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*Unfurling the Cape of Good Hope’s Earliest Colonial Inhabitants (1652-1713)*

Mansell G. Upham
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Tak for altid væsen ...
Preface

Timon: Earth, yield me roots

*He digs*

Who seeks for better of thee, sauce his palate
With thy most operant poison. What is here?
Gold? Yellow, glittering, precious gold?
No, gods, I am no idle votarist.
Roots, you clear heavens! Thus much of this will make
Black white, foul fair, wrong right,
Base noble, old young, coward valiant.
Ha, you gods! Why this? What, this, you gods? Why, this
Will lug your priests and servants from your sides,
Pluck stout men’s pillows from below their heads.
This yellow slave
Will knit and break religions, bless th’accursed,
Make the hoar leprosy adored, place thieves,
And give them title, knee and approbation,
With senators on the bench. This is it
That makes the wappened widow wed again –
She, whom the spital-house and ulcerous sores
Would cast the gorge at, this embalms and spices
To th’April day again. Come, damned earth,
Thou common whore of mankind, that puts odds
Among the rout of nations, I will make thee
Do thy right nature ...

William Shakespeare, *Timon of Athens*

Since 1976 Eva Meerhoff, born Krotoa (c. 1643-1674) and Catharina (*Groote Catrijn*) van Paliacatta [Pulicat] (c. 1631-1683) have haunted me. Discovering Krotoa (ancestor to both my father and my mother) and *Groote Catrijn* (seven traceable lineal descendents – five maternal and two paternal) to be two of my most prolific ancestors; and also that these two formidable women are lesser known ancestors (even multiple) to so many other colonially induced people *rooted* at the tip of Africa – like so many other ancestral beings from my/our past - were reasons enough for me to give them undivided attention. But the discovery that Krotoa was the first indigenous Cape woman to be colonially incorporated; and that *Groote Catrijn* was the first recorded female convict banished to the Dutch-occupied Cape of Good Hope and its first Dutch East India Company (VOC) slave to be liberated - exacted their release from the shadows demanding that *their stories* be told. My ongoing research into the lives of especially the Cape’s earliest colonial women (indigene, settler, sojourner, slave, convict) – women being the *fons et origo* of ongoing culture - affords me the opportunity to continue revisiting my original research - many initially featured (since 1997) in numerous articles in *Capensis*, quarterly journal of the Genealogical Society of South Africa (Western Cape). Krotoa’s and *Groote Catrijn’s* importance and that of their colourful contemporaries has now been reassessed in terms of unravelling and understanding more fully the impact of Dutch colonization at the tip of Africa. There is
now a heightened awareness in South Africa of indigenousness and slavery. Until recently, however, both Krotoa and Groote Catrijn – and many other folk - have been mostly overlooked or excluded from the orthodox and politically selective slave pantheon currently encountered in the rewriting and re-institutionalization of South African historiography. The reality of shared indigenous and slave roots across a diminishing racial or ethnic divide, however, cannot any longer be suppressed. There is a need for expanded biographies on, and ongoing genealogical inquiries into, not only these very important early Cape colonial figures, but many others.

More than 30 years of researching and documenting each recorded individual that peopled the early colonial period of the VOC-occupied Cape of Good Hope (1652-1713), and given the present-day dearth of knowledge regarding diasporized slaves and the ethnocidally challenged indigenes, at a time when the need to incorporate the historically marginalized underclasses into a more global consciousness is being increasingly recognized, the publication of accessible representative biographies has become imperative. Ever since Anna J. Böeseken’s seminal work Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape 1658-1700 in 1977, little attempt has been made to write more detailed biographies on any of the individuals originally referred to by Böeseken or any other people for that matter - thus the raison d'être for this collection of biographical excursions from the initial period of Dutch colonization. This collection comprises mostly indigenous and slave biographies for the period (1652-1713) ending with the devastating smallpox epidemic that utterly transformed the little colony forever thereafter. The lives of a few hundred people have been recollected in varying degrees of detail depending on how much has survived in the written record.

This work is also a tribute to my own indigenous and slave ancestors thus far unearthed from this period - consciousness of whom has given me a whole new more meaningful sense of being 'ameri-eurafricasian' and then some …:

the Goringhaicona:
Eva Meerhoff (born Krotoa)
the 'Bastaard Hottentot':
Frans Jacobs van de Caep
the African slaves:
Catharina Alexander van de Caep
Maria van Guinea [Benin]
Cecilia van Angola
Dorothea van Angola
Manuel van Angola
Diana van Madagascar
the Asian slaves:
Catharina (Groote Catrijn) van Paliacatta
Engela / Angela (Maaij Ans(i)ela van Bengale
Catharina (Catrijn) van Bengale
Catharina (Catrijn) van Malabar
Maria Magdalena (Mariana) Jacobse van Ceylon [Sri Lanka]
Jacob van Macassar
Maria Jacobs: van Batavia
and the pardoned Chinese convict:
Lim / Lin Inko alias Abraham de Veij.
Although much of South Africa’s slave and indigenous heritage is being rediscovered, little about the people dating back to the 16th century has hitherto been unearthed. The 18th and 19th centuries have been more accessible to researchers and historians especially in view of the more legible and easier-to-read records. The 17th century has proved to be a lot more inaccessible due to the more difficult Gothic Dutch script. Invariably researchers (especially academics) have been reluctant to share their transcriptions of archival documents consulted when publishing. I have opted, instead, to rather share my transcriptions in order to arrive at greater accuracy, insight and understanding of these difficult records. It is hoped that more fleshed-out biographies of many more slaves, indigenes and others will follow.

My heartfelt gratitude to:

- my mother **Maria (Ria) Catherine Upham, née Priem (1933-1996)** and my sisters, **Beryl Catherine Brighton, née Upham (1955-2004) & Anne Caroline Upham (1957-1988)**, for undying inspiration;

- my father **William (Bill) Mansell Upham (1933-2006)** for being a free thinking devil-of-an-advocate;

- **Margaret Cairns (1912-2009)** for her ever-willing assistance and being my micro-historical muse;

- **Anna J. Böeseken (1906-1997)** for her mammoth contribution to South African historiography;

- **Delia Robertson** for moral and other support - never doubting the value and relevance of my research.

**Mansell George Upham**
Tokyo, Japan
October 2012
Guide to the Text

General Historical Background

The wind-swept Cape of Good Hope (‘the Cape’) was a Dutch colonial trans-littoral holding or possession that emerged quite late (1652) in an already established colonial empire under the control of ‘The United East India Company’ or Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (‘the VOC’) stretching from Southern Africa to Timor. The VOC-empire had grafted itself onto an earlier Portuguese empire, which had already paved the way for increased European colonial expansion into Africa and Asia. Dutch trade with Asia was organized through the VOC in terms of an exclusive charter (1602) from the States-General of the United Provinces of the Free Netherlands (the ‘Dutch Republic’) for trade and enforcement of Dutch interests against competitors. A commercial as well as a government agent in Asia, its business was conducted by a hierarchy of officials (called merchants) with headquarters in Batavia [Jakarta on Java, Indonesia], after 1619. The directors of the VOC in the Netherlands were known as the Lords Seventeen (Heeren XVII). The Company was formally dissolved (31 December 1795) and its debts and possessions taken over by the Batavian Republic, predecessor to the present-day Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The VOC’s main priority at the Cape of Good Hope was to provide support to all of its ships that plied between the Netherlands (Patria) and the East Indies. This entailed the running of an efficient hospital, burying the dead and the ready supply of food and drink to the survivors. The colonial encroachment (occupatio) on aboriginal Khoe/San (‘Hottentot’/‘Bushmen’) lands resulted in the signing of ‘treaties’ ex post facto in attempts to ‘legitimize’ Dutch occupation in terms of International Law. The Dutch soon rationalized their ill-conceived occupation of the Cape by transforming the refreshment station into a colony, importing slaves and convicts, granting company employees their ‘freedom’ to become permanent settlers and expanding territorially, thereby colonizing not only their land - but also the Cape aborigines themselves. By the time the Cape was a fully operational VOC refreshment station, buiten comptoir1, factory, residency, fortified settlement and colony, a creole multi-ethnic Dutch-Indies culture had emerged at the tip of Africa (het uijterste hoeck van Africa). Significantly, the Cape of Good Hope was the only Dutch colony where the Dutch language, albeit creolized and indigenized, effectively took root and evolved into a formalized and institutionalized language - Afrikaans.

The Cape of Good Hope for that period is best imagined in terms of the present-day Cape Flats once being drifting dunes of sand. Between Cape Town and the second

---

1 Buiten comptoiremen were out stations or subordinate dependencies, each with its own governor or commander, which before (1652), extended from Ceylon in the west to the Celebes and Japan in the east [CA: BP (Cape Pamphlets): Colin Graham Botha, 'Early Cape Matrimonial Law'].
colony of Stellenbosch, there lay a waste-land of prehistoric sea-bed making the Cape peninsula appear to be an island cut off from the rest of Africa. The colony was initially a dumping ground for the VOC’s sick, dead, political exiles and convicts. The place can be summed up by the following key words: fort, penal settlement, cemetery, hospital, slave lodge, vegetable garden, drinking hole and brothel. Transferred officials and servants could not be expected to stay there indefinitely and ‘free-burghers’ (vrijburghers) - a minority of whom were manumitted slaves termed ‘free-blacks’ (vrijzwarten) - and their wives, if not legally bound to stay for a fixed period as ‘free citizens’, would have opted to leave sooner. Some even deserted by running or stowing away. There were very few imported women so that there existed a maximum demand for sexual favours from slave women and detribalized aborigines. Some European women, appreciating this chronic shortage, even risked cross-dressing and leaving for the Cape and the East Indies disguised as men. A number were discovered even before their ships sailed past the Cape. Then, there were many more stowaways and high-sea captives. All life revolved around the coming and going of the VOC fleets and its motley crews - and keeping the ‘Hottentots’ at bay. An overpopulated hospital, multiple burials, illegal trade (either between the ship folk and the free burghers or corrupt officials or local aborigines), fornication, homosexuality, prostitution, gambling, drinking, squabbling, stealing, punishing and killing were the dis/order of the day.

Nomenclature, terminology, Dutch 17th & 18th century writing conventions & archival sources

17th century Dutch writing conventions display a healthy aversion to standardization. There is a tendency in South Africa to convert, incorrectly, old Dutch names found in original documents using modern Afrikaans writing conventions. In particular, the principle of ‘writing one concept as one word’ derives from a more removed (if not alien) High German convention imposed once written Afrikaans conventions became institutionalized. Hence, the original Blaauw Berg is rendered Blouberg and re-rendered Blouwberg [sic]. The Dutch were happy to abide by the European (proto-international) name generally used for the Cape, viz. the Portuguese Cabo de Boa Esperanza. The Dutch, however, often influenced by French, gallicized the latter half of the name: Cabo de Boa Esperance. The Dutch rendition of the name is generally found as Caep de Goede Hoop. Caep or Caap is often also found as Caab. Place names are used as the Dutch knew them at the time, as opposed to latter-day ‘politically correct’ names. The spelling of personal names found in the records have been standardized (except when quoted directly from the sources) in order to avoid confusing the reader unnecessarily. Foreign terms are translated into English when they first appear in the text. Archival sources are not referenced separately, but are detailed in endnotes after each chapter.

Naming people

The 17th century Dutch generally used patronyms and toponyms, even when family names or surnames were known or in existence and sometimes used. The use of a family name serves often as an indicator of higher status. One’s provenance or place of birth was more important. This is because of the European convention of bureaucratically confining people to their places of birth even if they had already moved away. Slaves were named in the same way. Many toponyms, however, are often
interchangeable perhaps due to bureaucratic laxity and/or ignorance when dealing with the places of origin and/or purchase of enslaved and manumitted peoples, e.g.:

van Malabar / van Cochin / van Coromandel / van Paliacatta / van Bengale

**Currency, weight & measurements**

The VOC’s monetary unit of account until 1658 consisted of two currencies:

- the *guilder* (*gulden*) - also known as *florin* and represented by the symbol $f$; and the *stuiver* (1 *florin* = 20 *stuivers*)

- the Spanish-American *rial* - also known as the *real, real-of-eight* and *piece-of-eight*. (1 *real* = 48 *stuivers*)

Thereafter the *rixdaalder* (*rixdollar*), abbreviated as *Rds* replaced these as the unit of account and converted generally to the amount of 2.5 to 3 *florins* per *rixdollar*. (1 *rixdollar* = 1 *real* = 3 *florins* = 48 *stuivers*). For the first half of the 17th century the Spanish-American *rial-of-eight* (also found as *real-of-eight*) was widely used in the East by the Dutch as real money and as a unit of account, being usually converted at about 48 *stuivers*, and considered as the (slightly overvalued) equivalent of the *rixdollar* (1 *real* = 2.4 *florins*). By VOC practice the *florin* was valued at 20 *stuivers* in the Netherlands and 16 *stuivers* in the Dutch Indies (including the Cape). As the *rixdollar* converted to 48 *stuivers*, it was worth 2.4 *florins* in the Netherlands and 3 *florins* in the Indies. This variance allowed persons transferring money from the Indies to the Netherlands to make a profit on the exchange rate. The Dutch pound (*pond*) weight most commonly used was the Amsterdam pound which amounted to 0.494 kg. Land (*erwen*) in South Africa was (and still is) measured by means of *morgen* and *roeden*. 
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Mas vê a illa Gerum, como discobre
O que fazem do tempo os intervallos;
Que da cidade Armuza, que alli esteve
Ella o nome depois, e gloria teve
\textit{Camões}, x. 103. (1572)

But see yon Gerum’s isle the tale unfold
of mighty things which Time can make or mar;
for of Armuza-town you shore upon
the name and glory this her rival won.
\textit{Camões}, x. 103. (1572) (translation by \textit{Burton})
Abstract

Two slave women were named Armozijn during the initial stages of Dutch East India Company (VOC) colonial occupation of the Cape of Good Hope (‘the Cape’). Were they related? The younger Armozijn - Armozijn Claesz: van de Caep (c. 1661-1733) - features in numerous publications. Of slave parentage (heelslag) and half-sister to Claes Cornelisz: van de Caep (c. 1662-1709) - ‘half-breed’ (halfslag) teacher of the Company’s slave children - she named her eldest daughter Manda. Little, however, has been researched/written about the other older Armozijn – halfslag Armozijn van de Caep (c. 1657-1713) – investigated more fully here; as are the personal names Armozijn and Manda. Armozijn derives from fabric so-named – black silk fromOrmuz – ancient, opulent and strategic Persian Gulf island trading (also slave) port visited by Marco Polo and fabled in literature by Luís Vaz de Camões, Andrew Marvell and John Milton. Gnostic Mandaens (‘St John Christians’) and Zoroastrian Parsi refugees fleeing Muslim persecution are historically associated withOrmuz. Manda is a Mandaic and Aramaic word meaning gnosis (‘light’ and/or ‘knowledge’). There is also Lamu Archipelago’s Manda Island off the Swahili coast of Africa. Transfer of slaves over centuries from Mozambique, Madagascar, Zanzibar, Ethiopia via the Horn of Africa and Socotra Island (inhabited by ‘St Thomas Christians’) to the Persian Gulf for distribution throughout the Islamic Empire (Madagascar to Indonesia); participation by black African nakhudas (sailors) on voyages between Africa and Arabia; European control of the Strait of Hormuz (1515-1622); and subsequent European slave trade participation, resulted in mixed (Indo-Iranian-African) communities mushrooming around the Gulf. So-called black Muslims of the Gulf still exist within these communities their non-Muslim rituals relating to the Thonga-Bantu cultures of south-eastern Africa. Significantly, two ‘Arab’ slave girls Lijsbeth and Cornelia from ‘Abyssinia’ - offloaded at the Cape (1656) as gifts from French Admiral De-la-Roche-St. André visiting the Cape with his fleet (March 1656) to Huguenot-descended wife of Jan van Riebeeck, the Cape’s 1st Dutch commander - were two of four captured Malagasy ZafiRamínía (‘royal’) children (most likely Antambahoaka if not Antaimoro). Were they mothers to our two women named Armozijn?
Introduction

Two 17th century slave women at the Dutch colonially occupied Cape were baptized with the name Armozijn - recorded variously as Armazie, Armoisy, Armosi, Armosij, Armosina, Armosy, Armosijn, Armosyn, Armozy, Harmosy and Harmosyn. One of these women subsequently baptized her own daughter Manda - also found as Maanda / Maende. Both these unusual personal names are one of the more intriguing enigmas of early South African colonial history. Much has been written about Armozijn Claesz: van de Caep (c. 1659-1733), matron of the Company slave children. Little attention, however, has been given to her older namesake Armozijn van de Caep (c. 1657-1713). The other Armozijn barely features in publications about her junior counterpart. She was one of the many victims of the smallpox epidemic (1713). Both Armozijns were former VOC slaves born at the Cape to slave mothers defying positive identification. This article investigates the origins of the names Armozijn and Manda and reconstructs the life of Armozijn the elder - also for purposes of verifying familial or other ties between the two Armozijns and possibly identifying the mothers of both Armozijns.

The name Armozijn

Touchant le mot Ormuz, il est moderne, et luy a esté imposé par les Portugais, le nom venant de l'incident de ce qu'ils cherchoient que c'estoit que l'Or; tellement qu'estant arrivéz là, et voyans le trafic de tous biens, auquel le pais abonde, ils dirent Vssi esta Or mucho, c'est à dire, Il y a force d'Or; et pource ils donneret le nom d'Ormucho à la dite isle.
— A. Thevet, Cosmographie Univ., liv. x. i. 329. (1575).

Ostensibly, the name - also personal - Armozijn derives from the silk fabric armesie, armozeen, ormesine or ormuzine known in Dutch as armoesijn, armosijnen, armosijntjes, armosyn, armozijn, armozijnen - exported from Ormuz [Hormuz]. Generally black, this stout silk textile was used by Europeans for habbands and scarves at funerals and to make clergymen’s gowns. Similarly, there existed a red cloth carmosijn rood laken. The cloth derives its name from the legendary mainland (later island) kingdom and strategic trading port of Ormuz situated in the Strait of Hormuz linking the Persian Gulf with the Gulf of Oman and the Arabian Sea - a strategic waterway (48-80 km wide) controlling ocean traffic to and from the oil-rich Persian Gulf area. Located in the strait are Qishm and three other islands (Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb and Abu Musa) seized by Iran (1971) but claimed by the United Arab Emirates. The name Ormuz is considered to be a modern Persian corruption of Ormudsz - also found as Ahura, Ahura Mazda, Auharmzd, Auharmazd, Mazda, Ormuzd, Ahuramazda, Hormizd, Aramazd [Armenian], Horomazes [Latin], Ohrmazd and Ormazd - popularly believed to derive from the name of Persian God Hormoz (a variant of Ahura Mazda) but stemming from the local Persian word Hur-mogh meaning ‘date palm’. In local dialects this strait is called Hurmogh having the latter meaning. Moghistan - modern name for Harmozia - is thus the ‘region of date-palms’. In the Western imagination, Ormuz is incidentally a mythologized corruption of the Portuguese or mucho meaning ‘gold aplenty’.
History of Ormuz - A vast emporium of all the world ...

High on a throne of royal state, which far
Outshone the wealth of Ormus and of Ind,
Or where the gorgeous East with richest hand
Showers on her kings barbaric pearl and gold.

John Milton, Paradise Lost, ii. 1–4. (1667)

Ormuz (recorded variously as Agramuzo, Armuza, Harmozeia, Harmozia, Hormiz, Hormos, Hormoz, Hurmogh, Hurmoz, Hurmus, Ohrmazd, Ohrmuzd, Ormes, Ormucho, Ormus and Oermuzd) was a famous maritime city and minor ‘kingdom’ during the 16th/17th centuries. It occupied more than one position in the course of history and has now long practically ceased to exist. The capital was the fortified port-city of Ormuz - one of the most important ports in the Middle East controlling sea-way trading routes to India. The city-state (13th century) controlled the slave market from Africa and Arabia to Khorasan in Persia. The city’s original location was on the Gulf’s northern shore some 30 miles east of Gamron [Bandar ‘Abbas]. Tartar raids forced the city to retreat (c. 1300) to Gerum (or Jerun) Island. This was the kingdom’s seat when visited and attacked (1506) by the Portuguese. Alfonso d’Albuquerque landed (September 1507) and occupied (1515) the island. Nominal reign of native kings was maintained but the island was taken (1622) by Safavid shah (Abbas I of Persia) with the assistance of an
English squadron from Surat. In the mid-17th century it was captured by the imam of Muscat but later recaptured by Persia. Destroyed by the Persians, the island remained all but uninhabited though the Portuguese citadel and water-tanks remain. The island dependencies of Bandar ʿAbbas: Qishm (Kishm), Hormuz, Larak and Henjam and other ports on the Kerman coast were held by Omani sultans as Persian fiefs for more than a century. They are part of Iran (since 1854).

First mentioned in the voyage of Nearchus (325 BC), the city’s foundation is attributed by one Persian writer to the Sassanian Ardashir Babegan (c. AD 230); but it existed earlier for Ptolemy refers to it being on the coast of Carmania. Idrisi (c. 1150), mentions it as Hormuz-al-shiliah (‘Hormuz of the shore’) - a large, well-built city and chief mart of Kirman. Siraf and Kish preceded it as trading ports with India. In the 13th century Ormuz reached its zenith. Ruled by petty ‘kings’, one of whom (Turan Shah) wrote a history (abstract given by Jesuit Teixeira), the dynasty’s founder was Shah Mohammed Dirhem-Kub (‘the Drachmacoiner’) - an Arab chief who crossed the gulf establishing himself there (ante 1100 AD). Ruknuddin Mahmd (1246) was the 12th of the line. These rulers were subject, however, to the atabegs of Fars and the princes of Kirman.
A plate in Braun-Hogenberg's Civitates Orbis Terrarum, Cologne 1577, gives a stylised view of Hormuz. The town and the wind towers are prominent but there does not appear to be any indication of the fort.

**Ormuz and the Parsis (Parsees)**

Historically, Zoroastrian Persian *emigrés* in India called Parsis (Parsees) – resisting conversion to Islam, are historically associated with Hormuz and surrounding areas. In Persia, Zoroastrians - called Iranis to distinguish them from those in India - are chiefly found around Yezd. The community descend from Persians who, when Khalif Omar subdued Persia (AD 641), resisted conversion to Islam. They found refuge on Hormuz steadily emigrating across the seas, landing first at Diu on the Kathiawar coast (c. AD 700). Later crossing the Gulf of Cambay, they landed at Sanjan (Gujarat) where the local ruler, Jadi Râna, allowed them to settle. Adopting Gujarati, they erected their first fire temple (AD 721). Muslim incursions (1305) induced refuge elsewhere. Following further emigrations from Persia, they settled in Cambray, Ankleshwar, Variav, Vankaner, Broach, Surat, Thana, Chaul etc. When the Portuguese at Thana imposed Christianity, they escaped to Kalyan. The English presence in Surat (1612) presented new opportunities for industry and trade so that Surat and Broach became chief settlements. When the government of the [English] East India Company (in 1668) moved to Bombay, Parsis followed occupying posts of trust in government in Bombay. Certain families acquired wealth and prominence, notably Sorabji, Modi, Kama, Wadia, Jejeebhoy, Readymoney, Dadyset, Petit, Patel, Mehta, Allbless and Tata.
Salient customs peculiar to Parsis include: worship in fire temples; sea shore prayer to the rising/setting sun; marriages in public assembly; exposure of their dead to birds of prey in “towers of silence”; marriage exclusivity; refusal to incorporate aliens into religious membership; never uncovering the head; never smoking. Free from the trammels of caste, they have no religious food restrictions and are free to travel and take meals with other groups. Fire is venerated as highest and purest symbol of Divinity. Faithful to Zoroastrianism, Parsis are proud of their racial purity. Colour among many families, chiefly of lower classes, confirms mixed marriages, although the community remains generally unmixed and marriage with outsiders is rare.

Manda

The name Manda provides a further possible clue to the origins of the two Cape slaves named Armozijn. Significantly, there exists a small religious Semitic sect of great antiquity known as Mandaean or Sabians - Sabba in Mandaic. They adopted the name Sabian to profit by the tolerance offered by Islam to the ‘people of a book’ and in reference to their connection to the Quran, are called Subi or Subbi by their Muslim neighbors. Called ‘Christians of St. John’ by the Portuguese in the 16th century when they first encountered them on Hormuz, Mandaeans may even be the Nasoraeans mentioned by Epiphanius. Mandaeans still exist in limited numbers in southern Iraq and Iran. Neither Christian, Moslem, Jewish nor Zoroastrian, the religion contains a variety of ancient elements attesting to their antiquity. They maintain an ancient belief resembling that of Gnosticism and that of the Parsis. Adherents to the faith still survive in cities and villages in the lower Euphrates, the lower Tigris, rivers surrounding Shatt-al-Arab and in Khuzistan (formerly Arabistan), Shushtar and other Asia Minor cities.

They claim descent from Adam and their last great teacher and healer was John the Baptist in keeping with adherence to ritual cleanliness and frequent baptism – a custom antedating St. John’s baptisms and deriving from the belief that living water is the principle of life. Mandaean believe that Jesus and Moses were false prophets. They also have a hierarchical clergy and hold public worship on Sundays. They deplore fasting, monasticism and violence. They have a communion sacrament for remembrance of the dead resembling Parsi ritual meals. Their system of astrology derives from ancient Babylonia and the Magi cults. Their emanation system and dualism suggest Gnostic origin, but unlike Gnostics, they abhor asceticism and emphasize fertility. Mandaean are nevertheless considered to be Gnostic due to the Mandaic word *manda* which translates as ‘knowledge’ (*gnosis* in Greek). Could the Cape name Manda Gratia be a corruption of the Mandaean expression *Manda d’Hiia* (‘knowledge of life’)? It is the only remaining ‘Gnostic’ religion - excluding the Manichaean Orthodox Church - still in practice. Part of the Mandaean ritual dress *rasta* includes a white turban symbolizing radiance, light and glory.

The origin of the Mandaean is unknown; possibly they came from north of Babylonia and Persia, perhaps even Palestine or Syria. Their holy book *Ginza Rba* is a compendium of cosmology, cosmogony, prayers, legends and rituals. The sect is diminishing as younger members tend to apostatize. Many have fled the region since the 1990s due to the unstable political climate, immigrating worldwide. There is no official census of the Mandaean; conservative guesses at current population size range between 50,000 to 70,000.
Their language is Mandaic and primarily liturgical. A vernacular form is still spoken in Iran around Ahwaz. It is a variety of Aramaic, notable for its plene writing and for Iranian influences in grammar and lexicon. Neo-Mandaic survives in three sub-dialects found in Shushtar, Shah Wali and Dezful [northern Khuzestan, Iran]. Mandaean communities in these cities fled persecution (during the 1880s) settling in Ahwaz and Khorramshahr. While Khorramshahr boasted the largest Mandaic-speaking population (until the 1980s), the Iraq-Iraq War caused a diaspora, leaving Ahwaz the only remaining Mandaic-speaking community. Mani, founder of Manichaeism, was brought up in the Elchasaite sect who may be an offshoot of the Mandaens or influenced by them. The members of this sect, like Mandaens, wore white, performed baptisms and dwelled in the Southern Mesopotamian marshes; Mani later founded his own religion. How close the origins of the Elchasaites, Mani and Mandaeans are to each other remains an open question.

**VOC-Arab-Mandaean-Parsi-Persian-Indian trading networks: from Jidda to Bombay - from Basra to Cochin**

The vibrant world of the Arabian Seas region induced VOC settlements in Iran and Yemen during the 17th/18th centuries. VOC offices in Mocha [al-Mukha] and in Gamron [Bandar ‘Abbas] were directed from Surat (Gujarat). Since ancient times, littorals of the Arabian Seas attracted trading vessels from western India. Peddling - small-scale coasting trade to the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea - dominated the regional economy. Armadas of small vessels delivered a variety of goods - textiles, pepper, sugar, wood, rice, and slaves - to Arab traders as did their Indian counterparts. The shipping network of al-Mukha in the early 17th century included 27 major port towns in western India located from Sind to Cochin. The VOC profited by selling Indian textiles in Yemen and Javanese sugar in Persia remaining uncompetitive in the more refined small-scale coastal trading network. The VOC appointed a director for Persia who kept an office, several warehouses and a garden in Gamron. His agents monitored the silk markets in Kirman, Shiraz and Isfahan. Raw silk purchased in Safavid Persia could be sold in Europe for a good price but neither the British nor the Dutch could monopolize the silk trade. When the sale of raw Persian silk became less profitable, the VOC shifted its attentions to Persian gold. The annual fleet from Batavia (Jakarta) to Persia was usually loaded with pepper, cloves, nutmeg and Batavian sugar. Although Afghan armies toppled (1722) the Safavid dynasty, the VOC remained active (until 1766) in the region.

