses”.

The corner property, lot 1 of Block O, was originally a single erf but the transfer deeds show that it was subdivided by Thomas Tennant in 1836, and in 1844 a small portion was cut off to build a coach-house for the occupants of lot 2 (see Snow (c1860) and Thom (c1898) Surveys).
Block O, Snow(c1860) and Thom(c1898) plans (Lot 1 circled).
We can deduce, then, that a series of typical Cape townhouses were built and rebuilt on Lot 1 through the eighteenth century before the site was split in two. First one and then two and finally three storeys high over half sunken cellars, by about 1825 the building had reached its maturity. The two different façades that are reflected today eventually emerged after the Thompson house was almost completely demolished and two new frontages were erected. The corner (erf 2267) was completely refashioned in about 1916 by John Isadore Silver (Silver’s Chambers, see Goad’s insurance plan of 1925) and still remains as Shaps Cameraland. It is not known if any old fabric remains.

*Silver’s Chambers and a gun shop on lot 1, 1925 (bottom left)*
*(detail from Goad’s insurance plan, National Library of South Africa).*

The remnants of Thompson’s house and previous dwellings on the erf next door (erf 2266) were almost completely remodeled and reduced to two floors in height. This structure is now reflected in the façade to the lobby of Park on Long. The story of Thompson’s house, however, is only memorialised in the form of a large beam in the lobby of Park on Long and the vignette on his plan of Cape Town.
Shaps Cameraland (Silver’s Chambers) and entrance to Park on Long in 1999
(Jean van der Mescht).
References


Acknowledgement

Sincere thanks are due to Mr Gerald Shap for supporting this research and making a significant contribution towards bringing Long Street back to life. Tim Hart and Dave Halkett (ACO) generously shared their research material and expertise.

Property History of Block O, lot 1

**Erf 2266 (subdivided in 1836 when half became erf 2267)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Transfer Deed</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1699/07/16, OCF1.298</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Paaschens, Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702/02/02, T148</td>
<td>Paaschens, J.</td>
<td>Vroom, Pieter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704/10/30, T13</td>
<td>Vroom, P.W.</td>
<td>Gerritz, Coert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720/09/05, T1344 p70</td>
<td>Gerritz, C., widow</td>
<td>Gardiol, Susanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729/10/26, T1920 p156</td>
<td>Gardiol, S., widow</td>
<td>Ackerman, Christiaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732/12/12,T2094 p148</td>
<td>Ackerman, C.</td>
<td>De Vries, Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746/06/04, T148</td>
<td>De Vries, I, widow</td>
<td>De Waal, Cornelis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758/02/16, T3323 p14</td>
<td>De Waal, C.</td>
<td>Berrange, Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802/01/08</td>
<td>Berrange, A.</td>
<td>Van Backstrom, Johannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811/03/08, T11</td>
<td>Van Backstrom, J.C.F.</td>
<td>Alexander Gray &amp; Holding &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont’d)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Transfer Deed</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1822/02/01, T75</td>
<td>Ranken &amp; Scott</td>
<td>Cook, Lancelot &amp; George Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827/09/07, T146</td>
<td>Thompson &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Borrodailes, Thompson &amp; Pillans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832/11/09, T96</td>
<td>Borrodailes, Thompson &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Reeves, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833/12/17, T471 p233</td>
<td>Reeves, R., deceased estate</td>
<td>Tennant, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836/03/22, T213 p345</td>
<td>Tennant, T.</td>
<td>Bailey, Samuel (Dr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844/08/30, T999 p187</td>
<td>Bailey, S., insolvent estate</td>
<td>Sandberg, Maria Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858/07/02, T25</td>
<td>Sandberg, M.E.</td>
<td>Sandberg, Anna Catharina Johanna (widow of B. Gie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877/03/16, T316</td>
<td>Sandberg, A.C.J., deceased estate</td>
<td>Stegman, Andrew Murray &amp; Anna Catharina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877/03/16, T317</td>
<td>Stegman, A.M. &amp; A.C.</td>
<td>Boyes, Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891/04/15, T1427</td>
<td>Boyes, A.</td>
<td>Boyes, Emma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899/06/20, T4744</td>
<td>Smith, E. (formerly Boyes)</td>
<td>Cohen, Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919/07/10, T1824</td>
<td>Cohen, A., insolvent estate</td>
<td>Silver, John Isadore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920/07/10, T9857</td>
<td>Silver, J.I.</td>
<td>SA Gun Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925/03/30, T2878</td>
<td>SA Gun Works</td>
<td>Kruger, Hyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926/03/15, T2286</td>
<td>Kruger, H.</td>
<td>Everard, Isaac Bisseux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938/08/10, T8222</td>
<td>Everard, I.B.</td>
<td>Rubenstein, Marcia R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965/06/30, T16908</td>
<td>Rubenstein, M.R.</td>
<td>Merdor Investments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Erf 2267 (deducted portion became erf 2265 in 1844)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Transfer Deed</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836/03/22, T213 p343</td>
<td>Tennant, Thomas</td>
<td>Carter, John T.W.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837/12/21, T93</td>
<td>Carter, JTW, insolvent estate</td>
<td>Ward, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872/05/08, T96</td>
<td>Ward, G., assigned estate</td>
<td>Ward, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916/05/23, T3715</td>
<td>Public Debts Commissioners</td>
<td>Silver, John Isadore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945/02/28, T2445</td>
<td>Silver, J.H., deceased estate</td>
<td>Kirsch, Sarah (born Silver 1896) &amp; Albert, Leah (born Silver 1894)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960/09/30, T15405/6</td>
<td>Kirsch, S., deceased estate</td>
<td>Whitman, Sylvia Ray (born Kirsch) married to Douglas Alfred Whitman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965/11/18, T29285</td>
<td>Albert, L. &amp; another</td>
<td>Portswood Properties (Pty) Ltd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>