**European-African-Arab-Mandaean-Parsi-Persian-Indian trading networks: from Madagascar, Mozambique, Zanzibar, Ethiopia, Somalia to Socotra and Mocha - from Kuwait to Cochin**

The transfer of slaves over centuries from Mozambique, Madagascar, Zanzibar, Ethiopia, Somalia, Socotra to the Persian Gulf for distribution throughout the Islamic Empire (from Madagascar to Indonesia); participation by sub-Saharan or black Africans serving as nakhudas (sailors) aboard dhows and boom on voyages between Africa and Arabia; Portuguese (later British) control of the Strait of Hormuz (1515-1622); and subsequent European participation in the slave and other trade, resulted in several ethnically mixed (Indo-Iranian and African) communities mushrooming around the Gulf. Inhabitants of
Bab Hormuz, Qishm, Lark, Minab, Lingih, Bushihr, Bandar ‘Abbas and several other small communities on the shores of the Gulf, are living manifestations of this mix. So-called ‘black Muslims of the Gulf’ are still found within these mixed communities occupying the lowest rungs of Iranian society.

These blacks were brought to the Persian Gulf by African, Arabian and Portuguese slave traders as early as the 16th century.\(^{17}\) Known as the *ahl-i hava* (‘people of the air’), they live in the region of Minab - townships between Lingih and Bushihr - as well as on the island of Bab Hormuz. They worship the Winds (*baad*) without any apparent knowledge of their source or the reason for their centrality in their belief system. They attribute their belief in mysterious Winds to tradition performing shamanistic rituals to control the power of the Winds afflicting the destitute. Their rituals and instruments appear to derive from Thonga-Bantu cultures of south-eastern Africa (their most likely original homeland).

According to the *ahl-i hava*, their forefathers were brought to the Persian Gulf about four generations ago. They consider East Africa, especially Somalia and Zanzibar, to be their original homeland.\(^{18}\) They believe that the Winds arrive at the Gulf from far-away lands and choose a *steed* (the patient is called a ‘steed’). Individuals afflicted by a Wind become ‘possessed’ making utterances known only to the *babas* (male shamans) or *mamas* (female shamans) of that particular Wind. These Winds demand blood sacrifice, special gifts and drum performances in ritualized assemblies with poetry recitation (*bazi*). Once the demands of the Wind are met, it relinquishes its hold on its steed and the individual is admitted to the *ahl-i hava* - ‘becoming one who can live out of harm’s way’.

Social status, living conditions and affiliation with the sea are some of the criteria for admission to their ranks. Usually, beachcombers, fishermen, sailors (the unprotected - those who cannot promise offerings) are struck down by the Winds. Pearl divers, merchants and captains of the dhows and booms are usually not afflicted remaining undisturbed (*saf*). Most Winds are believed to originate in Africa, in Arabia, and in India. Only a few originate in Iran. The capacity of these Winds to do harm depends on the level of protection offered by the community. If the community shows signs of adversity, as it did in the early 1930s when many merchants and pearl divers left the seaports in favour of protection of small sheikhdoms, the Winds descend and kill many. When the main threats, like compulsory education and military service or forced unveiling of women disappeared, the Winds disappear as well.

Bashiri advocates further research on the anthropological, sociological, linguistic and religious aspects of this misplaced community and his investigation into their origins reveals that:

(1) these black communities are sub-cultures having strong ritual and spiritual ties with the Thonga / Bantu tribes of Africa; and

(2) worship of the spirits of their deceased ancestors has been influenced by the fundamental beliefs of Shi’ite Muslims of southern Iran.
The result is a blend of shamanism and Islam complete with rituals, rites and pageantry. Intriguing, too, is the fact that Arabs and Portuguese, who brought these African natives to the Gulf, also took many to India as well.¹⁹

**Ormuz, Manda & the Cape of Good Hope**

Why would two contemporary 17th century Cape-born slave women be named after a fabric, its legendary wealth and/or a celebrated, fabulously wealthy, sea port and historical kingdom - and possibly even after Zoroastrianism’s supreme deity? Were their respective mothers connected to this place or its religion? Why did the Cape’s resident minister, the Frisian Jacob Overneij₂⁰, sanction the retention of their un-Christian name when baptizing them as adults? No evidence links their mothers unequivocally to Guinea, Angola, Madagascar, the Indian sub-continent or the East Indies – the usual places of origin for slaves brought to the Cape. Ethnic and/or other links to the Indian subcontinent in any case need more contextualized consideration for the Persian Gulf has been the fulcrum of trade between Africa and Asia with Ormuz at its centre since ancient times.

Curiously, Armozijn junior makes an Arabic-looking mark in her will (1713). In a later will (1721) she signs her name more fully, but somewhat illegibly. The name reads something like Nemarneed - an attempt to write her native name in Arabic or some other Semitic writing system?²¹

Identifying these two slave women in terms of ethnicity is virtually impossible. Naming patterns of Cape-born slave children usually provide clues for identifying mothers. Unfortunately, Armozijn the elder died childless. Armozijn the younger named her eldest daughter Maanda²², Manda²³ or Maende²⁴. Again, we are confronted with yet another un-Christian name also sanctioned in terms of baptism by the same officiating Christian minister. In later life, her daughter appears with an additional name (matronymic or patronymic?): Ma(a)nda Gracia²⁵ / Gratia(s)²⁶ / Gratie²⁷. Did she use the Portuguese name Gracia as a patronym to identify herself as biological daughter of the slave (later manumitted free-black and free-burgher) Gratias Maijalas van Angola previously known as Jackie Joij²⁸ Otherwise could Gracia(s) be a sobriquet assumed by a manumitted slave as token of gratitude perpetuating institutionalized patriarchy? Three examples can be cited: Jackie Joij van Angola (also recorded as Gratias Maijalas), Manda (later Manda Gracia) & and Gratia d’Acosta (who prior to manumission may have gone by another name).

If Gracia was not a patronymic was Manda Gratia perhaps named after the slave woman Gratia d’Acosta? Were they related? Could Gratia d’Acosta be mother to Armozijn the younger? The marriage of Armozijn the younger’s brother to a woman of Indian
ethnicity (Beatrice van Cochin) possibly points to his maternity, even if biologically African, at least being culturally Asian. The toponym d’Acosta refers to the Portuguese da Costa meaning ‘of the Coast’. Usually, the toponym referred to the Malabar Coast of the Indian sub-continent (sometimes also the Coromandel Coast). Gratia, who baptized a son Herman (1666) when still a Company slave, later appears as ‘wife’ to freed slave Adriaen (Arie) van Bengale in muster (opgaaf) and tax rolls (1693, 1695 and 1696). Was he the same person as slave Andries van Coromandel belonging to the commanders Cornelis van Quaerbergen and Jacob Borghorst and whom the last-mentioned sold to the Company (1669)? Her union with a slave from Bengal possibly reinforces Gratia’s likely Indian origins. Generally daughters of Cape slave women named their eldest daughters after their mothers (acquiring their non-indigenous names). No slave, however, named Manda - and after whom Manda Gratia might have been named – can be found in the records.

La Mère / Mer sans raison30… Madagascar: Island of Tears …

Two slave girls have been overlooked as likely mothers to the two Armozijns. The ‘Arab’ girls, Lijsbeth and Cornelia, reputedly from ‘Abyssinia’ [Ethiopia, Somalia, Eritrea, Socotra and/or Yemen] and taken captive by the French on Madagascar, were given as gifts (March 1656) by Admiral De-la-Roche-St André to Maria de la Queillerie, wife of the Cape’s 1st commander Jan van Riebeeck.

As early as the 17th century Madagascar resisted European colonization until late in the 19th century. Only once the Merina became the island’s dominant ‘ethnic’ group (with British help and supply of firearms) did France, using gunboat-policy and threatening military invasion, force Madagascar to become a French protectorate (1883) and a colony (1896). Earlier attempts to colonize the island were unsuccessful remaining piecemeal, with the French managing to maintain initially only two forts at Fort Dauphin [Tôlanaro / Tolagnaro] near St Lucia Bay [Manafiafy] and St. Augustine Bay [Tuléar]. The French settled instead for neighbouring Ile de Bourbon [Réunion] and Rodriguez. From there they could eventually extend control over the other Mascarene Islands [Seychelles and Mauritius].
Madagascar, an ancient interlarded, caste-dominated microcosm of black East Africans, Asian-Austronesians (primarily southern Borneo Boro and people from the Indonesian/Philippine archipelagos), Arabians, Persians and Indians, was a centuries-old haunt for Swahili slave traders/settlers (long before any Europeans came on the scene) and latter-day European and mulatto pirates. Thereafter Portuguese, French, Dutch, English and Americans joined in procuring innumerable slaves from the island (and islanders) throughout the late 16th century onwards.

**Monitoring French maritime & trading activity from the Cape of Good Hope**

The Cape’s first commander was regularly updated about rival French interests near or at the Cape. In a letter (20 October 1655) the VOC directors, wrote that the French had formed a new company. At its head was the lieutenant-governor of Nantes in Brittany recorded variously as the Duc or Maréchale de la Maillery / de/(Le)meljery, Meslar(a)ye, Melleray, Miliery, Miljerey, Milleray, Millerey(n) and Mosleraye. Five ships were to proceed to Madagascar to form a settlement and trade with the natives. Three more flutes would follow and provide assistance. The plan was to settle families. Madagascar would serve as colony to procure slaves also from the east coast of Africa. The French hoped to gain ‘rich booty’ from Moorish traders operating between Gujarat, the Gulf of Persia, the Arabian coasts and the Red Sea. Since the Portuguese were established in these parts, the French - a fellow Catholic country - could “touch at, take in supplies, and trade with the towns and places on the East African, Arabian and the Indian coasts” under Portuguese jurisdiction (notably Mozambique Island, Sofala, Malindi, Mombasa and Goa). The French would assist the Portuguese by taking cargo and pepper from the Malabar Coast and Indian wares destined for Europe. The Dutch adopted a wait-and-see attitude instructing the Cape not to offend “that nation” should any of these ships
touch there and only to react if attacked.\textsuperscript{31} Water could be provided, but no other supplies.\textsuperscript{32} VOC priorities in Southern Africa had changed. The Company quickly dismissed Van Riebeeck’s suggestion that the refreshment station warranted a more junior official than himself as commander.\textsuperscript{33}

One ship \textit{St Georges} had already proceeded in advance of the admiral’s flotilla. Reconnaissance interrupted, it sailed into Saldanha Bay (8 February 1656) to await the admiral’s arrival. It had sailed via Madagascar to the Red Sea for plunder (\textit{om te roven}), with a bark (galiot with 3 masts), brought to Madagascar in pieces and assembled at Fort Dauphin. The bark, however, had been taken by the English in the Red Sea. Frustrated in their object, the ship went on to Socotra – the island opposite Guardafui on the Somali coast and Horn of Africa (now part of Yemen) - where they obtained aloes, musk and civet. The ship returned via the \textit{Mascarenhas} (where men were stationed for planting tobacco), to Ile.-St. Maria and on to Fort Dauphin. There they had taken on board cowhides, a quantity of wax and gum, etc.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{Boudewyn van den Abele} (from Brughes) gives an account of what the crew of the \textit{St Georges} got up to before joining the admiral’s flotilla. While at Saldanha Bay, the boy keenly recounted their adventure. These were dutifully recorded (16 February 1656) by \textbf{Jan Woutersz}: (from Middelburg), the Company superintendent there, and forwarded overland in a letter to Van Riebeeck.\textsuperscript{35} The ship had left Nantes (with 100 men on board and 20 guns) about two years ago stopping at Cape Verde for supplies. They arrived six months later at their settlement \textit{Fort Dauphin} at Tolanhaer on Madagascar near St Lucy’s Bay. At the time the fort (manned by 50 or 60 Frenchman and slaves) was “merely a square enclosure of poles no thicker than spars … houses made of sticks, bamboos and leaves” and poorly defended:

\[\ldots\text{the guns lying useless on the ground without any carriages only 3 are mounted on very old carriages; hardly half the number of men are provided with guns or side arms; they have at present only one small keg of gunpowder …}\]

The place had been settled some time already in terms of a charter granted to the governor of Nantes, La Miliery, but the garrison for many years seeing no ship from France, had begun cultivating rice with the help of 10 slaves and had amassed hides and wax to be shipped to France - also 200 rolls of tobacco (each weighing 100 lbs.) grown on the \textit{Mascarenhas} where six years previously seven French and eight slaves had been stationed living only on pork and goats’ meat and in huts made of branches and leaves. With the \textit{St Georges} their endeavours not only involved collecting hides, wax, ebony and gum, but also assembling small vessels brought from France for piratical expeditions in the Red Sea. More importantly, they:

\[\ldots\text{continue to make war on the natives, of whom they had killed a king, a prince and many men. Four of the captive children are on board the St. Georges to be taken to France, also a box with minerals taken from certain goldmines shewn them by the said king, from whom they had also obtained some pots filled with pieces of eight which had been buried.}\]

The \textit{St Georges} remained eight months anchored at Fort Dauphin while assembling a three-masted vessel for deployment in the Red Sea. They sailed along the Madagascar coast as far as St.Maria Island (Bay of Antongil), before proceeding to the Manastram
[Mananjary?] River situated south of Antongil Bay. This area is traditionally associated with the more peaceful Antambahoaka – a clan bordering the darker constantly warring Betsimisaraka clans. This clan has a curious aural and written history (sorabe) recounting their royal (ZafaRaminia), historical, if not also mythical, origins and ancestral voyage from Medina.36

Filling the ship with rice cheaply bought at the river, the French also obtained some precious stones which the Captain believed would cover the expenses of the voyage and allow them to abandon the trip to the Red Sea. The visit soon took a turn for the worst, however, and their captain was killed in a skirmish – coinciding with the killing of their king and a prince as well as the capture of the four ‘royal’ children:

“... but getting into difficulties with the natives of that river he had been killed by them. The crew not being able to get enough cattle, etc; for refreshing themselves, had done great injury to the natives and set them against each other by the ears so that all the villages were warring on each other. Consequently those of St. Maria greatly feared the French, whose large vessel was anchored in their harbour, and who continuing to trade on the coast might also involve them in a war with those of the interior. He also stated that the king and prince who had been killed were very favourably inclined to the Dutch, who had no desire to war but only to trade with them.”

The ship then proceed to Monamboela37 staying there for two months before proceeding to the Red Sea “to rob the Moors”. Chasing a vessel “supposed to be a Moor” but finding it to be English, their small bark and sloop was beaten off with the loss of 60 men. Disappointed, they returned via Socotra where they obtained musk, civet, and nine casks of aloes returning to the Mascarenhas [Réunion] taking on board tobacco and proceeding via St. Maria to Tolanhaer. Offloading the rice for the garrison, the ship sailed on to Saldanha Bay with its cargo of hides, wax, gum, minerals and the “4 Royal children” and “a small box about a foot square and covered with gray cloth, which contained great value” to await the admiral’s arrival. While at St. Maria they had met up with the crew of the Tulp sent from the Cape to trade and purchase slaves. “Prospering well”, the Dutch crew had obtained rice and proceeded to Monamboela for further trade despite losing two guns which had burst killing four men and wounding others. One had burst at Mauritius, the other at Antongil - probably when firing salutes.

The French flotilla (4 ships) arrived at the Cape (25 March 1656): La Duchesse with Admiral de-la-Roche-St André (recorded also as La Roch, Laroche, La Ros, Lacos, and Laros) at the helm (400 men and 40 guns), La Maréchale (Vice-Admiral Colon, 300 men and 36 guns) La Erman (Captain Richmont, 200 men and 30 guns) and St. Joris [St Georges] (Captain Labriants, 100 men and 20 guns). They sailed into Table Bay (31 March 1656). Four more ships were to follow and two ships had preceded them.38 The French informed Van Riebeeck that they intended to occupy Madagascar in three places, the old Fort Dauphin at St Lucia Bay, Antongil Bay and St Augustine Bay.

Observing the French to be in “sufficient numbers to trouble us here”, Van Riebeeck opted to treat them civilly “otherwise they might take by force what they want”. All ships in the Bay, eight in number (6 return and 2 outward bound) were placed on high alert, and the Cape indigenes warned not to trust the French who would steal them and their cattle. Twenty soldiers were drafted from the ships to strengthen the garrison which had been weakened as many had been sent on to Batavia. The Dutch were
skeptical, however, about the French expedition observing the flotilla to be manned by “wholly unwilling, lazy, poor and very sick men”. Commissioner **Rijckloff van Goens** later referred to the visiting French making a “great hubbub of wonderful ideas” like erecting fortifications in Madagascar “fancying that the earth there contained hidden treasures”.

The French admiral greeted (26 March) the commander of the Fleet and Van Riebeeck with a “cask of Canary wine, some raisins, *et cetera*” for which he was “recompensed with some refreshments, compliments, *et cetera*”. The admiral’s request for sail cloth, however, was politely refused but “he was allowed to have water”. Admiral **de-la-Roche-St André** received Admiral **Boogaerd** (27 March) on board his ship and was reciprocally entertained on board the **Hoff van Zealand** in the evening prior to the Return Fleet’s departure for St. Helena. With the departure of some Dutch ships, the tension heightened:

“Not trusting the French, we keep the men under arms and have double guards at night. The officers are all provided in their homes with loaded pistols in order to be well-prepared. During the evening the French pitched a tent near the fort and carried into it 40 sick ... As treachery might lurk behind this proceeding, the tents were carefully watched, and the inmates politely told not to go out during the night that they might not suffer injury from the natives.”

Finally the admiral disembarked (29 March) to call on Van Riebeeck in person and was “festively and politely treated”.

“He insisted upon buying oxen and sheep from us, and hinted that if refused, he might be compelled to take some from the natives, *et cetera*. As he had a strong force to back him, and we would not very well be able to prevent him, without causing greater trouble to ourselves, it was resolved to keep on as friendly terms as possible, and allow them for the four ships eight oxen and 10 or 12 sheep at two reals of eight, with permission to buy from private gardeners as much vegetables as they could get, who would make a nice penny by it. This satisfied the admiral; the day was passed agreeably, and he left at night well satisfied ...”

The French admitted that a shortage of sails would force them to dismantle one of their ships at Madagascar and leave them free to go cruising against the English. Before departing, the admiral presented **Maria de Queillerie** with two of the captive Abysinnian princesses, **Lijsbeth** and **Cornelia Arabus**, captured on Madagascar. He also presented Van Riebeeck with an unnamed male slave as a gift. Was this one of the other ‘royal children’? This slave died (14 June 1656), however, as evidenced by an entry in the Company Journal (15 June 1656).

**Zafiraminia Origins**

*The following section paraphrases and translates from the French* one of the more comprehensive websites available on what seems to be a most complex, certainly questionable, and murky history. *The information is provided below merely to give the reader a glimpse into the possible origins of the two abducted princesses that are the main protagonists in this exposé. It is hoped that more research in future will provide more answers.*
All the ‘royal’ dynasties (ZafaRaminia) of Madagascar (Antambahoaka, Antaimoro, Antonosy, etc.) purportedly originate from Aceh (more specifically Meulaboh) on Sumatra. Ramini is a region west of Aceh which includes Meulaboh and the people are known as Onjantsy of ‘People of Atsy’ (meaning ‘from Aceh’). Ramani are regarded as the offspring of the Prophet Mohammed whose daughter Fatima’s husband left Arabia to rule in Mangadsini (an ‘Islamized land’ believed to be on Sumatra). Historically, there were two children, a son Rahouroud and a daughter Raminia who married each other giving birth to two sons Rahadzi (or Rahasty) and Rakoub (or Rakovatsy). Dynastic infighting caused them to leave Mangadsini with their retainers voyaging to Ankoala on Madagascar and from them descend the line of the ZafaRaminia. They were of the Zaidi sect, a branch of Shi’a and their leader was known as Andriambahoaka (‘Prince of the People’).

Towards the 9/10th centuries the royal court of Ankoala was ruled by a deputy king originating from Aceh named Raden Anon (becoming Randrianoy). This court actively engaged with Muslim trading ports along the East African coast (Kilwa, Zanzibar etc) paving the way for further Arab settlements on Madagascar. Via matrimonial alliances and the added influence of the Ismaeli sect, the noble families known as ZafiKazimambo (Swahili for ‘descendants of the Queen’) came into existence. These Arabs brought with them black African attendants Ntaolo or Vazimba (Vanjimbo signifies ‘indigenes’ in Swahili). These Arabs came to be known as Ntaolo Ba Lambo (‘light-skinned people’) which later corrupted into Amboalambo. It was these people who popularized the name ‘Malagasybar’ / ‘Madagasybar’ or ‘land of Malagass / Madagas’ becoming standardized as Madagascar by the 12th century.

Sunnite and Shi’a rivalry in Arabia at the start of the 10th century impacted on the Indian Ocean littorals affecting also the Ankoala kingdom and the east coast of Madagascar resulting in warfare, pillaging, domination and slavery fuelled by the Ntaolo / Vazimbawho who penetrated the island’s interior controlling the major rivers (Mahajamba, Sofia, Bemarivo, Ikopa, Tsiribihina, Onilahy, Mangoky, etc.) giving birth to various warring clans: Sihanaka, Tsimihety, Merina, Betsileo, Antandroy, Mahafaly, Sakalava, etc. The ZafiRaminia and ZafiKazimambo retreated towards the north-east coast in the vicinity of Vohémar. This migration meant a complete break with the royal court on Sumatra.

The Antambahoaka’s southern neighbours, the Antaimoro with whom they share close ties, were descendants of the last Arab diaspora to Madagascar. Their history recounts the voyage to Zanzibar, stop-over on the Comores (Mahory) and arrival in the north-eastern part of Madagascar of Ramakararo (Ramaka meaning ‘Honourable Mequois’) and his companions Antalaotra (from Seville), Antemaka (from Morocco), Antesira (Africans), Antesonjo (from Algeria), Antevandrika and others fleeing Islamic unrest. Becoming part of the Zafikazimambo, Ramakararo opted to migrate (15th century) to Vohémar and along the east coast arriving at the banks of the Matitanana and taking as wife an Onjatsy. His descendant Ramarohalana later became the true founder of the Antaimoro-Anteony dynasty exterminating all rival adult males of the ZafiRaminia in the region and surrounding himself with a select group of Onjatsy. With the death of Ramarohalana, his son Andriatomambe succeeded him making Ivato his capital. Antaimoro society can be divided into three social classes: nobles of royal lineage Anteony (‘people of the river’); aristocrats Antalaotra (‘people of the sea’); and
retainers Fanarivoana. Antaimoro are known for their Ombiasy, shamans using sikidy, the Arabian art of divination, healing, diplomacy, directing conscience, and specializing in hasina (Islamic knowledge based on cosmology and astrological charts) to guide the elders and protect the kings. Their scriptures fandraka are transcribed in sorabe (an alphabet of Arabian origin) comprising magic formulas and extracts of the Koran sourates, recorded by their scribes the katibo. The first people to produce paper in Madagascar, their writings are enscribed on paper known as Satary with locally made black ink heboro.

Enslaved Malagasy Royalty at the Cape

In 1659 the two girls were purportedly aged 12 and 10 respectively. Böeseken lists them as Lijsbeth Arabus and Cornelia Arabus. Were they sisters? Visiting VOC Commissioner Rijkloff van Goens senior, however, refused to sanction these gifts to the commander’s wife (2 May 1657) and the two slaves, together with Van Riebeeck’s other gifted slaves: Eva van Madagascar, her son Jan Bruijn and Cleijn Eva van Madagascar (gift from the 'king' of Antongil obtained by deceased Frederick Verburgh), were expropriated by the Company.

Goens gave permission for Lijsbeth to serve in the household of Van Riebeeck’s sister, Geertruida van Riebeeck and her sick-comforter husband, Pieter van der Stael (from Rotterdam) while Cornelia was taken up into the household of the secunde Frederick Verburgh (from Amsterdam) and his wife Meijnsje / Meyntjen / Meyntsgen Campen / Campius. Böeseken states incorrectly that it was Cleijn Eva who was assigned to Van der Stael’s wife and that the two Arab girls were assigned to Verburgh’s wife. The attestation (1659) that Böeseken relies on, states unequivocally, however, that:

Frederick Verburgh (born c. 1627) arrived at the Cape as stowaway from Batavia on board the Salamander. He was appointed secretary to the Cape’s Council of Policy. The Verburgh family was a prominent and wealthy VOC family with members holding senior positions in the Company. His wife arrived on board the Malacca (19 February 1654) in custody of her brother, the minister Johannes Campius, who left her behind continuing his passage on the Malacca en route to Formosa (Taiwan) where he was tortured to death (1662). She married Verburgh at the Cape (6 March 1655). They
drew up their joint will (9 August 1655). She gave birth (8 December 1655) to a daughter, the first Cape-born non-aboriginal girl. The child died unbaptized in infancy (16 December 1655). Widow Verburgh already lost her husband (sometime between December 1655 and February 1656), but only learned (31 March 1657) of his death from fever on Ile-de-St. Marie (off Madagascar) while on a trading expedition. Following the death of her husband, Widow Verburgh soon left the Cape; as did the Van der Stael family (1663). Lijsbeth, following Van der Stael’s departure, was re-allocated to the Company’s chief gardener Hendrick Hendricksz: Boom (from Amsterdam) as evidenced by the muster (16 April 1657) and Cornelia, following Widow Verburgh’s sudden departure, was allocated to the new secunde, junior merchant Roelof de Man (from Culemborg).

Muster of Private & Company Slaves (Rijckloff van Goens, 16 April 1657)

- 4 female slaves [Cleijn Eva van Madagascar, Maria da Costa van Bengale, Maaij Ansel van Bengale & Lijsbeth van Bengale] &
- 1 male slave [Meijndert van Antongil with Commander [Jan van Riebeeck (from Culemborg)]
- 1 male slave [Espagniola] with the Sergeant [Jan van Harwaerden (from Zevender [Utrecht])]
- 1 female slave [Maria Zacharias: van Bengale] with the Sick-Comforter [Pieter van der Stael (from Rotterdam)]
- 1 female slave [Cornelia Arabus van Abisinna] with the Junior Merchant [Roelof de Man (from Culemborg)]
- 1 female slave [Lijsbeth Arabus van Abisinna] with the Gardener [Hendrick Hendricksz: Boom (from Amsterdam)]
- 1 Madagascar slave [Eva van Madagascar] to sweep the Fort
- 1 male slave [? Jan van Bengale] with the Barber [Jan Vetteman]

They remained Company slaves. This is confirmed by Van Riebeeck in a letter to the Heeren XVII. The Company’s slave lodge had yet to be built and Company slaves could not yet be housed together.

The new secunde, the unmarried De Man, soon died (6 March 1663). His personal slaves, Domingo, Thomas[so], Jan Meeu, Jacqje Joij and Maaij Claesje – all from Angola and captured from a Portuguese prize off the coast of Brazil, arriving at the Cape on the Amersfoort (1658), were sold from his deceased estate (27 March 1663). After this no further trace of Cornelia’s whereabouts has been found. Did she become part of the household of De Man’s successor, Abraham Gabbema (from The Hague)?

Cornelia was possibly mother to at least the following two children:

- b1 Arnozijn de Cleijne van de Caep (c. 1661-1733) heelslag born Cape c. 1661; Company slave possibly biologically fathered by either Paaij Claes van Guinea, Claes Kelder van Angola, Claes van Angola; baptized as adult (23 February 1687) becoming Company Slave Lodge matron (matres); being heelslag, manumitted (1701) in terms of Company regulations after 40 years enslavement; 3rd free-black woman granted property in Table Valley (June 1708); likely biological fathers of some of her 7 recorded children: free-black Jacqje Joij [later Gratias Maialas] van Angola, Company slave Jonas van de Cust & free-burgher Michiel Ley (from Basle [Switzerland])56; dies Cape 1733
Lijsbeth appears to have become incorporated into the households of successive Company gardeners: Hendrik Henricksz: Boom (Boomtje) and his wife Annetje.
Boom (from Overtoom); Jacob Hubertsz: [van] Rosendael (from Leiden) and his second wife Barbara Geems (from Amsterdam) and Herman Ernst Gresnicht (from Utrecht) and his wife Iltje Hendricks: (from Naerden).

Circumstantial evidence points (1666) to her being slave to recently widowed Barbara Geems - now remarried to free-carpenter Hendrick Reijnste: Gulix (c. 1639-1687) (from Dirksland), but whose new husband had been sent to Mauritius. During her husband’s five-month absence, the drummer Hendrik Coertsz: (from Deventer) was arraigned (4 August 1666) for assault and breaking into their house and calling Barbara Geems a whore and whoremonger. During the trial he claimed to have regular sex with both Barbara and her slave woman. On the evening preceding his arrest, he offered to pay for sex with her slave woman as usual. Although statements were taken from witnesses, none were taken from Barbara or her unnamed slave woman, in what appears to have been a controversial trial. Banished to Robben Island for three years, he was back on the mainland after two years promising to reform. Coertsz: was convicted again (7 November 1668) for soliciting sex from the female slaves in the Company Garden. Later, the stepson-in-law to Barbara, Adriaen Willemsz: van Brakel (from’s Hertogenbosch), purchased Lijsbeth’s likely daughter, Lijsbeth Sanders: (2 March 1671).

Lijsbeth was possibly mother to at least the following three children:

b1 Armozijn [de Groote] van de Caep (c. 1657-1713) joint will (1713) states aged about 55 years; illegitimate halfslag Company private slave; born Cape c. 1657; baptized as adult (17 September 1679) [Armosy een beiaerde Companijs meid]; listed as Cape Church member / communicant (23 April 1684) – with Beatrice van Cochin (future wife to Armozijn Claez:’s half-brother, Claes Cornelisz:) manumitted by Council of Policy resolution (8 May 1686); marries Drakenstein c. (1691/2) free-burgher Guilliam Frisnet (from Bergen-op-Zoom); witnesses following baptisms: 6 May 1678; 22 May 1678; 6 October 1680; 6 May 1685, 14 October 1685 & 12 April 1711); in baptismal entry for nephew Willem, infant’s mother [Lijsbeth Sanders:?] unnamed & referred only as “Armozijn’s sister”; dies childless in smallpox epidemic (1713); husband remarries (27 October 1715) Manda Gratia, former Company Slave Lodge matron (matres) & eldest daughter of Armozijn de Cleijne; [?] 1 child who probably dies in infancy:

c1[?] Margarita baptized Cape 29 July 1685; dies in infancy

b2 Elisabeth (Lijsbet/h) [Sa(a)nders: / Sandra: / Everts:] van de Caep (c. 1658- c. 1744) heeslslag; according to registered slave transfer (2 March 1671): aged 12; half-sister to halfslag Pieter Willemsz: Tamboer / Africano van de Caep (1660-1729) & foster sister to heeslslag Maria Everts: van de Caep - foster daughter of Hoen(a) / Houwj alias Anna van Guinea; [?] sold to Hendrik Hendriksz: Boom (from Amsterdam) confirming mother’s association with Boom’s household & fellow Company gardeners Wouter Cornelisz: Mostert (from Utrecht) & Hermann Ernst Greshnicht (from Utrecht) resold (6 January 1665) to Matthijs Coeijmans (from Ernsththal [Saxony]); in turn sells her (2 March 1671) to Adriaen (Baes Arie) Willemsz: van Brakel (from’s Hertogenbosch) – stepson-in-law to Barbara Geems (from Amsterdam) - new owner obliged, in terms of 2 Council of Policy resolutions (14 June & 14 July 1678), to cede her to free-black Louis van Bengale as settlement following her conviction (April 1678) for breaking into Louis’s house & stealing from him; Louis later manumits
her & her 2 children (27 July 1683); convicted & sentenced to flogging (5 January 1696) & 3 years hard labour in chains for housebreaking & theft; *de facto* marriages: (1) *Louis van Bengale*, (2) *Willem Teeerling [William Tarling?]* (from London, Middlesex, England) & (3) *Johann Herbst* (from Bremen):

c1  *Elisabeth (Lijsbeth) Louisz:* / *Louvice:* / *Louwise:* *Glim* / *Glam* baptized Cape 6 October 1680; manumitted with mother (27 July 1683); marries (1) *Hans Jürgens* (from Salzburg) arrives 1681; soldier; burgher 1688; marries (2) Stellenbosch 27 November 1724 *Jacobus Coetzee* (1680-c 1738) [s/o *Dirk Coetzee* & *Sara van der Schulp*); did he have an illegitimate child by *Cornelia Lammers*: van de Caap (d/o *Maria van Bengale*?) baptized Susanna Coetzer (baptized 1 April 1714?); 1707-1708: banished to Batavia59; farms at *Goede Rust* & *Non Pareille* (Daljosofat)

c2  *Willem Teeerling* junior baptized Cape 6 May 1685; manumitted with mother (27 July 1683); dies Stellenbosch 1713

c3  *Anna Louisz:* baptized Cape 1 / 7 [?] April 1685; marries (1) Stellenbosch 11 April 1706 *Casper Janse:* / *Johannis* van Cabo (s/o *Jan Luij* / *Leeuw van Ceylon* & *Dina van Coelang*); marries (2) Stellenbosch 15 April 1714 *Jacques Potjee* / *Pottier* (from Mohrum [Moscroom in Flanders?])

c4  *Maria Louisz:* baptized Cape 10 February 1686; marries Cape 9 August 1711 *Johannes Hoffmann* (from Langenberg) *Jan Hofman van den Berg jongman met Maria Louisz van de Caap*

c5  *Clara [Teeerling - adopts name Herbst]* born c. 1689; baptized Drakenstein [?]; dies 1714; marries 24 July 1712 *Johannes Harmensz:* *Potgieter*; he marries (2) 18 February 1714 *Maria Catharina van Eeden*

c6  *Gerbrecht / Gerbregt Herbst / Herfst* baptized Stellenbosch 1 October 1702; marries (1) 2 January 1718 *Johannes Vosloo*; marries (2) *Godfried Schuster*

b3  *Pieter Willemsz: Africano alias Tamboer* (1660-1729) *halfslag* born Cape c. 1660; [?] becoming free-burgher & drummer of Stellenbosch militia (hence nickname *Tamboer*); unnamed child dies in smallpox epidemic (1713); he dies at Drakenstein (1729) at place of niece’s husband, *Jacques Pottier* who marries daughter of his sister Lijsbeth Sanders; deceased mentioned as being “brother” to Lijsbeth Sanders in civil dispute between Lijsbeth Sanders & her son-in-law Pottier concerning his unpaid burial costs61.

The two *Armozijns* contrasted

Contemporaries, both women were Company slaves at the Cape. Both became active members of the Reformed Church. Armozijn *the elder* is recorded as a Cape Church member and communicant while the first will of Armozijn *the younger* makes special mention of her Christian faith. Both were baptized as adults sharing the exceptional name of *Armozijn*. This was an extraordinary departure from clerical convention. The name *Armozijn* is un-Christian. Usually children and adults at the Cape were baptized with Christian names. Although not originally ‘Christian’ names, pagan European and Graeco-Roman classical names are also included under the portmanteau ‘Christian’. Few exceptions can be found in the Cape’s earliest baptismal registers and usually given to children of slave or indigene mothers. These were invariably biblical names of a ‘heathen’ or less ‘chosen’ nature such as Thamar, Jeptha and Ismael. Also extraordinary, is the fact that both these women, although Cape-born, were never baptized by the Company as infants. Armozijn *the elder* was baptized (17 September
How slave children belonging to the Company, whether halfslag or heelslag, came to be overlooked or excluded from infant baptism begs the question in the cases of both Armozijns. It was VOC policy to baptize all infants born to slave women belonging to the Company. This policy was initially inconsistently applied at the Cape. Slave infants belonging to the Company appear not to have been baptized soon after the founding of the colony. This was at a time when the Cape did not yet have a resident minister. Initially, heelslag slave infants were excluded from baptism. Only some privately owned halfslag (mestizzo / mestizza and mulatto / mulatta) slave infants were baptized by visiting ministers. These were given preferential treatment being entitled to their freedom by virtue of their white paternity (visible or acknowledged) on attaining majority: at the age of 22 (girls) and 25 (boys). This was possible only after certain requirements had been met such as baptism and confirmation in the Reformed faith, command of the Dutch language and a nominal payment for their upkeep and education by the Company prior to freedom. With the arrival of the Cape’s first resident minister (1665), all Company slave infants, (whether halfslag or heelslag) were generally baptized on a regular basis. The pre-1665 heelslag and halfslag Cape-born Company-owned infants, however, remained overlooked and unbaptized.

When VOC Commissioner Hendrik van Rheede inspected the colony (1685), he noted unbaptized Cape-born slaves still housed in the Slave Lodge insisting that these children be baptized. Thereafter, baptisms of a number of Cape-born adult slaves – mostly female - belonging to the Company were recorded. Numerous examples exist in the records showing that Cape free-burghers and Company officials often sold, exchanged, relinquished, abandoned, forfeited or bequeathed their slaves to the Company. Legal niceties, as always, came into play. Baptized slaves (whether heelslag or halfslag) were forbidden in terms of Roman-Dutch law to be sold. It was thus bad economics to baptize a privately owned slave. Once baptized, a slave was ipso facto devalued. This legal saw resulted in many private owners, never baptizing their slaves, whether adult or infant – and even if the infants of their slave women were halfslag and consequently entitled (at least theoretically) to their eventual freedom. This created an anomalous situation: former privately owned unbaptized slaves - also infants and older children - were taken up into the Company Lodge. So too, were baptized halfslag children alienated from their mothers (now newly sold to other private owners) and taken up into the Company as ‘slaves’ until attaining majority and meeting the other prescribed requirements.

Armozijn the elder’s life took a different path to that of Armozijn the younger. The former was halfslag, the latter heelslag. The terms heelslag and halfslag were vital concepts determining a person’s legal status during the Cape’s VOC-occupation. The elder Armozijn obtained her freedom in terms of her known or visibly obvious white paternity. This was officially acknowledged and formalized in terms of a resolution of the Council of Policy (8 May 1686) even though patronymic-less and having no
acknowledged, identifiable or discernible European, white or Christian father. Could her mother not recall the man who actually fathered her child? Was she raped? Was she gang raped? Or was it deemed politically expedient to suppress the biological father’s name, especially if he were a little too highly ranked in the VOC hierarchy? Manumissions of halfslag majors were generally automatic and seldom ratified in terms of resolutions of the governing Council of Policy. Perhaps the resolution was necessary as her freedom as halfslag was already overdue and in question for some time. Had she been less white looking than other Cape halfslags in the VOC hierarchy? Manumissions of halfslag majors were generally automatic and seldom ratified in terms of resolutions of the governing Council of Policy. Perhaps the resolution was necessary as her freedom as halfslag was already overdue and in question for some time. Had she been less white looking than other Cape halfslags in the VOC hierarchy?
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Her (contested?) paternity, the younger Armoijn (like many others) openly asserted by using a patronymic: Armoijn Claesz.: Conceivably, either of the contemporary slaves, Paaij Claes van Guinea (died 1709) and Claes van Angola, could have been her biological father. Was she unable to invoke successfully any white paternity, only gaining her freedom after long and faithful service as matron (matres) to the Company’s slave children? Her manumission accords with the obligatory 40-years service required for Cape-born heelslag slaves to qualify for manumission set down by the visiting VOC commissioner in 1685. She was already in possession of land (by 20 April 1702) in Table Valley eventually formally granted to her (30 June 1708). Her halfslag half-brother, Claes Cornelisz, was freed earlier at majority (aged 25) in terms of his unchallenged birthright. As a halfslag, Armoijn the elder was legally entitled to marry also a European or white man. She married the Fleming, Guilliam Fri(e)snnet (from Bergen op Zoom). Their legal marriage, probably at Drakenstein (register has not survived) where they settled, is confirmed by their joint will (13 May 1713). The right of lawful and holy matrimony was denied the heelslag Armoijn the younger. She died (1733) an old woman - still unmarried notwithstanding her substantial progeny. Armoijn the elder was childless. Her surviving husband married at the Cape (27 October 1715) Manda Gracia, the daughter of Armijn the younger. Effectively, Armoijn the younger became mother-in-law to the deceased Armoijn the elder’s husband.

**Armoijn the elder**

A Company slave, she was born at the Cape (c. 1657). At the time of her baptism (17 September 1679), she was already at least 22 years old. Adult baptism required legal majority. Women qualified for majority status at the age of 22. She was probably born at the Cape before the arrival (1658) of two slave shiploads of slaves from Angola (Amersfoort) and Guinea (Hasselt). Her mother would have been one of the very few female slaves at the Cape at the time. These women were:

- **Maria da Costa van Bengale (Marij)** arrives ex Batavia in Return Fleet (1655), woman purchased in Batavia & private slave of Jan van Riebeeck; childless according to wills & deceased estate papers;
- **Maria van Bengale (Maria Sacharias:)** arrives ex Batavia in Return Fleet (1655) [?] - private slave woman belonging to (1) Hendrik Hendricksz: Boom (from Amsterdam), (2) Pieter van der Stael (from Rotterdam) & (3) Jan Zachariasz: (from Amsterdam) whom she married; 2 daughters (Maria and Hester Jans);
• Eva van Madagascar arrives ex Madagascar on Tulp (12 December 1654) Company slave woman purchased (with heelslag son Jan Bruijn) on Madagascar by Frederik Verburgh; sent to Batavia with no further offspring at the Cape;

• Catharina Anthonis: (from Zalagon in Bengal) arrives ex Batavia in Return Fleet (5 March 1656) - private slave woman of Caspaer van den Bogaerde, Councillor Extraordinary of India & commander of return fleet & sold to Jan Woutersz: (from Middelburg) whom she married; 1 unnamed daughter born before departing from the Cape;

• Elisabeth (Lijsbeth) Arabus & Cornelia Arabus van Abisinna arrive ex Madagascar on St Georges (25 March 1656) - private slave pubescent girls given as gifts to Maria de la Queillerie by visiting French Admiral De-la-Roche-St. André – expropriated by Commissioner Van Goens.

• Catharina (Groote Catrijn) van Paliacatta arrives on Prins Willem (21 February 1657) – convict woman exiled for life as Company slave); children identified;76

• Angela (Maaij Ansel) van Bengale & Elisabeth (Lijsbeth) van Bengale arrive on Amersfoort (21 February 1657) – private slave woman of Jan van Riebeeck purchased from Return Fleet’s Rear-Admiral Kemp); children identified77;

• Cleijn Eva van Madagascar (arrives ex Madagascar on La Maréschale (31 March 1657) - private slave girl (aged 5) sent by the ‘king’ of Antongil as a gift to Maria de la Queillerie – expropriated by Commissioner Van Goens;

Of these, there were only five Company female slaves: the Malagasy slaves Eva and Cleijn Eva, the convict Groote Catrijn van Paliacatta and the Abyssinian slave girls Lijsbeth Arabus and Cornelia Arabus. Only the offspring of three of these slaves have yet to be positively identified. Given the very young age of Cleijn Eva, we are only left with two likely contenders for the mothers of the two Armozijns: Lijsbeth and Cornelia Arabus.

The patronymic-less Armozijn the elder’s biological paternity remains unknown. Her father was accepted to be European as she was formally acknowledged (1686) as being halfslag.79 Armozijn was one of the Cape’s earliest slave children born to the new colony. She first appears on record (1663) as Armazie with three other Cape-born slave children. The Cape’s second commander, Zacharias Wagenaer (from Dresden) and his council, approving the teacher’s salary for the colony’s children, further resolved that “[i]n the same way the baptized slave children of the Company and the burghers, especially those descended from European or Christian fathers should be educated and in time brought to the true knowledge of God, as the sick comforter had already done in the case of Armazie, Crisen, Zon and Basoe – a laudable commencement.”80

Was Armazie the colony’s first halfslag? She is the first mentioned of the colony’s four eldest school-going slave children. Although a Company slave at the time of her baptism, she probably grew up in the households of high-ranking Company officials. She was only later baptized as an adult (17 September 1679).81

Armowy een belaerde Companijs meit

Armozijn the elder witnessed (6 October 1680) the baptism of Elisabeth, the daughter of the privately owned, Cape-born heelslag slave woman, Lijsbeth Sanders:82

Elisabeth  Elisabeth een slavin van Lovys van Bengale  Armowy de Grote.
The child was fathered by the mother’s owner, free-black and free-burgher Louis van Bengale. Armozijn *the elder* could witness the baptism as she herself was already baptized. To qualify as a witness, the witness had to be already baptized. In later life, this child went by the names Elisabeth (Lijsbeth) Louisz: Glam / Glim. Likely family ties seem evident. Were Armozijn and Lijsbeth sisters? Armozijn not only witnessed the baptism of an unnamed presumably sister’s child (1685), she also later witnessed the baptisms of two of Lijsbeth’s grandchildren. Armozijn *the elder* next makes an appearance (23 April 1684) in the records becoming a Cape Church member with the matron of the Slave Lodge and future wife to Claes Cornelisz: (brother to Armozijn *the younger*), Beatrice van Cochin (c. 1650-1720), and teacher at the Slave Lodge, Jan Pasquael. This is reflected in the church's list of communicants (communicanten):


On 6 May 1685 the child of Armosys *suster* (Armozijn’s sister) - unnamed in the baptismal entry - was baptized with the name Willem. The godparents (*peeten*) were Armozijn *the elder* and Jan Pasquael:

*Willem* een kind van Armosys *suster* peeten Armosy en Jan Pasquael.

Armozijn *the younger* was still unbaptized and could not have witnessed the baptism. Also in the same year (14 October 1685), Groot Armosij witnessed the baptism of the infant son of Maria Sara, named Dirk Johannes, fathered by one Dirk Adam:


The child’s mother was most probably the Company *halfslag* Maria Schalks: (daughter of Sara de Waster alias Koddo van Guinea) and the father the *halfslag* Dirck van de Caep (son of Sobba alias Lijsbeth van Angola) slave to Gresnicht but uncontrollable and apt to run away was given concessory premature freedom. The elder Armosy witnessed (30 December 1685) with Jan Pieters: the baptism of Hendrick, the infant son of the soon-to-be-married Sara van Solor and Claes Gerritsz: van Bengale:

den 30 decem:[ber] [1685] Hendrick Claes Gerritsen van Bengalen en Sara van Solor Armosy en Jan Pieters.

Sara was private slave to Company official (and later free-burgher), Willem van Diden (from Amsterdam), and his wife Margaretha Frans: Meeckhoff, the widow Heinrich Heinrichssen (from Sürwürden [Oldenborg]). Claes had served in the households of successive Cape commanders: Van Quaelbergen, Borghorst and Hackius. He probably arrived from Batavia with Wagenaer’s entourage when taking up his post as the Cape’s second commander (May 1662) or sometime soon thereafter.

On Wednesday, 8 May 1686 three *halfslag* Company slave women were manumitted by resolution of the Council of Policy. One was Armozijn *the elder*. The other two (presumably both *mulatta*) were Maria Schalks: and Jannetje Bort. All three women were servants of Simon van der Stel who had decided to streamline his
household. Were there doubts as to their right to liberty in terms of white or European paternity, particularly in the case of Armozijn the elder, as hinted by the council’s rationalization that it would be unfair to return them to labour again as Company slaves after serving in the governor’s household.88

In tegenwoordigheid van den E.Hr. Commandeur en alle d’ andere leden. D’ E. Heer Commandeur, kennende ‘t gewigt van een welgestelde regering, en wetende dat om deselve in vrede en voorspoed te bestieren niet meerder vereischt word als wel te belônen en scharpelijk te straffen; en hebbende so goede als kwade zedert dat zijn E. ‘t bewind deses commendements anvaarde van beids volslage preuves gehad, en thans sig bij ‘t versoekschript van drie der E.Comps. lijfjeigene slavinnen gelegenheid anbiedende om door een krachtig voorbeeld an die dienstbare menschen den weg tot d’ onwaardeerlijke vrijheid door haar trouw en deughdsâmheid te banen, en op dat de hoop om deselve t’ eniger tijd te kunnen erlangen, d’ andere onder ‘t jock van een sware slavernij anmoedige, So is ‘t dat zijn E., overwogen hebbende de langduurige en trouwe diensten der drie voors. slavinnen, Maria Schalck, Armosijn van de Caap and Jannetje Bort, der selver versoek in Rade voor te dragen, bewogen is; waarop eenpaarlijk geresolweert, angemerckt de supplianten alle drie gedoopt en van Christe vaders zijn en dat eene van deselve bereids lidmaat der Gereformeerde Kerkke is, en dat d’ andere twee in hare in dih Christelijk werck in korten staan te volgen; en dewijl ‘t niet geraden soude zijn dese elendige menschen, bij de reductie die d’ E.Hr.Commandeur ontreent zijn dienstboden heeft gemaackt, deselve wederom na Comps. logie bij dien ruijfien hoop te senden, haar in volle vrijdom te stellen en te vergunnen haar alhier bij alle toegestâne neringen nevens andere vrije personen ‘t erneren. Aldus gearreesteed en besloten in ‘t Casteel de Goede Hoop, jaar en dag als vooren.


Maria Schalks: (c. 1664-1700) also features in the life of Armozijn the younger, her brother Claes Cornelisz.; the teacher (schoolmeester) at the Company Slave Lodge, and his wife Maaij Beatrice van Cochin (c. 1650-1720), the freed slave woman and former matron (matres or matrice) of the Company Slave Lodge. One of the children of the Guinea slave Koddo / Prodo or Cladoor / Pladoor, she was freed by the Company (1687). Blood ties between the two families, however, seem unlikely. Family ties are specifically mentioned in the various extant testamentary legacies of Armozijn the younger and her family. Beatrice and her husband were clear about blood ties when making numerous testamentary legacies. So was Armozijn Claesz.; The family links manifest themselves again in the deceased estate of Manda Gracia where monies were owing to Maije Battrice and when Frans van Leeuwen (c. 1701-1726) appointed as heirs, his maternal grandmother Armozijn Claesz.; and later his siblings. Nevertheless, Claes Cornelisz; and his wife Maaij Beatrice witnessed (23 September 1691) the baptism of Maria Schalks:’s daughter Anna Heyns:

Den selfden dito [23 September 1691] een kindt gedoopt waervan vader is Paul Henghysz [illeg.] de moeder Maria Schalk, als getuigen stondt Claas Cornelisse, met zijn huijsvrou Bertris van Coutchien, is genaemt Anna.

They also witnessed (26 April 1705) the baptism of Maria Schalks:’s grandson Michiel Eksteen:
Although not a blood relative, provision too was made for Michiel Eksteen to inherit a legacy from the joint estate of his godparents, Claes Cornelisz: and Maaij Beatrice.89 Significantly, the child’s father, Heinrich Ooswald Eksteen (c. 1678–1747) (from Löbenstein), was also executor to Maaij Beatrice’s deceased estate.90 The fact that Maaij Beatrice witnessed (13 February 1716) the confirmation of the Company slave Johanna Kemp (c. 1689-1778) and that in her will she bequeathed a substantial legacy to her two-year old slave girl Maria van de Caab (daughter of Christina van Bengale by an unnamed father, baptized 1 October 1719), providing for Maria’s manumission and to be allowed to join the household of Jacob Krüger (from Sadenbeck) and his wife, Johanna Kemp, points to a continued association with the family of Maria Schalks:.91

Circumstantial evidence points to Johanna being the daughter of Cecilia Swerisse (died 1713) and the granddaughter of Janne Bastijaens: – all Company slaves.92 Intermarriage is also evident. Cecilia Kruger, Johanna Kemp’s daughter, married (21 August 1738) Heinrich Hesse (from Mulheim), the widower of Armozijn Claesz:’s granddaughter Maria Francina Cleef (c. 1708-1738).

Armozijn the elder is listed in the muster roll (1690) as part of an interesting cluster of closely associated free-black people and Europeans:

- Christian Meijnders [Meijn?]93
- the compagnons [partners] Guillaume Frisnet & Leendert Donsesel
- Gerrit Jansz: [van Ewijk?]
- Armozijn van de Caap
- Marij van de Caep [Maria Schalks:?]
- Bastiaan Colijn
- Marye Vertsz [Maria Everts:?]
- Anna van Guinea

The muster roll (1691) again mentions Armozijn van de Caab. Armozijn the elder married (sometime c. 1691/1692) at the Drakenstein church (Paarl). The marriage register for Drakenstein for the early period no longer exists.94 Their legal marriage is confirmed by their joint will (13 May 1713).95 In the opgaaf (1692), Armozijn appears with her new husband at Drakenstein. No children are listed. Her neighbours were Jan Schupping and Hester Weijers: Klim (from Lier), now married to her second husband, Jan Holsmit (from Zittard [in Limburg]), and who had the slave woman Sabba [Lijsbeth van Angola] in her household (1665).96 It was Sobba the slave of Hester Weijers: Klim’s who baptized an infant named Dirk (1665) already mentioned above. Armozijn the elder’s husband Guillaume Frisnet hailed from Bergen op Zoom (present-day Belgium). Prior to their marriage, he fathered a daughter Margaretha by Anna van de Kaep.97 Is the mother an error for Armozijn and did this child die in infancy?

eodem dito [29 July 1685] Margareta Anna van de Kaep, slavin, vader is Guillaume Frisnet.

Thereafter, a childless Armozijn and her husband appear in the opgaaf (census rolls) for the years (1695, 1700, 1702, 1705, 1709 at Drakenstein) and (1712 in the Cape District). Their neighbours at Drakenstein (1695) were Godfried Meyhuysen and
Gerrit Jansz: van Ewyk. The latter was listed with them (1690) but soon thereafter went to Mauritius. There his halfslag wife Hester Jans: van de Caep committed adultery with her slave and was sent to the Cape, tried, and sentenced (14 September 1691) to be flogged and condemned to five years in chains. She was sent to the Cape on the Berg China.

The muster roll (1697) lists Frisnet and Armosy van de Caep in the company of the Cape-born halfslag Willem Basson and Barend Jansz: van Zwolle (and Cape-born wife halfslag Annatje L[akens]). They appear (1700) with Theunis Dircksz: van Schalkwyk and Jan Schupping as neighbours. In 1702 they appear with Andries Siewerts: and Gillis Cornelisz: van Swag as neighbours.

In 1705 their neighbours were Widow Barend Burchard and Martinus van Staden junior. They appear (1709) with Pieter Vermy (from Born) and Jan Pretorius junior, both unmarried. Armozijn and husband witnessed (16 November 1710) the baptism of Elsje, the daughter of Maria Louisz: / Louvisies: / Laurensz: Glam / Glim and Hans Jurgen(s): / Jurrien (from Salzburg) – together with the infant’s grandfather, Louis - also at the Cape Church. Armozijn witnessed (12 April 1711) the baptism of yet another grandniece [?], Margareta, the daughter of Elisabeth (Lijsbeth) Louisz: / Louvisese: / Laurensz: Glam / Glim and Hans Jurgen(s): / Jurrien (from Salzburg) – together with the infant’s grandfather, Louis - also at the Cape Church. Armozijn appears in the opgaafl (1712) for the last time with her husband - this time not at Drakenstein but in the Cape District - with Steven Vermy and Jan Jur[riejn] (from Lier) as neighbours. During the height of the Smallpox epidemic (first mentioned on 9 April 1713), Armozijn and her husband drew up their joint will (13 May 1713). The Journal (15 May 1713) records: “the burghers die of small-pox in large number”. Each appointed the other as heir and 25 Caabsz guldens were bequeathed to the church (Diaconie). The epidemic had claimed 160 lives (by 13 June 1713). It was reported (25 June 1713) that the smallpox was raging in the country – “not 20 healthy people in Drakenstein…” Armozijn the elder was one of the victims. The epidemic was over (by 17 December 1713) and “people commenced to marry again after the small-pox”.

Her husband remarried (27 October 1715) the eldest daughter of Armozijn the younger, Manda Gratia. Frisnet and his new wife Manda, one son and one daughter, are listed (1716) in the Cape District. Their neighbours were Servaas de Kock and Melt van der Spuy. Frisnet and Manda, one son and one daughter, are listed (1719) in the opgaafl. Their neighbours were Pieter Croeselingh and Nicolaas Gockelius. Frisnet owned numerous Asian slaves:

Anthonij van Bengale; Hillele van Macassar; Januarij van Malabar; Pieter van Cochin; Januarij van Bengale; Valentijn van de Caep; Jan van Macassar; Carem van Batavia; and Jason van de Cust.

Lijsbet [Sanders: / Sandra: / Everts:] van de Caep [Armosys suster?]

Lijsbeth is first mentioned in a slave transaction (2 March 1671). Aged 12, she was sold by free-baker, Matthijs (from Ernsththal [Saxony]) to free-master carpenter Adriaen (Baes Arie) Willemsz: van Brakel (from ‘s Hertogenbosch). His wife, appointed colony midwife (1685) by the Company, was Sara Jacobs: Rosendael (from Amsterdam), stepdaughter of Barbara Geems (from Amsterdam). Her likely mother Lijsbeth Arabus
was at that stage probably seconded Company slave in the household of Barbara Geems. She also had a foster mother. She was Anna van Guinea, later recorded as the free-black Hoena and previously recorded as Houwj, formerly a slave in Van Riebeeck’s household and de facto wife to Evert van Guinea, former slave of Jan van Riebeeck who freed him prematurely and gratuitously (1659) for collaboration. He had informed on the whereabouts of his fellow runaway slaves thereby obtaining his freedom.

No complete record of how Commander van Riebeeck, once transferred to Batavia (1662), disposed of his property (including many of his slaves) at the Cape survives. His farm at Bosheuvel was only sold long after his departure by public auction (28 November 1665). Van Riebeeck’s agents presumably sold the remainder of his slaves at an earlier date. Van Riebeeck’s former slave Anna was sold already (by 6 January 1665). Prior to his departure, Van Riebeeck had formally disposed of only some of his slaves. These sales are registered and written up in the Transporten en Schepenkennissen. The remainder of his slaves (including baptized infants) appear to have been sold after his departure with some even reverting to the Company. No record of their legal alienation has yet been found. As it was illegal to sell baptized slaves, these (if not manumitted) reverted to the Company until attaining legal majority. Halfslag slave children were baptized and taken up into the Company’s Slave Lodge. When Armozijn came to be separated from her mother and sister Lijsbeth Sanders: is not known. Slave owners did not necessarily have any qualms about separating mothers from unbaptized heelslag infants.

Van Riebeeck’s slave Anna and her heelslag foster daughter Lijsbeth Sanders: appear to have become property of Boomtjen and wife Annetje de Boerin. Van Riebeeck had taken away Anna’s infant heelslag son Jan Dirksz: and sold him to the fiscal Abraham Gabbema (25 August 1661). Boomtjen and his wife arrived at the Cape (6 April 1652) in the original fleet, the Drommedaris, with Jan van Riebeeck. They brought with them seven children. By the time they ended their stay at the Cape, they had a total of eight children. Boom in his initial capacity as first chief gardener for the Company had the use of Company slaves. This practice continued with both his successors: Jan Hubertsz: van Rosendaël (from Leiden) and his wife Barbara Geems (from Amsterdam); and also Boomtjen’s former knecht Herman Ernst Gresnicht (from Utrecht) and his wife Ijtje Hendricks: (from Naerden) who had also been superintendent of the Company slaves. Lisjbeth Arabus a seconded Company slave (formerly in the household of Van der Stael) still with young children in tow - including Armozijn the elder - perhaps then became seconded slave to Barbara. Anna had already been part of Boom’s household. The Booms also owned the slave Paaij Claes van Guinea and the slave Niclaes [Claes Kelder] van Angola. Many years later (1688) Paaij Claas and Anna re-united and lived together as a couple at Stellenbosch.

Barbertje Geems

She arrived at the Cape (1661) with her three stepdaughters: Cornelia (Neeltje), Sara and Maria to join her husband the Cape’s master gardener, Jacob Huijbertsz: van Rosendaël (from Leiden [South Holland]). Her stepdaughter married (13 October 1661) burgher and cobbler, Frans Gerritsz: Noortlander van den Uijthoorn, locally known as Frans de Lapper. Barbara’s husband died (2 March 1662). Nothing of any value was found in his house. He left “a poor widow again to become a mother, and two
Barbara baptized (8 October 1662) a daughter Machteltje born after her father’s death. Barbara (21 August 1663) signed an attestation concerning the slandering of Hester Weijers: Klim (from Lier) by Theuntje Bartels: van der Linde (Mrs Borns). After being engaged (18 August 1663), she remarried (2 September 1663) free-carpenter Hendrick Reijnste: [Gulix] (c. 1639-1687) (from Dirksland) appearing for the 1st time in the muster roll (1663). Provision was made for the education (30 November 1663) of her two minor stepdaughters, Sara and Maria, with the rest of the colony’s schoolgoing children – including Armazie (Armosijn the elder). They were taught pro deo with an unnamed ‘Hottentot’ boy (presumably Jacobus Meerhoff the son of Krotoa).

Barbara’s stepson-in-law, Frans de Lapper, and his servant were accused by the indigenes (23 May 1665) of stealing cattle. She baptized (23 August 1665) a daughter Helena. Adriana (Adriaentje) Sterrevelt (from Nieuw Nederland [New York]) later known as Adriaentje Brouwers, as orphan and ward of the Cape Church, was cared for by Barbara (1665-1669). Pleading poverty, her 2nd husband requested to be re-employed by the Company. A disappointment as burgher and considered to be a lazy farmer, he accompanied (24 June 1666) six other men on the flute Hoogh-Caspel to Mauritius. His family remained at the Cape. Undesirable, he was soon sent back to the Cape by Commander Wreede. He returned (November 1666) and resided near the Fort where he and his wife sold liquor.

During his 5-month absence, drummer Hendrik Coertsz: (from Deventer [Overijssel]) was arraigned (4 August 1666) for assault and breaking into the house of Barbara Geens huysvrouw van de vertrokken vrijman Hendrick Reijnste whom he called a “whore” and “whoremonger”. He claimed to have regular sex with both her and her slave woman (unnamed but likely Lijsbeth Arabus as seconded Company slave). On the evening preceding his arrest, he offered to pay for sex with her slave woman as usual. Although statements were taken from witnesses, none were taken from Barbara Geems, or her unnamed slave woman. He was banished to Robben Island for three years. He was back on the mainland after two years promising to reform. Coertsz: was convicted again (7 November 1668) for soliciting sex from the female slaves in the Company Garden.

Her stepson-in-law, Frans de Lapper, was convicted (8 October 1666) for bartering sheep with the indigenes. Barely back from Mauritius, her husband returned to attend the baptism of their son Leendert (14 November 1666). Her husband was convicted (9 April 1667) for selling sugar beer (suikerbier) and fined 6 reals-of-8 profisco. Her husband was accused (17 May 1667) of bartering sheep with the ‘Hottentots’. In defence, he claimed receiving them from Hans Ras/ch (from Angeln [Schleswig-Holstein]). The case was remanded for further investigation. Hendrik Reijnste van Dirxlan sued (18 June 1667) Ras for the bartered sheep (allegedly obtained illegally from the ‘Hottentots’) confiscated by the fiscal. Both he and Ras were fined.

The family adopted (1 March 1669) a ‘Hottentot’ infant (Hottentotoosje) rescued (24 January 1669) from being buried alive by local indigenes with her dead mother but the
infant died soon after baptism. At the request of Reijnsz., the ‘foundling’ was adopted. His wife nursed the child from the time of exhumation. With the consent of Commander Borghorst, the Cape Church Council allowed Reijnsz: and his wife to bring up the child on condition that she be brought up Christian. In return for her upbringing, the child could remain in their service until her majority or married. Failure to abide by these conditions, responsibility for the infant would revert to the Deaconate. Reijnsz: and Barbara took the unprecedented step of baptizing (3 March 1669) the infant Florida. This ceremony was the 2nd Cape baptism of an aborigine. The child died soon after – two or three months later (April or May 1669). The death is recorded in a marginalized note in both the minutes and the Cape’s first baptismal register. The cause of death is never stated.

At the time of Florida’s confiscation (24 January 1669), the widow Eva Meerhoff (born Krotoa) was accused of being a drunk, “playing the beast at night” and reverting to her native habits. A mere 15 days after Florida’s confiscation, a new Church Council was elected (8 February 1669). The council consisted of resident minister Adriaen de Voogd, the elders, Johannes Coon and Gresnicht (the last named replacing Elbert Dircx: Diemer) and two deacons, Adriaen Wils and Gerrit van der Bijl (replacing Jan Reijniersz: and Gresnicht). The council resolved at its very 1st sitting to confiscate Eva’s 3 Eurafrican children. Eva was reprimanded, but informed differently. If she did not change her ways, her children were to be taken away from her. She fled. Did she know about the resolution to confiscate her children anyhow?

Eva likely witnessed personally Florida’s confiscation. If not, she would have known about Florida’s abduction. Again residing amongst her own kind, and likely outraged by Dutch violation of her people’s customs, the Dutch retaliated by sealing Widow Meerhoff’s house (the old pottery, then a make-shift abode) confiscating her children and placing them in the temporary care of outgoing deacon, Jan Reijniersz: and wife Lijsbeth Jans:, considered to be “people of an honest and godly character” – even though Reijniersz:, notorious cattle and sheep rustler, had even once strung up the Goringhaiqua paramount chief Gogosoa (the ‘Fat Captain’) and held him hostage (4 May 1661).

In terms of the pre-emptive resolution, the Meerhoff children were placed in the care of Reijnsz: and Barbara (from 1 March 1669) who were already safeguarding the confiscated Florida. All 4 Dutch Hottentots were thus confined to one family. The fiscal Cornelis de Cretzer was instructed to find Eva and arrest her. Two days after the confiscation of her children (10 February 1669), Eva was arrested and thrown into the dungeon or black hole (donker gat) after an abortive attempt to rescue her children the night before. The same day as the church’s decision to seal Florida’s fate with Barbara (1 March 1669), Eva’s children were also put into Barbara’s care. Their disgraced mother was banished - without trial - to Robben Island (26 March 1669) until her untimely death (29 July 1674).

The two youngest Meerhoff children, Pieternella and Salomon were shipped off (1677) to Mauritius as wards (servants?) to Theuntje Bartholomeus: van der Linde and her Frisian husband, Bartholomeus Borns (from Waerden). The eldest, Jacobus Meerhoff, a free spirit in touch with his native side and prone to wander, was later sent to join his sister in Mauritius. Unwanted and unmourned, he died mysteriously on the
voyage back to the Cape. It is not known who looked after Eva Meerhoff's two illegitimate sons, Jeronimus and Anthonij, after her death. Did Barbara also take them in? Significantly, the Church Council and authorities did not ever officially concern themselves with these children. The records are silent. Only Anthonij appears to have reached adulthood and is recorded alone and without a family as a taxable free-burgher Anthonij Meerhoff (1712). In all probability, he died prematurely (1713), a victim of the smallpox epidemic.

Barbara sued for debts owing (5 November 1670) – her husband being absent. Her sureties were her stepsons-in-law Baes Arie and Frans de Lapper. The last-mentioned confessed (28 October 1671) to illegal bartering with the indigenes and was fined. In 1673 Baes Arie bought an erf 4608 from Barbara. This was his new home (until 1702). By 1670 Barbara’s 2nd husband had left the Cape for Batavia, once again leaving his family behind at the Cape. He never returned. Barbara witnessed (12 March 1673) the baptism of her granddaughter Elisabeth. This child died in infancy but she again witnessed the baptism of another granddaughter (13 May 1674), also named Elisabeth. On 9 May 1678 her stepdaughter Maria Jacobs: Rosendael married Cornelis Wobma (from Amsterdam). She witnessed (16 April 1679) with Baes Arie) the baptism (16 April 1679) of another step-granddaughter Elisabeth. On 19 July 1682 her daughter, Helena Reijnekes: Gulix (Leen de Schout), married the surgeon Willem ten Damme (from Oldenzeel) who had fathered an illegitimate child by Maria Everts; daughter of Evert van Guinea and Anna van Guinea. The wife of Baes Aries was appointed midwife (1685) by the Company. Barbara manumitted (11 November 1685) her slave Jan van Ternate on payment of Rds 60. The records refer (23 August 1687) to Reijns: being deceased in Batavia. His heirs were his stepsons-in-law, the burghers Baes Arie and the surgeon Ten Damme. Barbara died (1688). Her slave Catharina van Madagascar (13) was sold (22 February 1688) by Norwegian Cornelis Petersen Linnes (from Christiania [Oslo]) at the public auction of her deceased estate to Diederick Potter for f150 (Cape valuation).

Lijsbeth Sanders: as Coeijmans slave

A repatriating Boom, sold (6 January 1665) his entire establishment (his house and erf in Table Valley) to the baker Matthijs Coeijmans / Cooman (from Ernsthal [Saxony]). This included his two slaves “and 2 children”: Anna van Guinea and Claes Kelder van Angola. Were the heelslag Lijsbeth Sanders: and Maria Everts: (Anna’s daughter by Evert) the two children sold that day?

Matthijs Coeijmans was the son of Machiel Coeijmans. [He married in the Netherlands] He married Catharina (Cathrijn) de Clerck. Was Leendert de Clerck her father or brother? They had two daughters: Anna (baptized Cape November 1666) and Maria (baptized Cape 22 September 1669). When the burgher Thomas Christoffel Muller (from Leipzig) left the Cape, Coeijmans took over his bakery rights. The knecht of Coeijmans died (1 April 1665) from injuries sustained in an attack by Cape indigene named pejoratively Dick Cop by the Dutch (een Hottento onder de Duijtsce Dick Cop genaemt). He had been stoned. The burghers Jan Reijniersz: and Coeijmans were convicted (27 May 1666) for theft. The matter was remanded until further evidence could be furnished. Coeijmans exchanged (8 July 1670) his place (including a newly built house) with that of Jochum Marquart (from Gorcum) moving from Table Valley to
a farm situated between the Company's Orchard and Bosheuvel. The farm was adjacent to Rustenburg, the Company's guesthouse (Iusthuijs). Coeijmans, his wife and children, however, left the Cape soon thereafter (1671).

Prior to leaving, they sold most of their possessions. These included the slaves: Thomas van Bengale, the 10-year-old Jacob\(^151\) van Macassar, Anthonij van Angola and Claes Kelder van Angola (born c. 1647). Coeijman’s slave, Claes - then 24 - was sold (2 March 1671) to Dirk Jansz: Smiend (from Groningen). Now manumitted (although no record has been found) by the Coeijmans, Anna van Guinea, and her daughter Swarte Maria Everts:, joined freed slave Evert van Guinea making her first appearance, albeit unnamed, in the census (1670). Evert probably purchased the freedom of his de facto wife and daughter. Regina van Guinea and Anna were sisters.\(^152\) Regina's likely daughter was Cape-born mulatta, Lijsbeth Jans:, who married free-burgher Jan Andriessen de Jonker van Rijssen / Arendsorp (from Koenigsberg) who gave his name to Jonkershoek valley at Stellenbosch. The Swarten Evert van Guinea - also recorded as de vrije Caffer Evert - was granted land, a garden in Table Valley, by Commander Jacob Borghorst (1669). He was freed by Van Riebeeck for revealing the whereabouts of runaway slaves (his compatriots!) during the mass slave desertion (1659).

Anna was assaulted by the slave woman of Steven Jansz: Botma (from Wageningen) who was subsequently convicted (2 September 1680) and punished. Anna had verbally abused her beyond endurance. Anna and Evert are listed in the census (1671, 1672, 1673, 1674-8, 1679, 1682 and 1685). He purchased a garden adjoining his original garden in Table Valley (1678) from Hendrik Evertsz: Schmidt (from Ibbenbüren). Anna’s sister is mentioned in the census (1682). In 1682 they also farmed at Welgelegen at Stellenbosch. This farm he purportedly sold (1685) to Norwegian Andries Oelfsen (from Oslo) the title deeds for which land Oelofsen only requested (1715). Anna was widowed (by 1688) and listed with 1 daughter and 12 cattle in the Opgaaf at Stellenbosch. Her neighbour was Johann Herbst (from Bremen).

Despite her established properties in Table Valley, she continued farming at Stellenbosch where freed slaves from Guinea had settled (Paaij Claes, Maria, Abraham and ‘wife’ Koddo or Plad Oor). Koddo was mother to mulatta Maria Schalks: and Maria was mother to heelslag Bruijnette van de Caep (born c. 1675). Also farming at Stellenbosch was Jan de Jonker. His wife was Cape-born mulatta Lijsbeth Jans:, daughter of Anna’s sister, Regina. Significantly, the free-black farmers at Stellenbosch (all initially at Jonkershoek) all once slaves belonged to prominent burghers: Coeijmans (Anna van Guinea and Anthonij van Angola), the two brothers, Wouter Cornelisz: and Jan Cornelisz: Mostaert (Manuel van Angola and de facto wife Lijsbeth (Sobba) van Angola and Dina van Quilon, wife of Jan Leeuw or Luij van Ceylon), and Joannes Pretorius (Maria van Guinea and Paaij Claes van Guinea).

Anna’s household included the lodger mulatta Maria Schalks: (1689), her foster daughter Lijsbeth Sanders, free-burgher Bastiaen Colijn (from ’s Gravenhagen) and his concubine - Anna’s heelslag daughter Maria Everts:. Anna is listed (1691) in Table Valley with two daughters, Lijsbeth Everts: - later known as Lijsbeth Sanders: - and Maria Everts:) and (1695) with five children (presumably grandchildren).\(^153\)
She is recorded (1692, 1696 & 1700) as Hoena living as ‘wife’ of Paaij Claas. 1687 Paaij Claes already settled (1687) as free-black in the new colony at Stellenbosch. Although he is earliest on record at Stellenbosch (by 1690), he contracted already (15 October 1687) with free-black Louis van Bengale. Paaij Claes would help Louis on his new Stellenbosch farm Bengale, and in return, Louis would feed Claes and allow him to work his own piece of ground. The land would be big enough to grow one muid of wheat. For each year, more land would be added to two muids, and so on.

Paaij Claes signed a contract (2 January 1694) with Johann Herbst (from Bremen). Now old and retired, he and his concubine (bysit) [Anna] would be provided with food and cared for in exchange for helping in the garden and on the lands. Herbst could use the garden for his own needs as well as the 6 oxen belonging to Paaij Claes. The contract would be valid until both Paaij Claes and Herbst were formally granted farms. Paaij Claes appeared in 2 court cases (1696), first as defendant and then as plaintiff. He was sued by Claes Vegtman (from Merano [in the Tyrol]) and he sued free-black Jan Leeuw or Luij van Ceylon. Paaij Claes alias Claes Swart was questioned by the court (6 and 20 September 1707). Paaij Claes died (1709) - still no farm and only ever disclosing his personal wealth to amount to no more than 8 oxen in the annual tax rolls.

Anna’s Cape-born daughter Maria Everts: (c. 1662-1713) better known as Swarte Maria, was a formidable individual in her own right. The Englishman Samuel Briercliffe who met her described her thus: “She is a tall woman, very black, having sparkling eyes which, though frightful in her, yet would be very killing in an English face, but she is a very good hostess, and provides for us splendidly and neatly withal”. Van Riebeek’s illustrious granddaughter and wife to the Governor-General at Batavia, Maria van Hoorn, en route from Batavia to the Netherlands recorded (15 February 1710) meeting Swarte Maria, daughter of the woman who had worked as a slave in the house of her grandparents and had looked after her father (Abraham van Riebeek, also later VOC Governor-General at Batavia) when he was a baby. This woman had given her a little bag of seeds to send to Bastavia. She noted further: “It seems that these people still have a great affection for our family”.

She was baptized at the Cape Church as an adult (29 March 1676) with her daughter Anna (father unnamed). Just prior to her marriage she was sentenced to six months hard labour (22 March 1679) for harbouring an absconded female slave. She married (5 November 1679) free-black Jacqje Joij van Angola later known as Gracias Maijalas. The Cape-born heelslag Manda Gracia: (c. 1679-1719), daughter of Armozijn the younger, may have been biological daughter of Jacqje Joij. He and his wife were legally separated, however (3 July 1680), after he accused her of trying to poison him. Thereafter he disappears from the records.

Maria Everts: had illegitimate children by various European men inter alia: resident surgeon Willem ten Damme (from Oldenzeel), one Kraak and free-burgher Bastiaan Jansz: Colijn (from s’ Gravesend). She is listed in the census (1691, 1693, 1698 and 1700). She died an extremely wealthy woman during the smallpox epidemic (1713). She owned today’s Camps Bay, the farm Klawervlei at Darling having grazing and hunting rights in ‘t veld by de Sonquasfonteyn and aan de Drooge valley buyten de Groene Cloof.
Lijsbeth Sanders (now 12-years-old) and described as zeker meijt slavin van d’Caep was sold by Coeijmans on (2 March 1671) to master carpenter Adriaen (Baes Arie) Willemsz: van Brakel (from ’t Hertogenbosch) and wife - the midwife Sara Jacobs: van Rosendael\(^1\) (from Amsterdam). They had married at the Cape (28 May 1670). She was daughter of master gardener Jan Hubertsz: Rosendael (from Leiden) and stepdaughter of widow, Barbara Geems (c. 1627-1688) (from Amsterdam). The elder Armozijn’s likely biological mother was for a time a seconded slave to Barbara.

**Lijsbeth Sanders: slave to Louis van Bengale**

Thereafter, Lijsbeth was transferred to free-black Louis van Bengale. The purchase took place after she had been apprehended (1678) for breaking and entering into the house of Louis and for theft. Her accomplices were two sailors (one being named Bart Koop...) who were convicted and banished to Robben Island. As ‘punishment’, she was ceded to the victim of her criminal actions, Louis, as compensation for damages suffered:\(^2\)

\[89\]

Confessien en Interogatorium des Jaars 1677 tot 1687

Compareende voor de naargenoemde Gecommitt:[ede]ns \textit{Lijsbeth slavin van de Baas Timmerman} Adriaen van Brakel, de welke ter requisitie van M[onseigneur]r: Tobias Vlasvath Fiscaal in loco vrij willigh heeft geconfesseert ende beelden, dat op voorleden Donderdagh wesende aan deser loopende maandt sij Confessant van een Hottento genaamt Corhaeij voor twee Dubbelse stij;[we]rs heeft geruijlt een gulde ringh en 3 paar silvered cnoopjes, welcke goud ringh sij Confessant op Saturdagh jongstleden ’s morgens vroegh aan de slaven van de borgerraet Elbert Diemer (gen:[aem]t Mari)\(^3\) heeft in bewaringh gegeven, mitsgaders den selvende dagh s’ middags aan Bastiaen Hendricksz Gijbergh alhier aan lant bescheiden, de voorgenoeemde 3 paar silvere cnoopen In’t Fort de Goede Hoop a[m]d[omin]ij 28 April 1678.

’t teeken XXX van de Confessante voorn[oom]t

Ons presendet

[signed] J. Kroon
[signed] J.L Falckenreijck

Mij Present

[signed] A. de Man
secre[et]arijs

Compareerde voor de naargenoemde gecommitee:[de]ns de voornoemde Confessante de welcke ondermael op scherpen examinatien haar voorgaende belijdenisse voor sooovele noch geaalteneert en gamplixeert dat sij op Donderdagh voorzv naar haar best onthoud tegens den avondt haar na ’t huys van de borger Louis van Bengale heeft begeven, makende alvoorrens ’t venster aan de zijde van ’t huys, ’t welck met twee spijkers was toegemaekt open wanneer sij Confessante haar nade achter deur begaf, de welcke zij open bevondt en weder na haar te deede gaande daar op in huys en vervolgens inde Camer, als wanneer sij bovenop het houte Casje inde Camer een spijker vondt, net de welcke sij het gemelde Casje open maeckt, nemende daar uit een gouden ringh, 3 paar silvered cnoopjes en partij gelt sondere weten hoe veel als wanneer sij haar uitij ’t venster tot dien eijnde opengemaekt weder na buijten begaf tot voorcomingh dat ’d sij door de slaaf van gemelte Louis nietmoest worden ondect, hebbende sij Confessante noch dien eijgen dagh omtrent deself van ’t
gemelde gelt aan Bastiaen Hendricxsz voor het huis van de borgers Arnoldus Willemsz [Basson] gegeven, om dat denselve presenteerde voorn:oemde gelt voor haar Confessante te bewaren, mitsgaders ’s anderen daags s’ morgens noch aan een matroos alhier aan hndt genaamt Bart Koop... [name left incomplete] Voor haar meesters huis al het resterende gelt de wijle den selven seijde gelt voor haar Confess:ante ter gelijcx te willen bewaren. In’t Fort de Goede Hoop a[nno]d[ominij] 30 April 1678

’t merk XXX van de Confess:ante voorn:oemt

Ons present
[signed] J. Cruse

[signed] J. Falckenrijck

Mij present
[signed] A.[dries] de Man
secr[e)t[ari]s

Her romantic involvement with Louis and ensuing pregnancy explain his further motives for acquiring her.

Born c. 1652, a former slave of the Cape’s 2nd commander, Zacharias Wagenaer (from Dresden), who brought him to the Cape from Batavia (May 1662), Louis was sold (25 September 1666) by his patron to secunde Hendrik Lacus (from Wesel) and his wife, Lijdia de Pape. His thieving 2nd owner fell into disfavour with the Cape’s new commander, Cornelis van Quaerbergen, who had him confiscated while detaining his master on Robben Island. Promised his freedom by visiting VOC Commissioner Rijckloff van Goens, this only materialized later. He was baptized (5 May 1675) aged 23 years.

Den 5 Maij [1675] een bejaart Persoon en vrij jongh man sijnde een Bengaall van natije, out onrent drij en twintigh jaar en was genaamt Louijs.

Thereafter he played an active role in the church witnessing numerous baptisms at the Cape Church. He was granted a garden in Table Valley (1 June 1676) and an erf (1 September 1676).164 Heavily in debt, he borrowed money from Andries Houwer (and Jacob van Heur)165 and also owed money to burgher Aernout Willemsz Tamboer (from Rotterdam).166 He owned the following slaves:

Anthonij van Coromandel;167 Matthijs van Java / Malabar168; and, Titus van Sambou / Macassar).169

Armozin the elder’s regular and close association with the free-black Louis and his 3 daughters, Elisabeth, Anna and Maria, confirms family ties. She was very likely maternal aunt, perhaps even ‘surrogate mother’, to Louis’s daughters. Although Hattingh covers Louis’s stormy relationship with Lijsbeth quite extensively, closer scrutiny of the existing records reveals important overlooked details. He does not consider the possibility or explore this likely relationship in his seminal reconstruction of the tempestuous life of Louis’s runaway concubine and fiancée, the criminally inclined Cape-born heelslag Lijsbeth and her progeny. 170
Lijsbeth baptized (6 October 1680) her daughter fathered by her former owner, Louis. The child was named Elisabeth - after the child’s grandmother Lijsbeth Arabus? Significantly, the baptism was witnessed by the infant’s likely maternal aunt the Company slave Armosij de Grote. In later life the child went by the names Elisabeth (Lijsbeth) Louis Glam / Glim.

Louis manumitted (27 July 1683) his slave Lijsbeth mijn meijt genaemt Lijsbeth van Cabo and her two children [Lijsbeth and Willem?] on condition that she serve him for one more year. A thorough search of the baptismal register reveals no other obvious child of Lijsbeth being baptized. Who was her 2nd child? He appears to have been the son named Willem fathered by Louis’s knecht Middlesex-born Englishman, William Teerling [Tarling]?

Louis acquired a farm (1684) of 29 morgen at the new colony at Stellenbosch - registered Bengale. At this time Louis fathered a 2nd child by Lijsbeth. This child was baptized Anna (1 April 1685). The child’s mother Lijsbeth Sanders appears to be mistakenly recorded as Maria van de Caep with the scribe omitting the mother’s name and recording Maria van de Caep twice as both mother and witness. The witness was Swarte Maria, the mother’s foster sister and foster aunt to the baptized child.

The following month (6 May 1685), the child of “Armozijn’s sister”, by Teerling was baptized Willem. Mother and father are both unnamed in the baptismal entry. The mother is merely alluded to as “Armozijn’s sister’. The godparents (peeten) were Company slave Armozijn the elder and Jan Pasquael.:

\[\text{Willem \hspace{1cm} een kind van Armosijs suster \hspace{1cm} peeten Armosij en Jan Pasquael.}\]

As Armozijn senior died childless (1713), did she ever came to play any surrogate role in the upbringing of her unruly sister’s children? That same year provision was made for Louis to pay for his erf and house on Oliphant Straat [Hout Street], in 4 installments (17 June 1685). It was probably at this time that Lijsbeth went to live with her foster mother Anna van Guinea, de facto wife of free-black Evert van Guinea. Evert died sometime (1686/7). Lijsbeth baptized a 3rd daughter (10 February 1686) fathered by Louis. The parents were now reconciled. The child was baptized Maria. The baptism was witnessed (presumably yet again) by Swarte Maria Everts.:

Louis and Lijsbeth entered into a contract of engagement to marry (17 March 1687). Louis also entered into a contract (15 October 1687) with the free-black Paaij Claes (from Guinea). The last-mentioned was to assist him with the farming, especially ploughing, harrowing and planting. In return Louis would make land available to Paaij Claes where he could make his own garden and plant a muid of wheat. This would increase annually depending on how long Paaij Claes stayed. Louis would also feed Paaij Claes, Paaij Claes was formerly the slave belonging to Boomtjen who sold (2 March 1671) him to ensign Dirck Jansz: Smiend (from Groningen) and wife Anna Jans: Speckaert (from Gramsbergh). He was again sold (1 September 1674) to Joannes Praetorius senior (from Ouddorp), then married to Widow Dirk Bosch (from Amsterdam), Geertruijd Mentinghs (from Hasselt [Limburg]). His new mistress (patronesse) was previously married to Wilhelm Ludwig Wiederholt and prior to that Evert Roleemo. Paaij Claes was probably freed with Maria van Guinea on the death of
their mistress (1676) – testamentary manumission but deceased estate papers are missing - settling (1687) as a burgher at the new colony at Stellenbosch. Both he and Maria joined up with other free-blacks from Guinea: Abraham and his de facto wife Koddo or Plad Oor, both freed by the Company together with other old and retired Company slaves (2 January 1687). In the same census Louis is recorded living alongside Abraham.177

The year 1688 saw the relationship between Louis and Lijsbeth disintegrate. Lijsbeth deserted her future husband not-to-be. She went to live with her widowed foster mother who not only maintained her household in Table Valley but also farmed at Stellenbosch. After the death of Evert, Anna is recorded as Hoena, ‘wife’ of Paaij Claes and they are listed as a couple at Stellenbosch (1692, 1696 and 1700). In 1688 she and her daughter are recorded living at Stellenbosch alongside Johann Herbst (from Bremen). Residing with Anna in her house in Table Valley was the daughter of Koddo or Plad Oor, Maria Schalks: who had been freed (1686) with Armozijn the elder and Janette Bort.178 Louis sued (15 March 1688) his fiancée for breach of promise of marriage. He requested the court (the Council of Justice) in civil proceedings that she be placed back in slavery. The court granted him custody of their children (3 daughters) born out of wedlock. The youngest child, however, was to remain in the mother’s custody for one more year while the father was to pay maintenance.179

56-year-old Teerling retaliated suing (11 June 1688) Louis for damages amounting to Rds 31. This was for an unpaid loan (plus interest) given to him by Teerling. The court granted an order for execution but when the clerk of the court demanded payment Louis refused to pay until Teerling had paid damages owing to him.180 Louis counter-sued (6 July 1688) Teerling for damages amounting to f 450 for ‘stealing’ or defrauding (afgerokkel) his female slave and for his negligent supervision (quade toesicht). His damages, according to his Memo van schade, actually amounted to f 574 if his losses were to include further damages incurred as a result of his inability to tend to his own sheep and farming at the same time.181

Louis’s vendetta against Lijsbeth was to continue for a long time to come. Declarations (20 July 1688) by soldier Maarten Adriaansz: and twoburghers (Jan Kok and Gerrit Stoffelsz:) were drawn up claiming that on separate occasions they had trapped Lijsbeth and Teerling in the house of free-blacks Abraham and Koddo and that of her foster uncle and aunt, burgher Jan Andriesz: de Jonker and his Cape-born mulatta wife, Lijsbet Jans;182 Lijsbeth “and her people” (volk) - Louis’s neighbours from Guinea, were also accused of slaughtering his sheep.183

Louis brought criminal charges against Willem and Lijsbeth (28 December 1688).184 Concerning Lijsbeth, he asked to be released from the contract promising to marry her. He claimed that he was unable to fulfill the contract as she had not yet been baptized and schooled in the Christian religion. He further requested custody of her youngest child and for Lijsbeth to be put back in slavery as his slave. The court decided that he could get custody of the youngest child in due course provided that he paid all monies owing for the child’s custody. The validity of Lijsbeth’s manumission, however, was brought into question, and though sensu stricto illegal as it was never registered, was allowed, being deemed a fait accompli.
Lijsbeth informed the court (24 January 1689) that she had agreed to marry Louis on condition that he desisted from terrorizing her. He had been tyrannical in his assaults by striking or hitting her and threatening to kill her (so tyrannisch mit smijten, slaan en dreigementen van dooden te bejegenen). The situation, according to her, had daily worsened and for that reason she had no desire to proceed with the marriage. Teerling was questioned (6 April 1689). That same day, Lijsbeth signed a confession concerning her carnal conversation with Teerling and ensuing pregnancy. She declared that only after Teerling had left the employ of Louis, and not while she was living with Louis, did she follow Teerling and join him and that she was now four months pregnant with Teerling’s child.

Confessie: Elisabeth van de Caep

Z Dit is het merck van Lijsbet van de Caep.
Ons praesent als gecommitt:[eerden]
[signed] J.H. Blum
[signed] Adriaen van Reede
Mij praesent
[signed] Melchior Kemels, Secretaris 1689

The child, born later, was Clara and went by the name of her adopted father Herbst.

Teerling and Lijsbeth were both arraigned (19 April 1689). The situation had deteriorated to the point that Lijsbeth was also accused of assaulting her foster mother and foster sister. Was this an attempt to discredit her morally, also in terms of her living arrangements and that of her relations? She was charged that despite being brought up as a daughter in the household of Evert, she had assaulted her foster mother (haer opvoester als moeder) with her fists and torn her clothing. Such behaviour, the court opined, came as no surprise as the assault had taken place in the wicked and dishonest households of Anna van Guinea and Maria Everts. On 25 April 1689 Maria Schalks: provided a sworn declaration concerning the alleged assault by Lijsbeth on the latter’s foster mother and foster sister. She was a lodger in the house of Anna in Table Valley. Also living in the house with the widow of Evert, were Bastiaen Colijn (from ’s Gravesend), his concubine Maria Everts: and the latter’s foster sister, Lijsbeth.

She had witnessed Lijsbeth come home drunk (evening of 11 April 1689) to her foster mother’s house in Table Valley where she and her foster sister Maria Everts: began to quarrel and come to blows (hoe waer is dat sij… gesien heeft dat Lijsbet voordFTER van voorn:[oemd]e Anna van Guinëa, op den 11 deser des avonts droncken int’ huijs gecomnen sijnde doenmaels wel met Bastiaen Janse van s’Gravensan daer in huijs wonende en met
Doubtless prompted, Maria Schalks: elaborated further on the suspiciously immoral living arrangements between Maria Everts: and Bastiaen Colijn. They lived, spoke, ate and worked together in the garden as a married couple under one roof with only one bed (Bastiaen en Marij te samen als getrouwde lieden met den anderen leven, spreekens, eten en t’ samen in den tuijn wercken, sonder nogtans dat haar deposante bekent is dat deselver te samen hebben op een koij slaen, maer wel in een afdack, alwaer maer eene koij state).

An astute Maria Schalks: was not prepared, however, to swear on oath that she actually ever saw them sleeping together:189

This exceptionally untidily drafted sworn declaration has been the subject of much controversy between academics Böeseken and Hattingh.191 Unwilling to share with their readers any verbatim transcription of the sworn declaration by Maria Schalks:, both misread the document.
there were two women named *Maria van de Caep*: the deponent *Maria Schalks*: whose age is 24 (and not 29) and *Maria Everts*;

- there was only one *Elisabeth (Lijsbet/h) van de Caep* being the same person as *Lijsbeth Sanders*: also known as *Lijsbeth Everts*;

- Lijsbeth went to the house of her foster mother, *Anna van Guinea*, in Table Valley after she deserted *Louis van Bengale* and fought with her foster sister *Maria Everts*: - only later becoming concubine to *Johann Herbst* (from Bremen);

- her mother was not at the house of *Abraham van Guinea* at Stellenbosch and she was not Abraham’s wife *Koddo / Prodo* or *Cladoor / Plaadoor*;

- last-mentioned was mother to *Maria Schalks*: deponent of the declaration in question lodging with *Anna van Guinea*;

- Anna’s association with *Johann Herbst* (from Bremen) and *Paaïj Claes van Guinea* and the latter’s association with both *Louis* and *Johann Herbst* confirms that Anna kept two residences: one in Table Valley and one at Stellenbosch.

Louis informed the court (25 April 1689) that he had undertaken a contract to marry Lijsbeth. The marriage, however, could not be consummated as she had not yet been schooled in the Christian religion and baptized. Concerning Lijsbeth’s whereabouts at the time she left Louis, Teerling informed the court that when Lijsbeth had left Louis, she had not come to him (Teerling), but that she had gone to her [foster] mother [Anna van Guinea]. Teerling admitted visiting Lijsbeth at the house of *Abraham van Guinea* [and *Koddo*] but stated that he never slept with her. Lijsbeth had visited Teerling at the house of his new master, *Jan Andriesse van Rissen*. Asked by the court whether Teerling sometimes visited Lijsbeth at the house where she lived or that she too ever visited him. Teerling responded “yes”.

Teerling was convicted and condemned (6 June 1689) to two months hard labour and to pay a fine of *Rds 25 pro fisco* for seducing Louis’s former female slave. He also had to do forced labour for two months in the public works and pay damages to Louis amounting to *f 450*. Nothing came of the fiscal’s request to the court that Lijsbeth be flogged, branded and put back into slavery as the slave of Louis. Instead the court concluded: despite judicial intervention and subsequent failure to convince the parties to reconcile, it was resolved to allow Lijsbeth to go her own way, precluding her from ever marrying as long as Louis remained unmarried but that custody of the illegitimate children by Louis would vest in the father who was obligated to bring them up as Christians and educate them; the youngest child, however, could remain with the mother for one year longer and the child’s upkeep paid for by Louis amounting to 25 Cape guilders.

... met allerhande sachte middelen p(ar)tijen eerst soekende te bevredighen, hebbe door haar interpositie niets kome obteineer (bewerkstellig), alsoo de Gh(edaag)de absoulijt verklaerende, noch te kome noch te willen met dito Lovijs om reedenen vooren gemelt trouwen, noch huishouden dus hebben p(ar)tijtje met wedersijds bewilligingh jijdelijk geaccoreerde, dat Lijsbeth soude gaen, waer het haer beliefde, doch niet met een ander trouwen noch doen by houden, immers niet te mogen in huwelijck met een ander treden, soos langh Lovijs ongetrouwt was; ende dat de Vaders gelijk begeerden de kinderen bij dito Lijsbeth in onecht geprockeert, soude tot hem neemen alleen het jonghste kindt noch een jaer bij de moeder latende, mits aan de selfe voor lijs onderhout int selfde jaer uijtkeerende vijf en twintigh Caapse gls, doch soude Lovijs ghehelden sijn, gedachte
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Louis relocated to Cape Town (sometime in July 1690). He sold his farm to free-black Anthonij van Angola a neighbouring farmer living further along the river at Weltevreden, later known as Mount Happy but registered as Angola.\textsuperscript{195} Thereafter Lijsbeth, and her two illegitimate children by Teerling (Willem and Clara), moved in with Johann Herbst (from Bremen) becoming his concubine. One daughter was born of their union: Gerbregt. Herbst had become a burgher (already by 1688).\textsuperscript{196} Prior to that, he had been the superintendent (as early as 1686) of the Company’s cattle post at the Hottentots-Holland [Somerset West].\textsuperscript{197} He had also fathered an illegitimate daughter Angenietie by Cecilia van Angola: \textsuperscript{198}


On 9 June 1690 Lijsbeth sued neighbouring free-black Marquart van Ceylon.\textsuperscript{199} In 1691 the muster roll lists Armosijn van de Caab followed by (a little further down the list) Bastiaan Colijn and Anna van Guinea and twee dochters Maria en Lijsbeth Everts van de Caab followed by (also a little further down the list) Jan Herft / Herst and Lijsbeth van de Caab.\textsuperscript{200} The census (1692) lists Claas and his wife Anna, Abraham and his wife vrijmaegt Rebecca van Macassar. On 2 January 1694 Claas and Herbst entered into an agreement. Lijsbeth was convicted (5 January 1696) for stealing jewelry belonging to the free-black Jacob Cornelisz: van Bengale.\textsuperscript{201} She was flogged and put in chains for three years doing hard labour.\textsuperscript{202}

The following year (30 August 1697) Louis and Rebecca drew up their joint will. Louis made testamentary provision for his three illegitimate daughters. On his death, each of them was to receive Rds 50 from the Orphan Chamber.\textsuperscript{203} He had already become a member of the Cape Church (15 April 1697)\textsuperscript{204} and his wife long before that (1693).\textsuperscript{205} Louis was granted (9 November 1699) another erf in Table Valley. The erf situated on the corner of Burg and Hout Streets bordered that of his earlier grant (1676).\textsuperscript{206}

In 1700 both Claes and Anna - are mentioned together at Stellenbosch. Following her release doing hard labour in the public works, Lijsbeth rejoined her concubine Herbst. Her 2nd illegitimate child by Teerling was named Clara. The child later adopted the name Herbst, after her stepfather. A baptismal entry for Clara has not been found and probably took place at Drakenstein. The first baptismal register of the parish was destroyed in a fire. Lijsbeth baptized at Stellenbosch (1 October 1702) her daughter by Herbst. The child was named Gerbregt. The baptism was witnessed by Jan Jacob; and Lijsbeth Louis:

Louis’s estate was judicially attached and sold in execution (19 January 1705) for unpaid debts owing to Heinrich Ploege (‘Hendrik du Plooy’). Ploege had sued (October 1704) with Louis requesting a postponement on the grounds that the loan amounting to f 451 was too large to repay so soon. Ploege opposed the application. The court ordered Louis to pay back the debt in cash.\textsuperscript{207} Consequently his possessions were
sold in a public auction at his house. As he only owned half the house, the money raised amounted to Rds 606:5:2 and the movable goods sold raised a further Rds 133:4:3. His possessions sold amounted to Rds 739:9:5. Other goods auctioned that day resulted in the total amount of Rds 997:3:5 being secured with Louis’s final total amounting to f 2200. Goods sold included a round table, two mirrors, six highback chairs, beds and bedding. Louis purchased (28 September 1705) four small paintings from the sale in execution of the property of Gerrit Hendrik Meijer.

On 22 November 1708 Louis was sued by the Church Council for an outstanding debt of f 300 plus interest. He had signed two promissory notes (April 1694) to the value of f 400 and another (January 1699) for f 200. Since then he could only pay half of the combined amount. The court rejected his plea to have payment of the outstanding amount postponed. By 1711 the interest had accumulated to an additional f 48. Furthermore, he had also signed another promissory note for f 200 (April 1703) for money owing to the fiscal Joan Blesius. In addition, he had also signed as surety for the manumitted slave Joseph van Batavia.

Herbst was removed from the Stellenbosch military muster roll (1708) due to his old age. We are informed in a resolution of the Council of Policy (30 September 1709) that Paaij Claes had already died earlier in that year. On 10 September 1711 the Council of Justice ordered the sale in execution of the property of Louis. The sale took place (9 November 1711). The land was purchased by Jan Mijnderts: Kruijwagen for f 1120.

The smallpox epidemic (1713) devastated the VOC’s colony of the Cape of Good Hope. Armozijn the elder and her husband drew up their joint will (13 May 1713). Lijsbeth’s son Willem Terlingh died unmarried and was buried at Stellenbosch (1714). Louis again tried to have his former slave put back into slavery. The court (14 November 1715) dismissed his action against her keeper Jan Hars [Herbst] calling his designs “a frivolous pretence”. He was fined Rds 2 plus costs also because he submitted written evidence without the obligatory seal. Louis was dead (by 1717) as his widow is listed as such in the census for that year. Herbst ceded inter vivos (1734) his place (opstal) named Opperherfst in the Wagenmakers Valleij [Wellington] to his son-in-law, Jan Vosloo d’jonge.

Lijsbeth made contractual provision (25 February 1738) for her old age. In return for her upkeep for the previous year (food, drink and lodging), she donated her slave Griet van de Caap and the latter’s six children to her eldest daughter Lijsbeth Louis: on condition that her eldest daughter would care for her for the rest of her life. Both women each signed the document with a cross.

Elisabeth Lowice weduwe wijlen den burger Jacobus Cotsee 1764, no. 10. Her heirs are listed as follows:

- Dirk Coetsee
- Elisabeth Coetsee
- Jan Coetsee
- De kinderen van Pretorius
- Sara Coetsee’s children by Overholster
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Ik onderketekende Lijsbeth Sanders verklare bij dezen aan mijn dochter Lijsbeth Lowise genaamd; thans getrouwd met den Burger Jacobus Coetse, als bij donatie, inter vivos, en om redenen dat mijne gem: dochter, mij reeds over de vier jaren Lang met Spijs, drank, en goede Huïjvesing hief onderhouden, en ook verdens sal verpligt sijn, van mijn Leve Lang mij te besorgen, van het nodige onderhoud aan de selve te schenken, vereeren, en op te dragen, gelijk ik doe bij dezen, sekere Slavine genet: Griet, van de Caab, met haere Ses kinderen, in name, Willem, Pieter, Christijn, Catrijn, Sijmen, en Arend, van de Caap, Renuntiere dier halven van alle het regt en Eijgendom, dat oijt op voorn: lijf eijgenen hebbe gehad en behoef als vooren, en dat over sulx gem: mijne dochter met de voor s:r Slavin en hare Ses kinderen, mag doen en handelen, als met haar vrij en eijgen goed, sonder dat ik of ijemand anders na dato deses eenige pretentie op de selves al mogen hebben, het zij in regten of daar buijten ten allen tijden te sullen vrijen en weren onder alle Submissen en verbanden van mijne persoon en goederen als na regten, des betijige ik ondergetekende Lijsbeth Lowise huïjsvrouwe van Jacobus Coetse, de Gemt: gifte van de voorn: Slavinne met hare Ses kinderen, niet alleen in dankbaarheijd aen te nemen, naar belove ook, mijne gem: Moeder Levens Lang van het nodige onderhoud sullen versorgen in teeken der waarheid en tot meerder bekragtiging hebben wij deene in Teegenwoordigheijd, van Seven geloofsbaere getuijgen ondertekent, op den 25 Februarij 1738,

Dit is de merk X van Lijsbeth Sanders
Dit is de X van Lijsbeth Lowise

Als getuijgen
Andries dutoi [Du Toit]
Guiliam overholster [Oberholzer]
Ingentus Marre
Kasper Pasdts
Dit is de merk X van Jacobus Marais
Dit is de merk X van Abraham Leroe [Le Roux]

Lijsbet Sander, 20 Jaaren dood, nagelaaten
1. Gerbregt Herfs Vr: van Schoester
2. de wede Coetsee
3. Maria Louise dood
# Elsie Hofman Vr: Van Jan Buijs
# Catharina “ “ Willem Landman
nagelaten 1 oude Slavin
3 mans slaaven
X slaaf bij de wed: Coetsee gebooren
Bij de Wede Coetsee gewoond en gstorven en de Slaven gebleeven sonder
dat des weegens is gesprooken,
4. Clara Herst afver]led:
  Lijsbert [sic] Potgieter Vr: Van Andries de Jager
  Sibilla “ “ Philip du Preez
30 junij. aan Elsie Hofman Vr: Van Jan Buijs de donatie inter vivos voorgeleesen, en met verdurepretensiie soo als haar suster Catharina VR: Van Landman alhier ook aangegeven vermeenen te hebben dat zij dan neevens alle de overage Erfgen: gelijkerhand moeten opkoomen en teegens deese camer procedeerden, als wanneer so aanstonds sullen ondervinden dat de donatie te regt gepasseert is, soo seijde zij daar op hebben nooijt geweeten,maar hoore ’t nu, en sal mijn andere Vrinden daar van waarschouwen.

1763
Lijsbeth died (sometime in 1742/3) leaving a mammoth progeny becoming one of the most prolific founding mothers of the majority of South Africans formerly classified ‘white’ during the apartheid years. Her substantial traceable ‘white’ progeny has been documented by Hattingh and include inter alia Louis Botha (the Union of South Africa’s first premier), the notorious Coenraad de Buijs (founding father of the mixed-race Buysdorp Community in Limpopo Province and the subject of two novels by Sarah Gertrude Millin: King of the Bastards and The Burning Man) and the executed free-burgher Gerrit Coetzee (recently resurrected by Newton-King in her research about his sodomy conviction and sentence to drowning for attempted bestiality with a mare).

**Conclusion**

Clearly the two Armozijns were adopted into the tiny surviving Guinea/Angola slave community at the early stages of Cape colonial settlement given their lack of an initial cultural and ethnic safety net – presumably their mothers died young each giving birth to only 2 or 3 children. There is the curious presence of the Guinea/Angola family of mulatta Maria Schalks: (c. 1664-1700) in the lives of both Armozijn the elder and Armozijn the younger. The temptation to presume a ‘Guinea’ / ‘Angola’ or West African origin remains. Unfortunately, the surviving archival records consulted has not revealed sufficient evidence confirming unequivocally that the two Armozijns were Abysinnian, Arabic Antambahoaka or even Antaimoro in origin – but, considering that their mothers were amongst the Cape’s very 1st slave women to arrive at the bottom tip of Africa and being able to identify mostly their offspring, only Lijsbeth and Cornelia Arabus van Abissina remain unaccounted. To hark back to Burton’s translation of the Portuguese poet Camões: the evidence unearthed thus far, nevertheless attests that this tale has already unfolded “mighty things which Time can make or mar ...”
A leaking *La Maréchale* arrived again – alone - in Table Bay (31 March 1657), hoping to return to Nantes. Dutch assistance was again sought. There were 170 to 200 men on board. Van Goens was inspecting the Cape during this time so that his version of *La Maréchale*’s voyage to Madagascar also survives. The French begged the Dutch of “many things in pitiful language, which, however, they did not always obtain”. In the Red Sea the ship seized a small Moorish vessel sailing along the Abyssinian coast bound from Mocha to Surat with the remainder of unsold fine cloth, pieces of eight, some ducats and musk. The cloth they exchanged on Socotra for civet, amber and aloes with which the ship was principally laden. The ship was in need of sails and other necessaries and the admiral was obliged to beach the other three ships on Madagascar. The *St Joris* and *La Erman* were abandoned on Ile Ste.-Marie while *La Duchesse* was beached at Fort-Dauphin. About 400 of the crew died due to sickness. The rest remained at Fort-Dauphin then a mere wooden stockade under Monsieur Rivaux. At Antongil Bay 17 men were left in a bamboo hut without any fortification to form an alliance with the 'king'. Van Riebeeck summed up the situation thus: “they appear to have had a fruitless and useless voyage, and done nothing very particular … for the rest they do not appear to have done anything particular, and seem to be in a pretty mess”.

What went through the minds of the slaves Lijsbeth and Cornelia Arabus when they witnessed the reappearance of only one of the ships that originally dumped them at the Cape?

**Survivors of De Tulp**

*La Maréchale* brought four sailors of the galiot *Tulp* destroyed in a hurricane (1/2 December 1655). The ship had been hurled from her three anchors and cast on shore. The galiot had taken in a cargo of rice and slaves at a river mouth opposite Ile Ste.-Marie. The men and some cargo had been saved. Four native canoes took the survivors to Ile Ste.-Marie, where 13 men died of disease, including the skipper (*Cornelis Jansz*), the junior merchant and Cape secunde (*Frederik Verburgh*), the mate, and the assistant (*Cornelis van Heyningen*). Only 11 men survived. These were picked up by an English ship but subsequently captured by *La Maréchale*. One of the Dutch survivors, the arquebusier Hendrik Dirksse (from Naerden) had been left behind in a hut at Antongil Bay with 17 of the French crew. The other 10 survivors were conveyed by the French to Fort-Dauphin. Six remained there to guard their salvaged cargo: Pieter Pieterssen, Jonas Janssen, Jelle Hendrickssen, Robert de la Grieve, Hendrick Janssen, Hendrik Isbrantssen. Four of these men carried on to the Cape with *La Maréchale*. Hendrik Dirksse was later rescued by the *Arnhem* but died en route to the Cape before the ship arrived at the Cape (16 December 1658). The English ship [Johanna] Catherine anchored off the Comores, and meeting up with the *Erasmus*, picked up (26 November 1659) two sailors of the *Tulp* wrecked at Madagascar (1655). Only one was willing to return to service, the other remained on board the Englishman.

*Cleijn Eva van Madagascar*
Together with the four Tulp survivors La Maréchale brought a slave Cleijn Eva (aged 5) as part of the ‘cargo’ retrieved at Antongil Bay left there by the French who had captured the bulk of the surviving crew of the Tulp from an English ship. A mere girl-child, Cleijn Eva, was a gift from the ‘king’ of Antongil to the commander’s wife. As gifts were disallowed in terms of VOC policy, she was relegate to the Company. Cleijn Eva died in slavery.

La Maréchale was soon sent away, however, with Van Goens observing:

Whether in course of time they will resume the voyage with the same number of ships, time will show. Of profits, however, I am sure they will not be able to boast, and God knows whether they will be able to proceed in safety, as according to our people their vessel is so leaky, that they have to pump continually. They left this place for St. Helena, hoping to find our ships there in order to obtain some necessaries from the latter. In order not to be betrayed by foreigners, we have ordered that no other than those of our own nation shall reside there, and that all others shall be sent away, as is being done now.

The fugitive Espagniola

After the ship’s departure, a French black slave or fugitive (swarte Franse slaef ofte fugitijf) named Espagniola was discovered on shore. His origins are obscure. If not purchased in West Africa, he may (judging by his name) have been purchased from the Portuguese. He was relegate to Robben Island (29 May 1657) and placed under the supervision of Jan Woutersz: (from Middelburg) with the Eva van Madagascar - brought to the Cape with her son Jan Bruijn on De Tulp (12 December 1654) - and two European convicts, Jasper Jansz: and Lourens Albertsz:. They were given a tot of a brandy every other day, unlike the other convicts who received a daily tot. They received no meat and bacon and had to eat the birds of the island. Eva’s tasks were clearly defined:

... you will also take with you a Madagascar female slave, named Eva, who is strong enough and able to carry the stones down and pile the same in good order alongside of the others, that they may dry the harder.

Eva played up. The superintendent reported that she refused, despite numerous beatings, to do any work.

Eva who does nothing but run about the island, chasing the sheep and driving them from their lambs. She needs someone to look after her and does not heed and cannot understand signs, gestures or thrashings, so that no credit can be gained at this work with such people.

She was shipped by mistake (May 1658) - without her son - to Batavia together with a number of slaves from Angola. Nothing more about Espagniola has surfaced. He likely remained a Company slave until his death.

La Maréchale – 2nd fatal voyage
The ship arrived at Nantes (September 1657).\textsuperscript{232} Despite previous setbacks to establish a colony on Madagascar, the French were not deterred. In a letter (16 April 1657), the \textit{Heeren XVII} informed the Council of India that plans were afoot in Nantes to send four large ships with colonists and their families in May. Rumours were that the French were disregarding treaty-secured Dutch monopolies abroad. If attacked, the Dutch were to retaliate and overpower them.\textsuperscript{233} Franco-Dutch relations worsened. Dutch ships in French harbours were seized. The Dutch reciprocated. War seemed imminent.\textsuperscript{234} The seizures were withdrawn and negotiations commenced resulting in a provisional treaty regulating future co-operation being signed at The Hague.\textsuperscript{235}

French plans to resuscitate its colonization of Madagascar were delayed. By 20 January 1660 the ships, the \textit{Portuguese} and the \textit{Gaspard}, together with the ill-fated cruiser \textit{La Maréchale} were fitted out for Madagascar. \textit{La Maréchale} departed with 180 men on board, now captained by Simon Ver(r)on, native of La Rochelle where most of the crew had been engaged. Veron was Protestant and had engaged his own crew of 44 at Rochelle and from natives of St. Martin. The second captain was Kiraquadieu (or Carquedion). There were also seven Roman Catholic clergy on board: three priests, a layman, a monastery surgeon, a servant of the missionary order and a bishop (actually prior) named Nicolas Estienne. The Cape was duly informed:\textsuperscript{236}

\begin{quote}
We have received news from France that the \textit{Mareschal de la Mosleraye} had left Brittany for Madagascar. A vessel of about 200 lasts, carrying 40 guns and 250 men, but that she was on the 13\textsuperscript{th} January still lying under St. Martin’s, to take in some supplies. It is presumed that she will endeavour to pay her expenses by freebooting.
\end{quote}

The ill-fated ship arrived at the Cape (9 May 1660):\textsuperscript{237}

\begin{quote}
Very heavy weather from the N.W. Early in the morning a vessel was seen anchored near the shore on the other side of the bay, and flying a white flag. The Commander accordingly proceeded thither over land behind the downs and on horseback accompanied by the skipper of the \textit{Loenen}, the junior merchant Roelf de Man, and some horsemen, and made signals on the beach on the vessel’s starboard side, as if there were men stationed on the watch everywhere, though at such a distance from the fort. Arriving near the vessel she was found to be dangerously near the breakers, and appeared to be a Flemish frigate, having red spliced banners, but flying no flag, so that no further information could be obtained, nor could one thoroughly see what was written on her stern. She is very likely a Frenchman or a Genoese, and is lying as dangerously near the shore as possible, her topmasts lowered and her foreyard raised about one-third on high, so that in case she parted she might sail on shore with the foresail set, and thus save the lives of the crew, as she has not more than a musket shot’s length deep water behind her. She, however, seems to be well provided with anchors and cables, and had two anchors down.
\end{quote}

The following day after noon the wind went down allowing the ship “to weigh its one anchor and carry out behind a spring on the other, finally succeeding in getting away from the shore with reefed sails, and safely reaching the roadstead”. On board was Monsieur Pierre Gelton or Guilton, a Prussian, the late lieutenant of \textit{De la Roche-de-St. André}, who was to replace Rivaux – cousin to \textit{Maréchale de la Mesleray} - as governor on Madagascar. During his stay of three years, he was to build a fort at St. Augustine Bay “in order to command the whole island from one end to the other”.
Another ship was planned for 6 months later with many married families in order to enlarge the colony there and to plant one in St. Augustine Bay also.

This time there were apparently no plans to sail to the Red Sea but to return from Madagascar laden with ebony, hides, citrons, honey, wax, sandal and aloe wood as well as tobacco from the Mascareñas cultivated there by their people and slaves. There were plans to start a silk culture on Madagascar. On board La Maréchale were a silk spinster and her husband who would earn their living on the island where already silk was procurable judging by the upper skirts and dresses worn by the great and shown to the Dutch by the crew of La Maréchale.

The ship had to retrieve the guns of the 3 vessels wrecked on Madagascar. The ship called at Tenerife and Cape Verde and informed the Dutch that prior to their arrival the fort of the West India Company had been plundered by a French vessel from Dieppe under a Swedish flag and commission and two Dutch vessels, fully laden and ready to sail, seized. 300 000 guilders in gold were carried off. The ships accompanying La Maréchale, the Portugese and the Gaspard, never even made their voyages beyond the Cape. The former was lost on the river Nantes with a crew of 150, while the latter captured by the Spanish.

On 12 May 1660 the captain of La Maréchale presented his three commissions to Van Riebeeck: one from the French king, one from the king’s mother and one from Governor la Melleray of Nantes. These were politely declined. Veron and Gelton were invited to dine with the commander while surveillance was increased “so that we might be safe from treachery, whilst at the same time arrangements were made that the men who daily came for water returned on board at night and did not remain on shore”. Of the Dutch, the man most fluent in French and utilized as interpreter was the secretary Hendrik Lacus (from Wesel).

What went through the minds of the slaves Lijsbeth and Cornelia Arabus and the fugitive Espagniola when they witnessed the reappearance of Gelton and one of the ships that originally dumped them at the Cape? The ship, however, was never to sail again. The Journal (17 May 1660) recounts the disastrous events leading to the abandonment of La Maréchale:

May 17th to 19th – Continuous wet and boisterous weather from the N.W. In consequence the French ship La Marechal was cast on shore during the night between Salt River and the redoubt Duynhoop having sailed to the beach from the foresail (? jib) before the wind. After the vessel (not stronger than a Biscayan sloop) had cut its masts and been knocked to pieces on the beach, and besides had previously lost three anchors, all that it possessed, the men were seen making rafts and continually pumping, keeping the spritsail up in order to reach the beach with the rising tide, not sideways, but with stem on. Orders were thereupon issued to those in the redoubt to observe who and what kind of people, goods or arms, &c. were being saved. About noon they sent two notes on shore by means of a barrel praying earnestly for assistance, as they feared to be thrown on their side, and in that case to be unable to save their lives. Hence, as it was impossible to reach them by water, an old Biscayan sloop (whale or surf boat) was placed on a wagon and conveyed along the beach towards the vessel. Only three men were saved this day in the two trips which the boat was able to make, being drawn to and fro by means of ropes. Two others had swum on shore through the surf, and another was lying ill in a tavern, so that six had
been saved, among them the Prussian (Pruysser) who was to relieve the Governor on Madagascar already mentioned. They requested spots on which to pitch tents for their people and the storage of goods, &c. These were pointed out right in front of their ship, and under the protection of the redoubt Duijnhoop.

The following day (fairly fine calm weather with a westerly breeze), 61 Frenchmen were landed from the wreck, including the captain, the bishop and three priests. The final head count amounted to 148. The Dutch were quick to contain the French ‘invasion’. Worth mentioning too, is the reaction of the Cape's local indigenes:238

... they requested us not to permit that nation also to settle here, alleging that they had enough in us, and should any more nations arrive, they would lose all their pastures, so that they proposed that they would rather help us in keeping away others than permit more to come.

They were to surrender all firearms, give a list of the crew, declare all salvaged goods (the sale of which had first to be offered to the Company) and their men were not permitted to go beyond the redoubt Duijnhoop and the fisherman’s house where fresh water would be made available and they could fish in the river and on the beach. Their cooperation was insisted upon and they were not to congregate publicly for Roman Catholic worship or attract any of the local populace.239

The French did not take kindly to being restricted. Veron confided in Lacus that he was not a Papist but of the Reformed faith. He rejoiced that “the Lord God had been pleased to visit them with such a misfortune and that he was among people of his own religion ... had he been wrecked elsewhere, without doubt he and his men would have been doubtless massacred by the Papists”. He requested the Dutch to take his crew of 44 into the Company’s service being all of the Reformed faith. The Prussian lieutenant Gelton, in turn, was particularly vociferous. He predicted diplomatic retaliation but softened after a follow-up visit with the bishop. The resistance and growing disobedience of their men resulted in minor concessions being made to keep order. Their main grievance was being forced to relinquish their weapons.

In a further follow-up visit the captain, second captain, the bishop (Monsignore Estienne) and a profusely apologetic Gelton agreed to accept the Dutch conditions. Following French co-operation in salvaging the cargo and handing over of weapons, a resolution (24 May 1660) was passed making provision for enlisting those crew members the French officers were willing to let go. This was justified on the basis that the threat of the French remaining unified could be minimized. An edict followed (27 May 1660) forbidding the colony’s free-population from assisting the French unless under controlled conditions. The French crew now numbered 145 or 146. The Council of Policy heard (5 June 1660) a request by the captain, the governor-designate of the fort at St. Augustine, and the bishop that the Dutch enlist some of their men. Of the crew 35 were thereupon recruited. This number increased to 140 (by January 1661). On 13 June 1660 the Reformed members of the crew attended church. All hopes of ever refloating La Maréchale were finally abandoned.

The Vogel Phoenix and Nagelboom departed (23 June 1660) for Batavia taking 58 Frenchmen, including Gelton, and also one woman and child belonging to La Maréchale. Her husband, an excellent gardener - “but as we cannot understand him” – was also
forwarded to Batavia. They arrived there (15 December 1660). The rest were to follow in subsequent fleets. The Dutch were reluctant to place too many on ships from the Chamber of Zealand such as the *Provintie* as these were mostly manned by French soldiers. The remainder of the stranded Frenchmen (including Veron), were to be sent on the *Musaet Boom*. 140 Frenchmen were sent on to Batavia (by 1 January 1661). The remaining Frenchmen were the clergy, the second captain and six others.

Bishop Estienne recorded (1 March 1661) his impressions of the Dutch commander’s wife. Of Huguenot ancestry, she communicated with them in French. He described Maria de la Queillerie as “indisputably one of the most perfect women, despite not being Catholic, I have ever seen and everybody likes her” adding that, “apart from her religion – I have never noticed the least passion in her, though I have often visited her. Whatever business or occupation she had to attend to, she showed so much self-restraint that she never seemed harassed, even not in a few discussions I had with her, for she is a daughter of a minister in Rotterdam and well versed in the Scriptures. She is not opinionated and that is rare”.

The fate of the captain (“an elderly honest man”) and of the second captain, Mons. Carquedion, remained unclear; the latter being reticent about their intentions and “a man of a surly temper (sijnde dat een misselijck humeur)” The French priests, their retinue and the two captains were permitted to leave for Europe with an earlier return fleet. Permission was finally given to break up the wreck. Van Riebeeck observed, not without a little *schadenfreude*:

> It will be a wonder if these disasters will not commence to be distasteful to the Marshal of France though the Bishop (the chief of the four priests) vaunts of continuing Madagascar affairs, and that it is their intention to build a fort on the inner coast in Augustin Bay (this is true) for the purpose of trading with Mosambique and the neighbourhood; and that besides another vessel would follow in six months’ time, and that a certain great Lord (Groot Heer) who enjoys an income of fully 18 ‘tons’ of gold, was prepared to proceed thither as Governor-General over the whole island, accompanied by a fleet of four ships carrying more than 1,000 men, with the intention of successively sending succour and keeping up a continuous and permanent navigation thither, making their refreshment station at Saldanha Bay.

Van Riebeeck was pleased to inform his superiors that Gelton, however, was less optimistic than the French clergy. He, after all, was the man sent out to start the new settlement at St Augustine Bay. In fact, he now offered his services to the Dutch, as a hostage if necessary, in order to prove his good faith. Not only had recruited at his own expense 30 to 40 men, he had been to Madagascar before on the previous voyage of *La Meréchale* acquiring a thorough knowledge of the island. Given the latest misfortunes, the French already on Madagascar (less than 100 men) would now in vain be looking to Europe for relief. After the loss of six ships, the chances of French continuing their plans to colonize Madagascar were slim. Gelton could “reveal all secrets” if given an ensign’s commission, being a good, plain-spoken German (*Duijts* or Prussia or Poland, speaking fairly good Dutch (*Duijts*), a clever (*gauw*) fellow knowing the *Jus fetiale*.

The French clergy remained hopeful about being conveyed to Madagascar. Requests to be taken on Dutch ships bound for Batavia were declined. Failing a passage on another French vessel en route to Tonkin [Vietnam] and Japan which departed from Dieppe
(December 1659) refreshing at Saldanha Bay, the clergy requested to be allowed a passage on one of the homeward bound Dutch ships or hire a small vessel to sail to Madagascar. Their party consisted of the bishop, three priests, one layman (their surgeon), and two servants.

Meanwhile fishing for the wrecked Frenchman’s anchors continued with the help of the visiting ship Loenen but without success. With this ship went a letter from the French clergy begging for a passage home. By this time a diehard Bishop Estienne revealed much information to Van Riebeeck:

The aforesaid Bishop, a man of a particularly high family, and very wealthy, has for a third time been disappointed in his voyage to Madagascar. Now however his property has been saved, but he lost everything in the two previous voyages. The ship Gaspar was captured by the Spaniards, and his second vessel, the Portugaise, was lost in the river Nantes. His third disaster overtook him here, but he declares that for all that, he did not intend to desist, even if the Marshal le Maljerey and the French Company of Paris abandoned the work, as he would in that case personally equip one or more ships, not for the purpose of living there always, but temporarily for a year or two, in order to establish churches there in an orderly manner, for which, according to his own statement and those of the other Frenchmen, he had in his will devoted half of his capital consisting of tons of gold (ton = 10,000 pounds). He had already spent more than 50,000 (? guilders) in men and many (church) ornaments which he has with him here; he also says that he might have proceeded to Tonquin [Tonkin] in the ship that was lying ready in Dieppe in October last, in order to become Bishop of that Kingdom, escorted by all his priests, but that, as there were so many Portuguese clergy there, he had completely set his mind on Madagascar, which he did not intend to give up, even if he had ten more lost voyages and sacrificed everything that he had in this world. You may imagine what the means of this man are, as his brother not long ago bought a palace from Cardinal Richelieu [Richelieu] for 12 tons of gold. He himself had been a military Commander of a brigade in France, yea! He had been such a "dominateur" and gambler, staking from 20 to 30,000 guilders at once, that one evening he gambled away his carriage and horses, as he told us himself, but having become melancholy through his losses he had recovered his self-control, and devoted himself to spiritual matters with the principle object of establishing churches at Madagascar, and perhaps traveling to and from that Island, &c.

The French clergy agreed to leave on the Provintie van Zeeland bound for Batavia. This ship, however, did not stop at the Cape. Veron departed on the Muscaet Boom taking with him salvaged goods (on condition he pay for freight and other expenses) and a private letter from the bishop. Five others accompanied him, including his late mate, intending to join the VOC. Veron, an "upright man", was also keen to enlist, but did not understand Dutch. Accompanying them was a declaration whereby the French abandoned the wreck and everything it contained. Van Riebeeck inquired, being ignorant of the Law of the Sea (zee of strandt rechten), whether he could proceed to break up the ship as the woodwork would come in handy for extending the jetty.

Attempts to negotiate a passage for the clergy on the English ship Depesche (arriving 24 December 1660 last from Indrapoura and Sillebar en route to Leghorn) failed. Van Riebeeck was again happy to report on French affairs on Madagascar being in a "very wretched condition" adding that "it will not be surprising if the settlement (reduced to a small number through want of success) be killed by the natives, who have always endeavoured, whenever an opportunity offered, to rid themselves of the French, whose
dominion over them they resent”. This paved the way for Dutch “traffic with that Island” from the Cape “with a fast and armed galiot once a year” which would be to the “progress and prosperity of the Cape, independent of the trade there in rice, cattle, hides and slaves which is certain, and that in silks, &c., which is probable”. Prior to his letter, news came from the Netherlands about eight French ships with Portuguese commissions – some armed with up to 30 guns. Discord, however, delayed French plans and one ship never got further than the mouth of the Straits of Gilbraltar and was attacked and blown up by Turkish ships. Another ship the St Louis bound for China could not leave, the season being too advanced.246

Governor-General Joan Maetsuijcker informed Van Riebeeck (15 December 1661) that all the shipwrecked Frenchmen sent, even those not yet enlisted, had now signed up. Gilton opted to return to France to take “an honest leave” of La Meréchale. He was granted a passage home in one of the return ships. Based on Gilton’s intelligence, a Batavia free-burgher Jacques Boulan undertook a voyage in the flute De Postillon to obtain more information and consider further traffic with Madagascar. The bishop’s request to Batavia for a passage to Madagascar was declined and the French priests and their retinue plus the two captains at the Cape were given permission to sail to Europe in the Return fleet (Het Wapen van Amsterdam, Amersfoort, Malacca, Het Hoff van Zeelandt, Orangie, De Mars and Nagelboom) “as it will be by far the best that you be relieved of those people”,247

The voyage of De Postillon returned (15 October 1661) proving to be unsuccessful. The vessel sprung a leak on the return voyage. Boulan was obliged to sail for Tuticorin rather than the Cape. He brought with him from Madagascar the French metal guns and the governor of that place, Rivaux. Of the original 147 slaves purchased there, only 31 survived the voyage. The rest of the cargo consisted of different kinds of gums, ebony, a species of sandalwood and other unknown trifles together with 37,000 ox hides. Unable to recover his costs, Boulan was of the opinion that the French with their bragging and professions of great profits derivable there had deceived him. Maetsuijcker summed up the colony at Madagascar as follows: 248

The establishment which that nation still has there is of small dimensions, only 70 Frenchmen, as we are told, are still there, who are leading a godless and dissolute life. From all their doings no other conclusion can be drawn than that they have taken possession of Madagascar merely in order to make it a centre whence to proceed on piratical excursions against the Moors in the Red Sea, instead of establishing a just trade or colony there, as the island is a very convenient spot for such vultures. We do not believe that the Duke of Millerey, now that his plans have been frustrated, will again send an expedition thither, for which he will have less occasion, as we intend to send to Netherland by the return fleet his artillery and cousin, for whom and for which, it is said, he had expressly dispatched the wrecked vessel La Maréchale.

The dismantling of the wrecked ship La Maréchale commenced with the removal of 10 iron 8-pounders while 14 others still remained in the wreck lying below the redoubt ‘Duynhoop’ at the Salt River.249

We learn more about the fate of the wreck in a letter (9 April 1661). The timber was used to extend the jetty after the wreck was broken up. The remainder of the wreck caught fire during the night (6 March) and destroyed. The fire was caused either by the
Hottentoos smoking tobacco and helping themselves to the iron, or the carpenters when on board to select wood for the jetty. Much of the timber was lost by the ‘unexpected removal’ of the wreck which was “very much in the way”. Iron pieces were still lying in the wreck’s bottom but these and whatever else was abandoned. Those pieces rescued by the French were brought to the Fort for preservation. The rest were either taken with the French to Batavia or abandoned. The sails which had been used for tents were completely rotten. The rudder and other woodwork washed onshore were burnt by the Hottentoos who took the iron. Much of the meat and pork the officers sold among the free-burghers, also sails and rope “and many other articles, so that they must have made much money out of them among the people here; and seemed to be as rich when they left as when they stranded.” The iron obtained by breaking up the vessel and that was not immediately used, was stored carefully but the bolts etc. had already been extracted by the crew “and squandered among the Hottentoos and others”.250

**Conclusion:** the dregs of the storm ...

Alas, the storm is come again!
My best way is to creep under his garberdine;
There is no shelter hereabout.
Misery acquaints a man with strange bedfellows.
I will here shroud until the dregs of the storm be past

*William Shakespeare, The Tempest*

“Misery acquaints us with strange bedfellows” - to paraphrase a post-tempest Caliban-huddling Trinculo.251 Notwithstanding the fruitless two voyages to plunder and colonize and the ultimate disintegration of *La Maréchale*, the ship’s chief legacy was doubtless the human cargo brought by its companion ship *St. Georges*: the two ‘Arab’ girls Lijsbeth and Cornelia.
APPENDIX II:

ARMOSYN

REVISITED

Finis can never be written to a story such as this. The possibility always exists that at some future date other untapped sources may reveal further pieces of this jigsaw and so present a fuller picture of the family of the fascinating Armosyn Claas van de Kaap.

Margaret Cairns

Additional primary source material on the Company Slave Lodge matron and later free-black ARMOSYN CLAASZ has emerged: two earlier wills have been found; the fate / whereabouts of her daughter MARIA STUART and grandson ABASALOM BAREND CLEEF are further clarified; Armosyn’s brother, the Lodge schoolmaster (schoolmeester) CLAAS CORNELISZ - likewise equally well-placed in the Slave Lodge hierarchy and also given to formalising legally his personal affairs, is introduced and Armosyn’s parentage investigated. The writer is indebted to the late Margaret Cairns for her ever-generous help and for kindly having allowed him access to her personal papers.

Margaret Cairns pioneered biographical and genealogical research on Armosyn Claasz252 - one of the VOC-occupied Cape of Good Hope’s earliest recorded locally-born slave women. She published her findingd in 1979253. Since then, there has been little new primary research on Armosyn Claas. Cairns states unequivocally that “Armosyn held a privileged position in the world of freeblack women”. Land grants to free-blacks were infrequent. Although Armosyn’s grant was the 16th one of such grants, she was only the third grantee to be a free-black woman,254 Her former position as matron – matres or matrice - of the Slave Lodge eased her peculiar transition from Company slave to free citizen. She left a unique legacy of detailed and personalised testamentary bequests (still housed in the Cape Archives Repository in Cape Town) to both her free and unfree(d) heelslagh and halfslagh children. In this regard alone, Armosyn, stands virtually in a league of her own.

Recently, popular writer Karel Schoeman has centered a number of his writings around Armosyn Claasz255. It was Cairns who liberated Armosyn out of the shadows. It is Schoeman, however, who popularises her. Promoting Armosyn as an important historical and socio-political icon of the early colonial Cape, his secondary version of Armosyn serves as a backdrop explanation for her pietistic blood descendant - the
famous ‘mission helper’ and devout Christian: Machtelt Smit or Mother Smith\(^\text{256}\) - whom Schoeman considers to be the first South African-born to achieve fame in her own right (“die eerste gebore Suid-Afrikaanse vrou wat in eie reg bekendheid verwerf het”). The two women form links in the chain of a newly-conscious complexity (and complexion) of ‘Afrikaner’ social, cultural and political development. Armosyn is presented as a ‘representative’ early Cape ancestral figure and historical leit-motiv. Only in two significant aspects does Schoeman augment Cairns’s research. He endorses Hans Heese’s theory that Armosyn’s mother was “in all probability a slave from West Africa” and mentions the free-burgher Cornelis Claasz (from Utrecht) as the likely biological father.\(^\text{257}\)

Research into primary archival sources subsequent to the pioneering research of Cairns reveals greater complexity involving, and surrounding, the life of the historical Armosyn Claasz. The discovery of her brother Claas Cornelisz van de Caab\(^\text{258}\) – a former schoolmeester in the Lodge and thereafter a prominent free-black at the Cape settlement and his lawful wife Beatrice van Cochin\(^\text{259}\) (c. 1650-1720) (former matres and Armosyn’s predecessor at the Lodge) – also reveals an Armosyn by no means in limbo but actually having ‘connections’.

The name Armosyn

Had Armosyn Claasz’s mother been of West African origin, it seems odd that her mother would have chosen to name her daughter after this exotic silk material originating from the East. Although the Cape’s slave population was predominantly West African at the time of Armosyn Claasz’s birth (c. 1659 or 1661), there were also Asian and Madagascan slaves living at the Cape - mostly privately owned by officials and free-burghers.\(^\text{260}\) We know of at least two Company slave women from the East – both convicts (bandieten).\(^\text{261}\) The fact that there were two recorded contemporaneous women both named Armosyn (both Cape-born and both Company slaves) also complicates the issue. These are termed Armosyn I\(^\text{262}\) and Armosyn II, the latter being Armosyn Claasz.

The two Armosyns

Two aspects need to be clarified when distinguishing the two Armosyns:

- whether they were heelslagh\(^\text{263}\) or halfslagh\(^\text{264}\); and
- if Cape-born, why were they baptised at the Cape as adults (bejaardes) and not as infants?

The records are unambiguous in stating that Armosyn I was Cape-born and halfslagh. The same cannot be said for Armosyn II (Armosyn Claasz) who, although also Cape-born, appears never to be recorded halfslagh.\(^\text{265}\) This important distinction explains why their respective manumissions differ fundamentally from each other. Armosyn I, unlike Armosyn II, is never found recorded as a swartinne. In the case of freed halfslagh women, we are invariably reminded of their white paternity. Resolutions by the Council of Policy specifically mention white paternity when liberating Company-owned halfslagh slave women. The fact that they all were single mothers to children by white men appears to have proved a further incentive for their manumission on the understanding that marriage would be the outcome. Armosyn I was freed at the age of
28 while Armosyn II (if we accept her year of manumission to be c. 1702) was freed at the age of 40. As a Cape-born *heelslagh* slave, she was legally entitled to her freedom after 40 years service subject to certain conditions. Cape-born Company slaves who were not *halfslagh* had to serve for 40 years (plus payment) before qualifying for manumission whereas imported Company slaves only had to serve 30 years. She was already in occupation of her *erf* (granted belatedly 30 June 1708) as early as 20 April 1702. Armosyn II’s brother, Claas Cornelisz van de Caab, who is recorded as being a *halfslagh* Cape-born Company slave, also appears to have been manumitted long before his (presumably *heelslagh*) sister. The fact that they have differing patronymics is telling.

The Company appears to have been consistent in baptising all its slave children born at the Cape. Why would the two Armosyns (and Claas Cornelis?) have been excluded? Why were the two Armosyns baptised only later and with un-Christian names? It is possible that Company slave mothers who were not Christian, but loyal to their own religion, could refuse to surrender their children to baptism. Followers of Islam, in particular, would fall into such a category. The slaves brought from Guinea were unlikely to have been baptised prior to their arrival at the Cape, whilst those from Angola and captured from the Portuguese were likely to have been baptised *en masse* prior to their capture by the Dutch. The validity of Papist (even mass?) baptisms appears to have been accepted in principle by the Dutch. The abnormally high mortality rate and desertion amongst the slaves from Angola and Guinea from the time of their arrival at the Cape – in particular the spring of 1661 - may have resulted in incomplete record-keeping. Motherless children in particular, could conceivably have escaped infant baptism. Are there likely to have been many such children?

Significantly, it was in this period that the two Armosyns and Cornelis Claasz were born at the Cape. An indubitable recorded baptism for Claas Cornelisz still evades the writer, either as infant or as adult. Privately-owned slave children, more often than not, were seldom baptised by their owners. Should any of these have been sold or resold to the Company (though not a common feature), the possibility exists that some slaves could end up in the Lodge as un-baptised slave children. Records of these sales to the Company by officials appear to exist, but those by free-burghers do not. We know for instance that outgoing commander Jacob Borghorst sold his slaves to the Company before leaving the Cape as did the free-burgher Thomas Christoffel Müller (from Leipzig). The former is directly recorded, whilst the latter transaction is merely mentioned indirectly.

The position of the Matrice in the Company Slave Lodge

It remains unclear when the position of matres / matrice came about officially. The church’s list of communicants or active members (*communicanten*) confirms that already by 1684, a freed (Company?) female slave from the Malabar Coast – described in Dutch as *Mallebarin* - held the position of matron of the Company Slave Lodge. Listed together with two others, she is named only in terms of her position *Matrice*.
All evidence points to this woman being Beatrice van Cochin (c. 1650-1720) - informally and (affectionately?) known as Maije Batrice [literally 'Mother Beatrice'] - who later became lawful wife to Armosyn Claasz's brother, Claas Cornelisz van de Caab. Significantly, she appears together with Armosyn I and Jan Pasqual, the Lodge's schoolteacher who was predecessor to Armosyn Claasz's brother. No record of her baptism or manumission has been found. She is not listed (1688) as part of the free population. Her arrival at the Cape has been narrowed down to the year 1677 when the VOC despatched a large contingent of slaves to the Cape from Tucicorin and Ceylon. Was she part of this group? Did she arrive already baptised? The majority of these slaves were from the Madurese and Malabar Coasts and neighbouring Cochin and Quilon.

As earliest known matron, Beatrice van Cochin would have played a pivotal role in monitoring all ‘carnal conversations’ that were generally acknowledged to take place within the Company Slave Lodge. She appears to have been succeeded as matron by her husband's sister, Armosijn Claasz, who in turn was succeeded by her daughter, Manda Gratia,274 whom we know to have been matres (already by 1711). In effect, a certain line of succession and hierarchy had been formed within the Slave Lodge. This raises the question: To what extent could Company slaves of West African origin entrench themselves in positions of authority within the Slave Lodge? Would it have suited the Company to have slaves overseen by other slaves of similar ethnic background or would it have been more effective to have slaves from the East supervising a majority of ‘negroid’ or black African slaves? Were Claas Cornelis and Armosyn Claasz specially groomed for their future senior positions in the Lodge? What role would an older Beatrice van Cochin have played as initial force majeure within the Lodge?

On the recommendation of visiting commissioner, Hendrik Adriaan van Reede tot Drakestein, for the education of the colony’s children, provision was made for - not just separation of the free and unfree ('half-castes' included) - but also the slave boys from the slave girls. Prior to that, education of the colony's children appears to have been arbitrary, depending on the vicissitudes, not only of the ever-changing commanders, but also the limited availability of competent persons. In terms of the newly-proposed separation, the mestizo Jan Pasquaal,276 van Batavia continued to attend to the Company's slave boys, whilst the ex-slave woman Margaretha was appointed to teach the slave girls.277 Both teaching careers, however, were abruptly terminated. That same year Margaretha married a prominent free-burgher and relocated to the new colony at Stellenbosch. The division of the sexes appears to have fallen away and Pasqual was convicted (1687) for sexually molesting his female wards. He was subsequently banished to Mauritius.278 The task of morally uplifting the Company’s slave children was left to Armosyn Claasz's brother, Cornelis Claasz van de Caab. He was appointed in terms of a resolution by the Council of Policy (15 September 1687):279

D’ E. Heer Commendeur door verscheide berigten versetendigd zijnde als soude Jan Pasquaal, schoolmeester der E.Comps. slaven kinderen, betigt werden met verscheide meisjes of dogterjes zijner onderwijsinge anvertrouwd, te meermalen vuijle onkuijsheden en vleeslijke lusten gepleegd te hebben; So is eenpariger stemme verstaan en goedgevonden den voors. Pasqual anstonds door den
Two years later Claas Cornelisz became a member of the Church. He is listed as one of the new communicanten together with none other than the learned secretary to the Council of Policy, J. G. de Grevenbrouk280 (his protegé):  


The next year (1690), we find him marrying Beatrice van Cochin the matres of the Slave Lodge on 9 July. The marriage was childless. Not only can his baptism be located (a prerequisite for his marriage); so too his record of formal manumission to which he was entitled in terms of his acknowledged (uncontested?) white paternity. It appears that once he became a free-black he no longer carried on as schoolmeester. He was succeeded by Daniel Rodrigo.281 As a free-black couple their popularity can be gauged by the numerous appearances they make as baptismal witnesses in the church registers. On 12 August 1701 Claas Cornelisz van de Caab was granted a rather sizeable erf in Table Valley.282 This grant effectively makes him the first Cape-born mestizo / mulatto to be granted land in the colony. His property faces Church Square diagonally opposite the Slave Lodge and just down the road from the property that was later granted (1707) to his sister Armosyn. Scrutiny of both the deceased estate papers Claas Cornelisz (and his wife) and that of Armosyn (and Manda Gratia) indicate a definite helping hand being extended to Armosyn and her family from time to time. On 12 October 1709 Claas Cornelisz geboortigh alhier aan de Caab ende Beretrice van Coutchin drew up a joint will.283 The following provision was made:  

Should the wife predecease the husband, the following legacies would come into operation:

- an zijn suster Armozijn Claasse f 700
- aan zijn cousijn Frans van Leeuwen zijnde een soontje van zijn nigt Manda van de Caab een somma van ses honderd guld[er]s
- aan het soontje van den burger Hendrick Oswalt Eksteen, genaamt Michiel Eksteen f 300

We find, however, a surviving Bertrise van Cochin listed as a widow (1709) with no children. On 1 October 1719 Betrise van Couchin made a testamentary provision for the manumission of a slave child Maria van de Caab and a legacy of f3000 that the child might not become a burden to the diaconate - this slave child was put into the care of Jacob Cruger284. In this will she made provision for money to be paid out to her late husband’s sister Armosijn Claasse / Claasz. The executors to her will were H.[einrich] O.[stwald] Eksteen and B.[althazar] Pot.285

Armosyn’s earlier wills
Two earlier wills drawn up on behalf of (but both signed by) Armosyn Claasz have been found. Although the existence of her will (1721)\textsuperscript{286} was known, it had not yet been located.\textsuperscript{287} Her will (1713)\textsuperscript{288} comes as a total surprise. In both instances she was ill and bed-ridden but survived, not only the 1713 smallpox epidemic, but also her illness of 1721. The contents of her two wills are dealt with briefly.

**1713 Will**

*Armosijn Claasse* geboren aan derer uithoek oud omtrent 54 jaren, zijnde door de E, Comp:e vrijgegeven, en derhalwe vrije inwoorder alhier van de gereformeerde godsdienst siekkelijk te bedde leggend.

Her heirs were: *drij kinderen met namen Claas, Maria, en Magtella.*

The guardians – *voogden* – for the onmondig *Magtella* were to be *de voorsz: Claas en Maria benevens nog een dogter van de Testatrice genaamt Maanda; dat's versoggen de laatste niet aen voordat geemancipeert en in vrije staat gesteld sal zijn.*

**1721 Will**

*Dit zegel behoort tot het inleggende Testament van de vrij swartinne Armosijn Claasz van de Caab,* gepasseert de dato den 12e October 1721.

*De vrije Swartin Armosijn Claasz: van de Caab oud omtrent estig Jaaren siekelyk te bedde leggend.*

Her legatees were:

- *Diaconij Armen f 15*
- *Harmen Comrink* [Combrink] married to her daughter *Mageltje Leij f 1000*
- *Claas Jonasz van de Caab f 1000*

- The minor *Maria van Maria Stuart vrij swartinne f 1000*
- *Absalon Barenz:* still a Company slave – if free at the time of his grandmother's death, *Maria van Maria Stuart* was to only receive *f 500*, the other half would become his inheritance
- The children of the deceased *Manda van de Caab* wife of *Guilliam Frisnek* to receive *f 1000*
- *Frans van Leeuwen* soldier in Company's service and gone to Batavia
- *Willem Frisnek* van de Caab
- *Geertruy Frisnek* van de Caab
- The two remaining children *Jan Sniesing & Pieter Cornelisz* both still in slavery – if freed, to get equal portions of the *f 1000*.
- *Remainder of estate to Christina Armosina Comring*

The executors & guardians to *Maria van Maria Stuart* were to be *Harmen Comring & Claas Jonasz.*

When perusing the three wills of Armosyn Claasz, one is awed by the detailed stipulations so rarely found in the testamentary dispositions of the time and by her real and almost insurmountable attempts to rise above her circumstances. Her life-long
struggle to realise the emancipation of all her children, which was only partially successful, makes for painful contemplation indeed.

**What happened to Maria Stuart**

Cairns makes the assumption that Maria possibly died at the Cape in the Smallpox epidemic (1713):289

"In 1711 when the Cape was under the control of Louis van Assenburgh, she, then a free black according to this same document, made application to the Council of Policy for her daughter **Marie (Maria Stuart)** to be freed from slavery, either gratuitously or at a named price. The request was granted by the governor on condition that the girl served for a further three years and in addition the payment of a sum of money that would later undoubtedly be fixed by him".

She states further that her emancipation “was deferred for three years … circumstances suggest that she did not gain her freedom but died about 1713 probably during the smallpox epidemic of that year”. Shell is correct in stating that it was Maria Stuart (rather than her mother as indicated by Leibbrandt) who would have had to slave *again* for three more years:290

"In the Lodge itself, the women were under an equivalent authority figure, the *matres* – literally, a schoolmistress 291 – who lived in a separate room strategically located next to the chamber set aside for the Lodge's schoolgirls. Her duties exceeded those of the traditional "schoolmarm", and matron seems a more appropriate term. In the two references in which matrons are mentioned by name292 it is clear that they enjoyed the same, or greater, privileges of manumission as the male mulatto mandoors. As mothers themselves, they also had children to free. Both matrons mentioned were also mulattos [sic], and both were allowed to purchase and free their children. Armozijn van de Caab, the matron before 1711, was manumitted by Governor Willem Adriaan van der Stel because of good service; she asked the Company to free her daughter, Marie van de Caap [described as de meijt Marie in the record in question], who was still in the Lodge. The Company granted her request, but required that the slave girl work for the Company for three years before being sold to her mother at the price Lord van Reede had laid down in 1685 for all such mulatto children”.

The actual situation is set out in the relevant, self-explanatory, resolutions of the Council of Policy quoted *verbatim* below in the original Dutch together with Leibbrandt’s translations of the Company Journal entries.

"Armosyn, lately Matron of the Company's slave children, and manumitted for her faithful service, is granted the freedom of her daughter on condition that she (Armosyn [sic]) shall serve the Company three years longer”.293

*Armozijn van de Caab, gewesene matres van 's Comps. Slavinne kinderen in de logie, door den Heer Willem Adriaan van der Stel in vergeldingh harer goede diensten, in vrijdom gelargeert geweerde, mede aan den Edle. Heer Commissaris versorgt hebbende dat zij haar dogter genaamt Marie, zijnde een 's Comps slavin, door Zijn Edeles gunste van slavernij in vrijdom gestelt mogt zien; ofte dat haar mogt vergunt werden, de zelve haar dogter, tot een behoorlijke prijsje te mogen vrie; Zoo is op gemelt versoek goed gevonden om haar toe te zeggen dat de voor noemde dogter wanneer zij de E.
being to rely on being acknowledged (or appearing to be) difficult it was for any Company slave woman desiring civil freedom - and not being able to rely on being acknowledged (or appearing to be) halfslagh.

By offering the services of a substitute in the form of the slave boy **Tandewa**, Armosyn astutely managed to circumvent an intricate legal impasse. A departing Maria Stuart’s freedom could only be realised on condition that an outstanding three years of her services would have to be extinguished in terms of a suitable replacement. Armosyn’s personal sacrifices, being expected to make provision for further services in order to secure the premature freedom of at least one of her children, gives us a rare glimpse of how difficult it was for any Company slave woman desiring civil freedom - and not being able to rely on being acknowledged (or appearing to be) halfslagh.

Maria Stuart was thus freed conditionally (3 and 7 April 1711) and allowed to accompany the wife of the VOC official and skipper **Steeven Scheijderuit** to the Netherlands on board the **Raadhuis van Middelburgh**. The ship was part of the Return Fleet, departing (15 April 1711) from the Cape and arriving (7 August 1711) at Remmekens, in the Netherlands. If Maria Stuart did indeed survive the voyage to the Netherlands to be at the beck and call of an ailing official’s wife, she may have ended her days better off than any of her family at the Cape. Had she ended up in Batavia, her fortunes could perhaps have gone either way. That she had to leave without her children is a damning indictment on Dutch attitudes towards childcare. Did she die an untimely death before 1721 (she is unmentioned in her mother’s will (1721) unlike her sister Manda Gratia mentioned by name and as being deceased), or did her mother allow her to ‘disappear’ anonymously for the sake of escaping to freedom without constant reminders that she once was socially dead - a morte vivante? Her daughter **Maria van Maria Stuart** later known as **Maria Francina Cleef** (baptised as a Company slave 14 July 1709) was freed in 1720.** Absolom van Maria Stuart alias Absolom Barend Cleef** who is referred to as being “absent” (absenten) in his
grandmother’s will (1728), was not so fortunate. He absconded when still a Company slave into the interior (or did he stow away?) sometime in or before 1728 and is still listed (1732) as a deserter (droster).298

Kees de Boer, Isabella van Angola and Catharina van Malabar

A preliminary investigation into the (biological) parentage of both Armosyn Claasz and her brother Claas Cornelisz, raises more questions than answers. The assumption that the former Company official and free-burgher Cornelis Claasz (from Utrecht) – better known as Kees de Boer by his contemporaries - is based solely on an attestation (21 March 1661) - and hearsay evidence - by two men, the cook Claas Lambertsz: (from Almeer), and the cooper Arent Gerritz van der Elburgh, alleging that Kees de Boer had admitted to them that he had fathered the child (unnamed, gender unknown) of Isabella van Angola299, the slave woman belonging to the free-burgher Jan Reyniersz (from Amsterdam):

"25th March: - Declaration of Claas Lambertsz; of Alsmeer, cook, and Arent Gerritz van der Elburgh, cooper, stationed here and made at the request of the burgher Jan Reyniersz; that Cornelisz: [sic] Claasz; of Utrecht, also a burgher, had confessed to them that the child of the female slave Ysabelle owned by J. Reyniersz; was his child, &c".300

Unfortunately, no investigation that might have ensued thereafter seems to have been recorded (or survived?). Perhaps the allegations were even dismissed out of hand. Had the allegations been true, Reyniersz as legal owner of Isabella van Angola could have qualified in terms of claiming damages from the father. On 14 April 1672 Reyniersz, returning to Europe, sold Isabella born on the Angolan Coast (aged 30) years to the free-burgher Wynand Leendertz [Bezuidenhout] for Rds 200. She is not to be confused with another Isabella van Angola who belonged to Commander Jan van Riebeeck who confirms in a declaration (18 September 1659) that he had already purchased in 1658, four female Angola slaves - one named Isabel - together with three male Angola slaves and four male and two female Guinea slaves “as shown by the books, under the dates of 30th April, 10th May and 31st December 1658”. A departing, Batavia-bound Van Riebeeck sold (22 April 1662) his slave Isabella earlier - without children - to the free-burgher Hendrik van Zuerwaerden (Hendrik Snijer).301 Her new owner made testamentary provision for her manumission from his deceased estate and she was subsequently freed (15 May 1672) on the death of her master. She had been manumitted together with the Angola slave Jackje Joy (later known as Gracias Maialas) and the impression is given that they were freed as a de facto ‘married’ couple. No children are mentioned.302 She appears as a free-black woman alone in the Opgaaf Rollen for the years 1692 (as May Isabel) and 1695 (as Isabella van Angola).

Reyniersz baptized (12 September 1666) a halfslag slave child Catharijn by an unnamed slave mother [presumably his only surviving female slave, Isabella van Angola].303 No mention of any children is made in the sale by Reyniersz of Isabella to Bezuidenhout. Could Reyniersz have sold them to the Company? If any were halfslagh, would that have influenced his disposal of such children? Would he have been obliged to allow for their freedom at the prescribed ages of 22 (for girls) and 25 (for boys) whose fathers were European? We know nothing more about Bezuidenhout’s slave Isabella. Following the death of her second master (1673), she may have belonged to
his widow, Jannetje Gerrits (from Amsterdam), and her new husband, Cornelis Stevensz Botma (from Wageningen [Gelderland]).

Given that Armosyn Claasz was born either in 1659 (according to her earliest will) or in 1661 (according to her two later wills) and that she has the patronymic of Claasz, the temptation is there to assume that Kees de Boer was her biological father. The writer is of the opinion that such an assumption is incorrect. The evidence weighs in favour of Armosyn Claasz being born heelslagh - possibly with an enslaved non-European father named Claas and having to remain in slavery without an automatic right to freedom like her brother. If there is any likelihood of a connection to Kees de Boer, I would rather consider Armosyn’s Claasz’s brother, the halfslagh Claas Cornelisz van de Caab, to have been the biological son of Kees de Boer. The evidence weighs in favour of him being halfslagh, having an automatic right to freedom on becoming 25 years of age and with a patronymic in keeping with the usual practice of the time. It was customary to use the father’s first name and not last name as patronymic. Kees de Boer’s legitimate children (and those that were initially illegitimate) all used their father’s first name as a patronymic: Cornelis, Cornelisse, Cornelisz or Cornelissen. Any identification of parentage, however, is bedeviled by the fact that the names Cornelis and Claas were fairly common amongst both slaves and non-slaves at the Cape at the time.

Had Isabella van Angola (Reyniersz’s slave) been mother to either Armosyn Claasz and/or Claas Cornelisz, one would expect the name to have been perpetuated by their descendants. It is a curious fact, however, that the uncommon name Isabella (or Sijbella) does feature prominently amongst the descendants of the freed slave woman the Cape-born Maria Hansz whose one child’s baptism was witnessed by Cornelis Claasz.304 Were they related by blood? Had Armosyn Claasz and Claas Cornelisz been of West African origin, it is surprising that there is never once any reference to their ‘negroid’ origins. Often in the records special mention is made of either neger or zwarte or kaffir and even the female form cafferinnen. Claas Cornelisz’s marriage to Beatrice van Cochin further points to a more likely Indian connection or cultural affinity. The possibility that both Armosyn Claasz and Claas Cornelisz might have been voorkinders of Kees de Boer’s concubine and later wife, Catharina van Malabar must be ruled out. Her baptised halfslagh voordochter Adriaentje Gabriels, referred to as the stepdaughter of Kees de Boer, clearly had a different father. All the voorkinders fathered by Kees de Boer by Catharina van Malabar – a privately-owned slave - were legitimised by their marriage and those born in slavery, automatically liberated. As this was a large and established family who later relocated to Stellenbosch, one would expect evidence of biological ties in the records. Certainly Armosyn Claas and Claas Cornelisz were close and acknowledged openly their blood ties. This is not the case between Kees de Boer / Catharina van Malabar and them.

Cairns & Schoeman revisited

In conclusion, the writer concurs with Margaret Cairns’s general assessment of Armosyn Claasz’s life.

“The study of her life bears out what is true for most periods, that the descendants of a particular person demonstrate an increase, decrease or maintained level of social development. Armosyn,
by her own efforts while still a slave in the lodge raised herself from the ruck of her fellow slaves to a position of authority and trust. The characteristics she displayed in so doing she passed on to some of her descendants who continued the work she had begun. That others failed to do so must be accepted as the inevitable consequence of human nature".305

That Armosyn had help from her brother and his wife, however, needs to be brought into the equation when determining the extent of “her own efforts”. The assumption that the descendants of three of the four children of Armosyn Claasz were all taken up into what became the ‘Cape Coloured’ community needs to be reviewed.306 Maria Stuart went to the Netherlands and the Jonas family was an accepted part of the ‘white’ community and well represented in the Zwartland to this day – a rare example of a ‘white’ family descending from a heelslag black man.307

Schoeman’s portrayal of Armosyn as an example of how slaves could compete openly in a prejudice/colour-free 17th century world is problematic. Indeed, it was only some, or a few, (privileged?) slaves that could play a future or prominent (aanstaande) role in Cape colonial society.

"... the lack of any confirmatory racial discrimination at the Cape in the 17th and early 18th centuries and the leading role that [only some?] slaves and free-blacks played in the community.308

In the Dutch overseas factories no [?] proclaimed colour prejudice existed and in the East relations between whites with indigenous women were common.309

Schoeman’s observations about race relations in the Dutch East Indies do not apply to the Cape of Good Hope which evolved differently. Slave women at the Cape were not indigenous (‘inheems’). ‘Accepted’ or formalised relationships with indigenous women as in the East were never common at the Cape. That non-indigenous Eastern women at the Cape had it easier, as it were, can be substantiated, but the same cannot be said for African women - whether, Khoe/San, or from Angola and Guinea. Armosyn Claasz’s elusive parentage, her unmarried state - even after manumission, is testimony to the general predicament of Company slave women, few of whom even came to be emancipated during the early VOC period at the Cape - as opposed to the easier ‘escape hatch’ open to privately-owned slave women.

Schoeman’s claim that the lives of Armosyn and her children fit the pattern of the upcoming Cape’s mixed race petite bourgeoisie that could ‘pass for white’, is not credible:

“Armosyn Claasz and her children were thus part of what can be described as an upcoming local small bourgeoisie of mixed origins, chiefly of Eastern origin and coming from modern India (especially Bengal) and Indonesia (especially Macassar and Bugis) with only a few [black] Africans such as Armosyn herself or Maria Everts amongst them”.310

Armosyn and her family never ever attained the heights of a Maaij Ansela van Bengale (Mrs Arnoldus Willemz Basson) or her Cape-born halfslag daughter Anna de Koninck (Mrs Olof Bergh). Only some of her children came to be freed, others remained / died in bondage, one was even taken away, a grandson absconded and some
descendants ultimately would have become classified as ‘Coloured’. Perhaps being of possible ‘negroid’ extraction albeit it Indianised, over and above being a Company slave, further frustrated her chances of marriage and liberating all her children. Contrary to Schoeman’s claims that Armosyn’s descendants “probably felt no need to disguise their slave origins and ... were thereby not prevented from taking up their rightful in Cape society”, they cannot be said to have all taken up their rightful place in Cape society.\textsuperscript{311}

\textbf{Mansell George Upham}
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12 CA: C 145 (Resolution of the Council of Policy, 8 September 1767), pp. 270-305.

13 Wikipedia.


15 http://essenes.net.
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Hartog (from Frankfurt am Main) by wife Anna Henning; (4) Jannetie Verburg (from Leiden), marries (4 March 1696) msties Cape-born burgher Gerrit Basson (son of Arnoldus Willemz: Basson (from Wesel) & Angela / Engela (Maaij Ans[el]a) van Bengale); (5) Catharina Verburg, marries Cape 4 March 1696 free-burgher Joost Pietersz: van Dijk.

48 Ship leaves Holland (20 October 1654, arrives at Cape (19 February 1654) with a few sick on board & 4 deaths, and departing again for Batavia (11 March 1655).

49 CA: (Transporten en Schepenkennis (herinafter T&S): Joint will: Frederick Verburgh & Meijnsje Campius, no. 97, 9 August 1655).

50 ... nadat deselve net 9 maanden min een dagh hier getrouwt zijn geweest [Van Riebeeck’s Journal, vol. I, p. 374].

51 Omtrent ten 11 uyrren in de voornacht is’t kraemkindeken van den onderkoopman Verburgh’s huysvrou gestorven [Van Riebeeck’s Journal, vol. I, p 377].

52 She is not the Widow Verburg on record as having four slaves (1662). This is Maria Verburg, step-daughter of Commander Zacharias Wagenia [A.J. Böeseken, Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape 1658-1700, p. 24].

53 Instructions left by the Hon. Rycklof van Goens, Sr. in Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received 1649-1662, Part 2, p. 236.

54 Leibbrandt, Letters Received, vol. II. See also Memorîen, p. 9. In the original document the total is incorrectly given as 10.


57 CA: CJ 1, p. 326; C 2394, p. 25 [old numbers 418 & 137] [Attestation of Hendrick Barentsz [Hendrik Barendsz van der Zee (from Leeuwaerden) who signed his name Hendrick Barentse]] and Hans Coenraet Veugeleyn); CJ 1, p. 473 [old number 425].

58 A: CJ 1, p. 473 [old number 425].


60 Pieterje buiten echt geboren dochter van een slavin van Van der Stael ... [C. Spoelstra (ed.), Bouwstoffen voor de geschiedenis der Nederduit-Gereformeerde Kerken in Zuid-Afrika (HAUM, Amsterdam 1906)]. Circumstantial evidence points to this baptismal entry being that of Pieter Willemz: Tamboer. Although Pieterje is more often a girl’s name, it can also be a diminutive for Pieter. The infant’s gender is unmentioned in the baptismal entry.


63 DRC/A G1 (Baptismal Register, Cape Town).


66 These included: Abram & Hercules (9 December 1686), Catrina, Elysabet, Helena (2 February 1687), Armosyn, Jannetie, Anna & Helena (23 February 1687).

67 CA: C 18 (Resolution of the Council of Policy, 8 May 1686), pp. 28-29.

68 A privately owned slave, he was sold by Jochum Cornelisz: Blanck to his son-in-law, Elbert Dircksz: Diemer (from Emmerich) on 27 November 1665.

69 There was also a [Company?] slave Claes who was convicted (8 September 1660).

By 20 April 1702, she was already in possession of land in Table Valley eventually formally granted to her on 30 June 1708 ([J.L. Hattingh, ‘Grondbesit in die Tafelvallei: Deel 1: Die Ekspelment: Vryswartes as grondeienaars, 1652-1710’, Kronos, p. 45].

CA: Cj 2598, no. 50, 13 May 1713). Their joint will states that they were lawfully married: Guiliem Frisnet van Bergen op Zoom, out omtrent 52 jaarren, burger en inwoonder alhier, en Armozijn van de Caab, oude Luijden [emphasis is mine]. No marriage could be located at either the Cape church or at Stellenbosch. The records for the early marriages at Drakenstein have not survived. Records of civil marriages at the Cape after the formation of the Commissioner for Marriage Affairs in 1678, have not survived. Prior to this, civil marriages were permitted in terms of specific resolutions of the Council of Policy.

According to her joint will with her husband (13 May 1713) she was 55 years at the time.

The Angola slaves were a singular Portuguese prize en route from Luanda, Angola to Salvador, Bahia (Brazil) intercepted at sea; the Guinea group were a singular VOC purchase made at Popo (now Grand Popo in Benin, formerly Dahomey). M.G. Upham, ‘An impact minimal, yet phenomenal – Slaves from ‘Guinea’ & ‘Angola’ at the Cape of Good Hope [unpublished paper].

CA: MOOC 5/1 blad 13: (Diverse Voorvallen); MOOC 13/1/1 (Boedel Reekeningen), no. 71 (Deceased Estate Accounts: Isak van Bengalen); Cj 2598, no. 22 (Joint will: Frans Verkouter & Maria van Bengale, 1706); Cj 2650, no 6 (27 August 1709).


Mansell G. Upham, ‘Maaïj Ansla & the Black Sheep of the Family: A closer look at the events surrounding the first execution of a free-burgher in Cape colonial society for the murder of a non European‘, Capensis, nos. 4 of 1997, nos. 1-4 of 1998, nos. 1 & 2 of 1999: ‘Hell and Paradise … Hope on Constantia De Hel en Het Paradijs … De Hoop op Constantia‘ – Jan Grof (died ante 1700) and his extended family at the Cape of Good Hope – a glimpse into family, household, patriarchy, matriarchy, bondage, marriage, concubinage, adultery, bastardy, métissage, manumission, propinquity and consanguinity in 17th century Dutch South Africa before slavery’s abolition, the weakening of kinship and emergence of the modern nuclear family’, First Fifty Years Project, Remarkable Writing (February 2012): [http://www.e-family.co.za/remarkablewriting/HeelenParadijsDeHoopOpConstantia.pdf].

A troublesome slave on Robben Island, she was shipped ‘by mistake’ (per abuis) to Batavia (May 1658). She was mother to the Cape-born slave Jan Bruijn sold by the Company to the free-burgher Leendert Cornelisz: (from Sevenhuijzen) [A]. Boeseken, Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape 1658-1700, pp. 8 & 25.


Familia Antiqua, matres, matrice, matrises, and matries, p. 28-29.

Cairns misreads this baptismal entry in her seminal article on Armozijn Claesz: assuming the child to be that of Armozijn the younger - Margaret Cairns, ‘Armosyn Claas of the Cape and her Family, 1661-1783 [sic]’, Familia, vol. XVI (1979), no. 4, p. 87: ‘Willem, baptised 6.5.1685 ‘een kind van Armosy [sic] juffrouw [sic] onder [sic] get. [sic] van [sic] Armosy en Jan Pasquaels [sic].’

Wagenaar brings following slaves: the baptized Japanese man, Anthonij; Annica; Willem; Louis, all from Bengal. His daughter has 4 slaves in attendance: Jantje (van Bengale), Matthijs (van de Cust Coromandel [sic]) [Matthijs van Angola], Paulo (van Malabar) & the ‘girl’ (de meijt Catharijn) [Catharina van Malabar]. Other slaves that probably arrived at this time (or soon thereafter) were: Gratia d’Costa, Florinda van Jafnapatnam, Catharina van Bengale, Maria van Goa, Susanna van Bengale, Andries (Arie) van Bengale, Claes Gerritsz: van Bengale, Anthonij Jansz: van Bengale, Jeronimus van Coromandel, Titus (Tita) van Bengale, Ventura van Ceylon, & the Malay (Maleijer) Barru [Baddou]?

Maria Schalck: (c. 1664-1700) daughter of slave Koddo / Prodo van Guinea, also recorded as, Clador / Plador), a Company slave, freed with other old and retired (afgeleefde) slaves by resolution of the Council of Policy (2 January 1687) and likely illegitimate daughter of free-burgher, Willem Schalck: van der Merwe (from Broek / Oud Beijerland); marriages (23 September 1696) free-burgher, Paul Hein [Heyns] (from Leipzig); deds 26 May 1700: Huijden op woensdag morgen de klock seven is overleden Maria Schalck huissvrouw van Paul Heijn: Cabo de Goede Hoop den 26 Maij Anno 1700 [CA: MOOC 14/212].
Jannetje Bort (c. 1663-1713) (also recorded as Jannetie Hendriks) possibly daughter of Catharina (Groote Catrijn) van Paliacata; marries Cape (22 December 1686) sergeant Dirck van Coningshoven / Koningshoven (from Utrecht); dies 1713 (smallpox epidemic) leaving the 7 surviving children: Catharina (married to Hendrik Treurniet); Maria Elisabeth (married to Jacob Hasselaer); Susanna; Helena; Clara; Hendrik; & Isak [CA: MOOC 13/1/1, (no. 43 Johanna Bord wede Coninxhoven)].

CA: C 18 (Resolution of the Council of Policy, 8 May 1686), pp. 28-29.


Heinrich Oswald Eksteen (1678-1747) (from Löbenstein [Thuringia]); arrives (1702) as adelborst on the Oostersteyn; 1704 burgher; member of the Burgher Raad & Orphan Chamber; marries (1) in 1704 Sara Heijns and marries (2) in 1714 Everdina Cruijwagen; 1719 marries (3) Aletta van der Heijden [CA: CJ 2598 (Testamenten, Codicillen &c., 1702-1714), no. 60; CA: CJ 2656 (Testamenten, 1740-1741), no. 61]. He also fathers an illegitimate child Hendrik Eksteen (baptized 8 February 1705) by the free-born black woman Agnietie Colijn (daughter of Maria van Bengale & Bastiaan Janse van s' Gravensan alias Bastiaan Jansz: Colijn (from s’ Gravensand)) who also had two illegitimate children by the Swiss-born free-burgher Johann (Hans) Oberholzer (from Zürich): Jan Oberholzer & Barbara Oberholzer.

CA: MOOC 7/2 (Testamenten, 1712-1720), no. 126; CA: C 54, pp. 91-102 (15 October 1720); Resolusies van die Politieke Raad (Johannesburg 1968), vol. VI (resolution, 15 October 1720), p. 79; Dutch Reformed Church Archives (hereinafter DRC/A): G1 8/1 (Baptismal Register: Cape Town, 1 October 1719), fol. 179; Prof. J.L. Hattingh, 'Slawevrystellings aan die Kaap, 1700-1720', Kronos vol. 5, p. 31. He later fathers illegitimate children by Cape-born heelslag Martha Manuels: who once belonged to Wouter Cornelisz: Mostaert (from Utrecht) & Hester Weyers: Klim (from Lier).


Joint will: Guilliam Frisnet van Bergen op Zoom, out omtrent 52 jaaren, burger en inwoonder alhier, en Armosijn van de Caab, oud omtrent 55 Jaaren, egte Luijden [CA: CJ 2598, no. 50 (13 May 1712)].

Opgaaf (1692), nos. 3101 & 3102 (courtesy of Dr. H.F. Heese).

DRC/A: G1 1/1.

Opgaaf (1695), nos. 166 & 166B (courtesy of Dr H.F. Heese). Armozijn, however, is incorrectly listed as Hermina [sic].


Son of Arnoldus Willemsz: Basson (from Wesel) by his wife Angela van Bengale (Maaij Ansela).

Cape-born daughter of the Swede Mikael Mikaelsson [Clements] (from Stockholm) and his wife Isabella van Delft (from Bommel).

Opgaaf (1700), nos. 235 & 235B (courtesy of Dr H.F. Heese).

Opgaaf (1702), nos. 298 & 298B (courtesy of Dr H.F. Heese).

Opgaaf (1705), nos. 414 & 414B (courtesy of Dr H.F. Heese).

DRC/A: G1 1/1 (Namen der Christen Kinderen, 16 November 1710).

Guilliam Frisnet en zijn vrouw Armozijn [DRC/A: G1 1/1 (Namen der Christen Kinderen, 16 November 1710)].

Louis van Bengaalen en Armozijn van de Caap [DRC/A: G1 1/1 (Namen der Christen Kinderen, 12 April 1711)].

Opgaaf (1712), nos. 162 & 162B (courtesy of Dr H.F. Heese).

Guilliam Frisnet van Bergen op Zoom, out omtrent 52 jaaren, burger en inwoonder alhier, en Armosijn van de Caab, oud omtrent 55 Jaaren, egte Luijden [CA: CJ 2598, no. 50, 13 May 1712].

H.C.V. Leibbrandt, Précis of the Archives of the Cape of Good Hope: Journal 1699-1732.

Opgaaf (1716), nos. 203 & 203B (courtesy of Dr H.F. Heese) - listed as Manda Gratias.

Opgaaf (1719), nos. 218 & 218B (courtesy of Dr H.F. Heese) - listed as Manda Gratie.

11 June 1706: (aged 23) sold by Claas Meijboom to Frisnet for Rds 55 [T&S].

31 May 1707: sold by Jan Brommert to Frisnet [T&S].

31 May 1707: sold by Brommert to Frisnet [T&S].

27 January 1711: (aged 36) sold by Johannes Pijthius to Frisnet for Rds 166 [T&S].
20 June 1726: sold by free-black Pieter van Bengale to Frisnet for Rds 80 [T&S]; 17 June 1727: sold by Frisnet to Gijsbert Verweij [MOOC].

5 September 1726: creole (aged 2) sold by Frisnet to Jacob[us] van As for Rds 150 [T&S].

9 June 1727: sold by Frisnet to Hans H. Neemzu for Rds 104 [MOOC].

16 June 1727: sold by Frisnet to Hendrik Constantie for Rds 133 [BOCC & MOOC].

17 June 1727: sold by Frisnet to Theunis Dircksz: van Schalkwyk for Rds 100 [MOOC].

CA: C 6 (Council of Policy: Resolution: 4-5 March 1670), pp. 24-26 [TANAP].

Possibly a misreading for Houni.

Journal under 24 November & 28 November 1665, p. 165.

_Oude Hans & Jafenne_ (also recorded as Gegeima / Lobbitje) van Guinea (18 September 1659); Jan Dircksz: van de Caap (25 August 1661); Marij van de Caep (28 September 1661); Angela / Engela [Maaij Ans[ies]ela] van Bengale (19 April 1662); Catharina van Malabar, Jan Meeu, Thomas[so] Keuken & Maaij Claesje – all from Angola (20 April 1662); Christina (Christijn) [Regina / Ticonne / Licinne / Tavina van Rapenberg van Guinea?] (22 April 1662); Maaij Isabella van Angola (22 April 1662) & Jacqje Joij van Angola (1 May 1662).

These were the slave women Maria (Marij) van Bengale, Dominga [sic] [Lijsbeth] van Bengale[?], Maria van Guinea, Maria van A ngola, Maria Pekenij van Angola, Francina (Francijn) van Angola, their children & the slave men Dirck, Evert van Guinea, Ouwe Jan van Angola, Matthijs van Angola & Meijndert van Antongil [Madagascar]. Only some of these slaves ended up in private hands whilst others certainly appear later as Company slaves.

Van Riebeeck, for example, is on record for doing so on two occasions. He sold (265 August 1661) to fiscal Abraham Gabbema the slave infant Jan Dircksz:, son of his slaves, Dirck van Guinea & Houw / Hoena [Anna] van Guinea. He sold (28 September 1661) the one-year-old infant of Christina van Angola [sic] (fathered by a slave named Deucous / Deuxous van Guinea), also to Gabbema.

By May 1656 Mrs Boom is recorded as being the mother of 8 children [Journal (18 May 1656)].


This was after the death of Anna's 'husband', the Evert van Guinea (sometime between 1686 and 1688). She appears as Hoena, 'wife' of free-black Claes van Guinea in the census (1692 & 1700) [courtesy of H.F. Heese] [J.L. Hattingh, _Die Eerste Vryswartes van Stellenbosch 1679-1720_, pp. 42-43].

H.C.V. Leibrant, _Précis of the Archives of the Cape of Good Hope: Letters and Documents Received, Part II_, p. 163.

He was the son of Gerrit Willemssz Noortlander woonende onder 't gerecht van Mijndrecht. He had a paternal uncle Sijman Willemssz: and a [maternal?] uncle Marten Fransz: [Transporten en Schepenkennis, 11 April 1665].

H.C.V. Leibrant, _Précis of the Archives of the Cape of Good Hope: Attestations_, p. 455 (5 August 1662).

CA: C 326, pp. 421-422 (Attestation by Catharina Martens, Barbier Geens & Catharina Ustincx, 21 August 1663); A J. Bøsken, _Uit die Raad van Justisie_, p. 147.

"Ernestus Back shows great diligence in teaching both Dutch and black children to read and learn their catechism - monthly fee required … The two girls Sarah and Maria Rosendaels together with a "Hottentooische" shall be taught Pro Deo."

Journal, p. 146.

The child was later placed (1667) in the care of Widow Wiederholt [Geertruijd Mentinghs (from Hasselt)] who received f 65 from the Diaconie for looking after _Ariaentje een arme kind_; & later transferred to the care of Sophia van der Tempel (July 1670) [Maria M. Marais, _Argiefjaarboek_, p. 15].

The provisonele assistent Johannes Pretorius, the huistimmerman Samuel de Back, Jilles Rooman, the messelaar; Jan van Oldenburgh [Van Eeden], the slanger; Sijmon Huijbrechts, the snyer and 2 free-burghers Hendrick Reijnste & Andries Roelfsz.

"The carpenter, Hendrik Reynst, who had been accepted for a year's service at f 15 per month, has been sent back by the commander, Sieur _Wreede_, in consequence of his repeated protestations that he did not see how to earn a living there" [Journal 10 November 1666, p. 199; Letter, (30 November 1666) by Jacob Granaet].
140 Uit die Raad van Justisie, 1652-1672, p. 365 n. 993. Böeseken states that he returned to the Cape in 1669 [sic]. He actually returned earlier in 1666.

141 [CA: CJ 1, p. 326] [CA: C 2394, p. 25 [old numbers 418 & 137] [Attestation of Hendrik Barentsz [Hendrik Barendsz: van der Zee (from Leeuwaerdien)] [signed Hendrik Barentsz] & Hans Coenraet Veugelein] [CA: CJ 1, p. 473 [old number 425].

142 CA: CJ 1, p. 473 [old number 425].

143 CA: CJ 1, p. 328.


146 This baptism is not in C.C. de Villiers & C.Pama, Genealogies of Old South African Families.

147 A.J. Böeseken, Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape 1658-1700, p. 143.

148 The house was situated between that of garden of Jan Verhagen (from Akendorp) & his wife, Annatje Brujin (from Norway), the erf of Frans van Hairbrugge & the house & garden of Gysbert Dirksen Verwey & his wife, Catharina Theunissen Gansevanger.

149 Did they marry at the Cape in a civil ceremony?

150 Schepenkennis 1 April 1665; H.C.V. Leibbrandt, Précis of the Archives of the Cape of Good Hope: Journal, p. 142 (31 March & 1 April 1665).

151 Böeseken calls him Jan.

152 Regina van Guinea (same person as Tavina [misreading for Regina?] van Rapenberg who, later freed, is recorded as Ticonne / Licinne [also misreadings for Regina?] in oppaaf (1682) as sister to freed (formerly private) slave woman Anna van Guinea. Originally belonging to disgraced free-burgher Leendert Cornelis: (van Sevenhuysen) who rejoined the Company leaving the colony (1662) after having his property (including 5 slaves namely: Sara de Waster [Koddo?] van Guinea, Tavina van Rapenberg [Regina / Christina?] van Guinea, Judas de Wever van Guinea, Pieter Pietersz: van Guinea & Jan Bruijn van Madagascar) confiscated with debts owing to Maria de la Quellerie, she appears to be same person as Christina (Christijin) [sic] van Angola [sic?] whom Van Riebeeck sold (20 April 1662) to Elbert Dircksz: Diemer (from Emmerich).

153 CA: VC 39 (General Muster Rolls, 1666-1698).


156 André van Rensburg, Website: South African Stamouers under Bastiaan Colyn.


158 G. Con de Wet, Die Vryliede en Vrywartes in die Kaapse Nedersetting 1657-1707, p. 213.

159 CA: CJ 2, p. 114.


161 Daughter of Jacob Hubertsen van Rosendaal (from Leiden) and Barbara Geems (from Amsterdam) (c. 1627-1688).

162 CA: CJ 2954 (Confession en Interrogatoriën 1658-1700), fol. 26 & verso (Declarations of Lijsbeth van de Caep, 28 & 30 April 1678); Resolusies van die Politieke Raad, Deel II, 1670-1680 (Suid-Afrikaanse Argiefstukke, Kaap no. 11), Kaapstad, 1959, p. 253 (resolution, 14 June 1678) & pp. 258-259 (resolution, 14 July 1678).

163 Maria (Marie / Mary) van de Caep, daughter of Deusous van Guinea & Christina (Christijin) van Angola [sic] [Tavina van Rapenberg / Ticonne / Licinne / Regina van Guinea?] sold (28 September
1661) when aged 1 by Jan van Riebeeck to secunde Abraham Gabbema who in teun sold her (6 April 1666) then aged 5 to his brother-in-law Elbert Dircksz: Diemer (from Emmerich).


165 CA: 1/STB 18/144 (Gemengde Notariële Aktes: declaration: Michael Kann (courier), 31 March 1687 & receipt: Louis van Bengale, 16 April 1682; Lovijs van Bengalen debt acknowledgement, 10 May 1683; CA: 1/STB 5/1 (Notule van verrigtinge in siviele sake: Andries Houwer contra Louis van Bengalen, 17 March 1687; CA: 1/STB 18/60 (Obligasies: Louis van Bengale, 20 March 1688); CA: CJ 3 (Oorspronlikke regsrolle en notule: fol. 1, verso, Andries Houwer contra Louis van Bengale, 10 February 1689) & fol. 8. verso & 9. (Andries Houwer contra Louis van Bengale, 9 & 19 April 1699); CA: 1/STB 5/1 (Notule van verrigtinge in siviele sake: Jacob van Heur contra Lovijs van Bengale & Andrijs Houwer, 5 May 1699).

166 CA: 1/STB 5/1 (Notule van verrigtinge in siviele sake: Aarnout Willemsz: contra Lovijs van Bengale, 15 March 1688); CA: 1/STB 18/60 (Obligasies: Louis van Bengale, 4 November 1688).

167 CA: CJ2 (Oorspronlikke regsrolle en notule) fol. 117 (F iscal contre Louis van Bengale, 23 September 1680) en fol. 18 (Fiscal contra Anthonij van de Cust Coromandel, 9 August 1681); CA: C2 (Oorspronlikke regsrolle en notule) fol. 5 (Fiscal contra Anthonij van de Cust Coromandel, 3 February 1681); J.L. Hattingh, Die Eerste Vryswartes van Stellenbosch, 1679-1720, p. 22.


169 15 June 1697 [Böeseken has 21 June]: aged 22 sold by Philibert van Bresschot [Böeseken has Bœsschot merchant on the Bantham] to Louis van Bengale Rds 70 [CA: T&S]; 4 August 1700: Titus van Macassar aged 20 [sic] sold by Louis van Bengale to David Lingelbach Rds 55 [CA: Transporten en Schepenkennis].


171 CA: 1/STB 18/144 (Gemengde Notarieke Aktes: Louis van Bengale, 27 July 1683).

172 The farm was only formally granted to him (15 September 1692) by which time he had already given up farming and relocated to Table Valley.

173 The joint will of Louis and Rebecca confirms that he had three minor illegitimate daughters [CA: CJ 2597 (Testamente) fol. 184-187 (Will: Louis van Bengale & Rebecca van Macassar, 30 August 1697)].

174 Margaret Cairns misreads this baptismal entry and incorrectly ascribes this child to Armozijn the younger in her seminal article (1979).

175 A.J. Böeseken, Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape 1658-1700, p. 142.


177 Kodo is not listed in the census for the year (1688). Paaïj Claes van Guinea is also not recorded. Was he no. 251 in the census but not mentioned by name?

178 Appears on her own in 1695 (Opgaaf): No. 419: Maria Schalk: 1 woman; Cape. On 23 September 1696 Maria Schalks: marries Paul Heim [Heyns] (from Leipzig).

179 CA: 1/STB 5/1 (Notule van verrigtinge in siviele sake: Lovijs van Bengale vs. Lijsbeth van de Cabo, 15 March 1688).


183 CA: 1/STB 18/152 (Declaration: Jan Kock & Cornelis Joosten), incompletely, 1689; J.L. Hattingh, Die Eerste Vryswartes van Stellenbosch 1679-1720, p. 27.

184 1/STB 18/105 Procuratien, Louis van Bengale (28 December 1688).


186 CA: CJ 291, no. 251 (Confession: Elisabeth van de Caep, 6 April 1689).

187 De fiscaal Cornelis Pietersz Linnes contra Willem Teerling en Elisabeth van de Caep ... praetenderendete zijn vrijgelate Slavinne van den vrij swart Louijs van Bengalen mede aen Stellenbos


Hattingh misreads this as 29.

Anna J. Böseken 'Wie was die vader van Lijsbeth van die Kaap' & 'Prof. J. Leon Hattingh se antwoord', Kronos, vol. 5 (1982), pp. 61-67.

CA: CJ 291 (Crimeinele Processtukken, 25 April 1689), p 239.


J.L. Hattingh, Die Eerste Vryswartes van Stellenbosch, 1679-1720, pp. 21 & 28. According to Hans Fransen & Mary Alexander Cook, The Old Buildings of the Cape (A.A. Balkema Cape Town 1980), the farm was later known as Leef-op-Hoop and later as Klein Gustrow.

He appears as such in the tax rolls (1688). Hattingh incorrectly has him becoming a free-burgher later in 1690 [J.L. Hattingh, 'Die Blanke nageslag van Louis van Bengale en Lijsbeth van die Kaap', Kronos, vol. 3 (1980), p. 11].


According to C.C. de Villiers & C. Pama, Genealogies of Old South African Families, p. 306, the child is incorrectly stated to be a son Joannes. The infant Joannes was in fact son to Caspar Willerts & Arriaentie Sterrevelt. The mistake derives from a misreading of the baptismal register.


CA: VC 39 (General Musters Rolls, 1666-1698).

He is recorded variously as Jacob Cornelisse(n) van Bengale / Colombo / Malabar; slave belonging to Thielman Hendricksz: (from Utrecht); manumitted (1677) by resolution of the Council of Policy; 13 June 1707: granted [2/114] erf in Table Valley [Block LL] (30 r 41’ (446.6 Ha) (after 14 years occupation sells to Deaconate); marries Cape 3 February 1693 Cornelia (Neeltje/n) van Macassar by whom he has 3 children: Mietje, Catharina & Cornelis; marries (2) 10 January 1700 Sara van Madagascar [CA: MOOC 3/1, no. 2 (Inventory: Neeltjen van Makassar & Jacob van Bengalen, surviving spouse)].


DRC/A G1 8/1 (Doop en Lidmaate Register van Gemeente Kaapstad, 15 April 1697); J.L. Hattingh, Die Eerste Vryswartes van Stellenbosch 1679-1720, p. 22.

DRC/A G1 8/1 (Doop en Lidmaate Register van Gemeente Kaapstad, 23 July 1693); J.L. Hattingh, Die Eerste Vryswartes van Stellenbosch 1679-1720, p. 22. Sams person as Company slave & convict (gecondemneerde) Rebecca baptized in the Cape Church: eodem dito [22 September 1686] Rebecca Gecondemneerde van de Comp.[agnie beiaerde.


CA: CJ 4(i) (Oorspronklikke regsrolle en notule), p. 154 (Hendrik Ploeg vs. Louwies van Bengale, 6 October 1704).
The recent claim that the whole [sic] crew and 25 slaves of the Tulp and a cargo of rice perished on the coast of Madagascar makes no sense [Piet Westra & James Armstrong, *Slave Trade with Madagascar: The Journals of the Cape slaver Leijdsman, 1715*] ( Africana Publishers, Pinelands 2006)).

222 Anna J. Boesen states that Cleijn Eva van Madagascar was given by the ‘king’ of Antongil Bay to Frederik Verburgh as a present to the commander’s wife [Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape 1658-1700, p. 8]. Boesen relies on CA: C 326 (Attestatiën, 1652-1662), no. 87, 18 [sic] September 1659, p. 119 which has been renumbered as C 2391 (Council of Policy: Attestations: September 1662-February 1660), 1 September 1659), [pp. 86-87] [previously pp. 119-120]. The attestation merely states: Cleijn Eva door den Coningh van Antongil aan der Commande:f(u)rs vrou tot vereening gesonden. W. Blommaert claims that Cleijn Eva came on La Maréchale [relying on the same attestation but also on the Negotie Boeken van de Caep, A[n]n[j]o. 1657, Haags Koloniaal Archief, no. 3971, fol. 241] ‘Het Invoeren van de Slavernij aan de
1652 Abraham Batavia, 18 June 1660, pp. 176-177.

228 Karel Schoeman incorrectly assumes him to be a female slave [Early slavery at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1717 (Protea Book House, Pretoria 2007), pp. 35 & 42].


232 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received, 1649-1662, Part II, p. 24.

233 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received, 1649-1662, Part II, p. 24.

234 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received, 1649-1662, Part II, pp. 17-18.

235 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received, 1649-1662, Part II, p. 20.

236 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received, 1649-1662, Part II (Joris Backer, Amsterdam 23 February 1660), p. 155


242 Leibbrandt, Letters & Documents Received, Part 2 (7 May 1661; 23 August 1661 & 17 November 1661).


246 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received 1649-1662, Part II, (C. de Graaff, &c, Amsterdam 15 October; C. de Graaff & Daniel Bernard from Amsterdam, 16 October); (C. de Graaff, &c. from Delft, 2 December 1660), pp. 161-165.

247 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received 1649-1662, Part II, pp. 167-169.

248 Leibbrandt, Letters and Documents Received 1649-1662, Part II, pp. 185-186.

249 Leibbrandt, Letters Despatched from the Cape 1652-1661, vol. III (Jan van Riebeeck to the Seventeen, 1 January 1661), p. 188.


252 Also found as Armosij, Armosy, Harmosij de cleine, Klein Armosi slavin, Klein Armosi slavin van de Comp[agnie], de vrij Swartine / de vrij Swartin Armosijn Claasz, Armosijn Claasze van de Caab, Armozijn van de Caab and Armozijn Claasze.


254 The first grant was to Angela van Bengale (9 December 1690) - the Cape’s first imported slave woman to be granted land. The second grant was to the Cape-born Maria Hondsogter (11 December 1691) - the first Cape-born ‘half-caste’ or halfslag to be granted land. The third grant was to Armosyn van de Caab (30 June 1708 - the first Cape-born heelslag to be granted land.
together with her daughter, (provenances unspecified) and their children were placed in the Slave Lodge: a slave woman van Dogter no. 23 (Institute for Historical Research, University of the Western Cape, Bellville November 1996), pp. 36-42; his Dogter van Sion: Machtelt Smit en die 18de-eeuse samelewings aan die Kaap, 1749-1799 (Human & Rousseau, Cape Town 1997) & his latest two-volume work: Armosyn van die Kaap: Voorspel tot vestiging, 1415-1651 (Human & Rousseau, Cape Town 2000) & Armosyn van die Kaap: Die Wereld van ‘n slavin, 1652-1733 (Human & Rousseau, Cape Town 2002).


255 Schoeman has subsequently revised his portrayal of Armosyn, see his Armosyn van die Kaap: Die Wereld van ‘n slavin, 1652-1733 (Human & Rousseau, Cape Town 2002) & Early slavery at the Cape of Good Hope 1652-1717 (Protea Book House, Pretoria 2007).

256 He signed his name Claas Cornelisz. He is also found as Claas Cornelian and Claes Cornellussen van de Cape.

257 Also found as Matries, Beatrix van Couchin, Beretrie van Couthin, Bertres Cornelisse van Coutzien, Bertries van Couchun, Bertris van Couchun.

258 The muster roll (1663) indicates 55 slaves belonging to the Company: 11 men & 10 women from Guinea, 5 men & 12 women from Angola, 6 slaves from Madagascar & 2 slaves from Batavia & 27 children (see Anna J. Böeseeken, Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape 1658-1700, pp. 14, n. 67 & 24).

259 Groote Catrijn van Paliacatta (c. 1631-c. 1683) and Susanna Een Oor van Bengale (executed 1666). The former’s progeny has been identified but not all those of the latter (see M.G. Upham, 'In Hevigen Woede - Groote Catrijn: earliest recorded female convict (bandiet) at the Cape of Good Hope – a study in upward mobility', Capensis, no. 3 (1997), pp. 8-33; ‘Maaij Ansela & the Black Sheep of the Family’, Capensis, no. 2 (1998), p. 27 & 'Consecrations to God: The ‘nasty, brutish, and short’ life of Susanna from Bengal otherwise known as 'One Ear' - 2nd recorded female convict at the VOC-occupied Cape of Good Hope', Capensis, no. 3 (2001), pp. 10-23).

260 Also found as een beiaarde Companijs met Groot Armosy, Grote Armosy, Armosy de grote, Armosij van de Cape & Armozijn van de Cab.

261 Heeslagh = ‘full-caste’ or full-blood (refers generally to non-white slaves having no white admixture). These were further distinguished by the 17th century Dutch inter alia as neger, caffer, indisch, chinees etc.

262 Halfslagh = ‘half-caste’ (slaves having white or European admixture).

263 Of all her recorded children, only her infant son Frans and her youngest child Machteltje are recorded as being halslagh. The children of her daughters Manda Gratia & Maria Stuart appear to have been mostly (if not all) halslagh as opposed to kasties (ie the term used for children that would have been only a quarter black (or white?)

264 Being halslagh she was entitled to her freedom already at the age of 22.

265 Cape Archives (CA): C 700 (Memorien en Instructien, 1657-1699), p. 217; Anna J. Böeseeken, Slaves and Free Blacks at the Cape, 1658-1700, p. 46.


267 Records are non-existent only for the period (8 April 1663 – 28 August 1665) - a period of two years & four months. The majority of infant slave baptisms are recorded previously in the Company Journal, but the children and the parents are not mentioned individually by name.

268 For policy directives on baptism at the Cape (including Papists [Roman Catholics] and slaves), see Ds. Johannes Overney’s letter (c. 1678) to the Classis Amsterdam in Zeeuwel, Bouwstoffen voor de Geschiedenis der Nederduitsch-Gereformeerde Kerken in Zuid-Afrika, Deel I, pp. 28-29.

269 Commander Jacob Borghorst sold all twelve of his slaves at cost price (f 2 842:10:0) to the Company before he left the Cape (March 1670) [see RPR]. Of Borghorst’s slaves, the following female slaves (provenances unspecified) and their children were placed in the Slave Lodge: a slave woman Polleciij together with her daughter, Lijsbet en twee kinderen and Marija.

270 The free-burgher Thomas Muller (from Leipzig) sold Gegeima (alias Lobbitije), a slave woman from Guinea, back to the Company (no record of sale found) but claimed later that her daughter Maria had not been part of the deal. The child was subsequently manumitted.

271 Coming from Cochin, an important Portuguese factory, she is even likely to have been baptised before coming into Dutch hands.

272 Also found as Manda van de Caab, Maanda Gratia or Maendra Gratia, this Portuguese name could either have Angola or Asian origins.
doende

Bergen).

Margaretha Jans Visser who married the Norwegian Lambert Laurensz Barzenius van Hoff (from Bergen).


Johannes / Jan Guillemus / Gu(i)lielms / Guijelmus / Guglielmos de Grevenbroeck / Grevenbrouck (1644-1725).

His position as schoolmeester is confirmed by the Membership List of the Church (27 July 1691): Den 27 Julius [1691] zijn tot de Gemeente overgekoomen, Hildegonda Bonen met Attestatie van Amsterdam, met Daniel Rodrigo, Schoolmeester in Comp.jaglievs Logie met belijdenisse.


CA: CJ 2650, no. 10 (12 October 1709) & MOOC 7/1/1, no. 71, Joint Will: Claas Cornelisz geboortigh alhier aan de Caab ende Ende van Couthchin (23 January 1710).

CA: CJ 2600, no. 22 & MOOC 7/1/2, no. 126 (will: Beatrice van Couthchin oud omtrent 70 jaar) 27 January 1720 (vertoont 7 September 1720).

H.C.V. Leibbrandt, Précis of the Archives of the Cape of Good Hope: Requesten, (no. 105, 15 October 1719), vol. IV, p. 1244g.

CA: CJ 2601, no. 57 (12 October 1721), pp. 56-61.


Margaret Cairns, ‘Armosyn Claasz of the Cape and her Family, 1661-1783’, Familia, vol. XVI, no. 4, pp. 85-86, 89 & 92 [CA: CB, pp. 63-8 (3 April 1711) is given as the source].


It is not clear whether the matron was in fact the same position and office as the schoolmistress. The appointment of Margaretha as schoolmistress for the Company slave girls appears to have coincided with the ongoing appointment of Beatrice van Couthchin as matron.

Armozijn van de Caab (ante 1711) & Christijn van de Caab (1728). Shell (Children of Bondage) is unaware, however, that Beatrice van Couthchin and Manda Gratia are also mentioned by name in the records as being matrons in the Lodge.


Resolusies van die Politieke Raad, Deel IV (3 April 1711), p. 203.


Anna J. Böeseken, Resolusies van die Polieke Raad, Deel IV (7 April 1711), p. 207.


CA: C 1240, {Attestatien, Lys van Drosters}, p. 95.

Also found as Yasbelle.

Leibbrandt’s Précis, Attestations, p. 450.
He was born c. 1635 in Sürwürden (geboortigh van Seurweurden) in the duchy of Oldenburg [now Oldenburg, Germany] which for centuries was ruled by the Danish crown.

Een meijt slavinne genaemt Isabelle sjinde onder d'voors[ejde]. leijffeijgenen twee namenl.[jick] Isabelle en Jackie, welcke van Hendrick van Zuijrwaerden vrijdom belooft. [CA: MOOC 23/5, nos. 19-21 (Staat en Inventaris & Taxatie van Hendrick van Zuijrwaarden & verclaaring van Margaritha Frans Meekhoff, 15 May 1672)].

den12 Sep[tember] gedoopt een slavinne kint van Jan Reijniersz onder getuychen van hom en syn vrouw en wiert genaemt Catharijn.

Den 27 dito [April 1691] Een kindt gedoopt waervan vader is Dirk Pretorius, de moeder Margariet [sic] Hanze, als getuijge stonden Claes Cornelisse, ende Maritie, de kindt is genaemt Joannes.

Margaret Cairns, Familia, p. 87.

See Karel Schoeman’s statement that “[d]rie van Armosyn se kinders het getrou met persone wat as ‘halflag’ of vryswartes aangedui word, en namate kleurbewussyn gedurende die agtiende eeu in die Kaapse samelewing toeneem, is hul afstammeling in die gekleurde gemeenskap ingetrek, dog die jongste dogter sou die stammoeder van ‘n blanke [sic] familie word”. (Dogter van Sion, p. 16).


"... die gebrek aan beduidende kleurdiskriminasie aan die Kaap in die sewentiende en vroë agtiende eeu en die vooraanstaande rol wat [sommige?] slave en vryswartes in die gemeenskap gespeel het." ['Kaapse Stamouers: Die Voorsate van Machttel Smit, 1661-1749, Kronos: Journal of Cape History, no. 23 (Institute for Historical Research, University of the Western Cape, Bellville November 1996), Kronos, p. 36].

"In die Nederlandse handelskolonies het daar geen uitgesproke kleurvooroordeel bestaan nie, en in die Ooste het verhoudings van blankes met inheemse vroue algemeen voorgekom)." [Karel Schoeman, Kronos, p. 39].

"Armosyn Claasz en haar kinders was dus deel van wat as ‘n opkomende plaaslike kleinburgery van gemengde herkoms beskryf sou kan word, hoofsaaklik van Oosterse oorsprong en afkomstig van die moderne Indië (veral Bengale) en Indonesië (veral Makassar en Boegies), met slegs enkele Afrikane soos Armosyn self of Maria Everts tussen hulle)" [Schoeman, Kronos, p. 40].

... het klaarblyklik geen noodsak gevoel om [hul] slave-herkoms te verdoesel nie, en ... nie daardeur verhinder om h[ulle] regmatige plek in die Kaapse samelewing ... in te neem nie) [Schoeman, Kronos, p. 42.]