

## **BAPTISM AND IDENTITY CREATION AT THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE, 1665 TO 1840**

**VC Malherbe (Centre for Socio-Legal Research, University of Cape Town)**

Three important sources – perhaps I should say: three important English-language sources - for the practice of baptism at the Cape of Good Hope, under Dutch East India Company rule, are works by Robert Shell, Jonathan Gerstner and Gerrit Schutte.<sup>1</sup> As many of you are familiar with these references, I will simply summarise some points – on which these scholars do not necessarily agree – before moving on to the baptismal records of three Protestant denominations – the Nederduitsch Hervormde, Lutheran and Anglican churches – until roughly 1840, a date which includes the end of slavery at the Cape. My topic concerns baptism and identity creation. There is still much to discover about the manner in which manumitted slaves, and the successive generations of free blacks, used baptism to forge new identities and establish a place in Cape society.

The baptismal policy of the Dutch church, before and after the right of public worship was extended to other churches, included the following:

\*Every child of a Christian believer should be baptised, including those born out of wedlock. The exceptions to this (according to Schutte) were children domiciled with a non-Christian mother, whose 'atrocious beliefs' might otherwise result in 'profanation' of the sacrament. Gerstner has explained the division within the Reformed church concerning the redemption of believers ('internally' vs 'externally' holy), as it pertained to baptism. The former belief (redemption at birth) – which was more exclusionary with respect to non-Christians – held sway at the Cape everywhere except in the Company's slave lodge.<sup>2</sup>

\*Baptism was a prerequisite for marriage in the Reformed Church – and Christian marriage was the only legal marriage at the Cape. I have mentioned the fact of important differences in Shell and Schutte's understanding of baptism. Schutte maintained that the only time one had to produce a certificate of baptism was when requesting marriage in the Reformed church, and added: 'But then the Reformed church did not monopolize marriages.' He argued that Shell grossly overstressed the 'civic consequences' of baptism, most particularly with respect to an individual's eligibility for high office.<sup>3</sup>

\*Heads of households which included slaves and heathen were responsible for their instruction in the Christian faith, their baptism and, ultimately, their confirmation as members of the church – a process with implications for the institution of slavery itself. The critical question was: what should happen to a Christianised slave? The ambivalence of the Synod of Dort (1618), where no binding consensus was reached, was interpreted by slave owners, and the employers of Cape indigenes, to suit their labour needs and sense of self. (See the short chronology for some of the policy shifts from time to time.)

\*Related to this last point, baptism was a prerequisite for slave manumission – along with fluency in

Dutch and a guarantee (usually required of the owner) that the freed slave would not become a burden on the Poor Fund of the church. The manumission of the slave children, Fredrik Domenicus and Maria Catharina *van de Kaap*, in 1832 – by when the issues concerning Christianised slaves were about to fall away, with Britain’s Abolition Act - was clearly linked with baptism (*met den Doop vrijgegeven*).<sup>4</sup> But, the rule notwithstanding, emancipation sometimes preceded baptism.

\*In Schutte’s words: ‘At no time did the church bar non-Europeans from the font, either in theory or in practice.’<sup>5</sup> But, beginning in 1695, the baptisms of free children (including free blacks) appear on separate registers from those of slaves (also, Company slaves were recorded separately from those who were privately owned).<sup>6</sup>

\*Adoption by Protestant parents who undertook to rear a foundling or other child in the Reformed faith qualified a child for baptism. Here Schutte took issue with Gerstner regarding the alleged influence of ethnicity with respect to adoption. Referring to questions considered by the Synod of Dort, Schutte asserted: ‘In formal terms ethnic origin was of no importance, since the problem regarded the adoption of “children of non-Christian parents”’.<sup>7</sup> Adoption, it should be pointed out, was only legislated in its modern sense in 1923. Prior to that, it was effected by notarial deed and the adopting parents were not protected from claims which birth parents might make at some later stage on a child which they had brought up.

\*Children under the age of 7 were eligible for infant baptism. After that, applicants for baptism were obliged to qualify by means of catechism and profession of faith.

\*Baptism was an occasion of ‘peculiar solemnity’, to be attended by witnesses as well as the person baptised - who might be an adult (*bejaarde*) or a child presented by its parents. In the case of out-of-wedlock births, the Dutch church – always condemnatory, if not notably effective, with respect to sexual license - appears to have become more active in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century with regard to censuring transgressors and securing firm sureties of maintenance prior to granting baptism. The Lutheran registers show that guarantors (*borgen*) were sought, who might be other than those named as witnesses (*getuigen*).<sup>8</sup>

There was another aspect to the ‘solemnity’ of baptism: in what reads as an extraordinary verdict in a suit for divorce, on grounds of a wife’s adultery,<sup>9</sup> the court ruled against the husband, who was the plaintiff, stating that it might have accepted the evidence for an adulterous relationship had the mother named the child’s father ‘while in labour, or at its baptism’.<sup>10</sup> This matter was decided by English judges, recently arrived at the Cape to implement the Charter of Justice which was introduced in 1828.

\*With the extension of the right to public worship to Lutherans, to the English church and Muslims, and, in time, to other Christian denominations, Jews, and so on, the various faith communities resisted poaching of their members, and attempts by members to baptise their children elsewhere. In 1806 the

Dutch church complained that the English chaplain to the garrison was baptising those not 'intrusted to his care'. When the chaplain claimed that to refuse baptism, when freely requested, made him 'a traitor to my trust' he was firmly instructed to honour 'the customs of the Settlement'.<sup>11</sup>

\*Under the second British occupation of the Cape, that is, from 1806, persons desiring to marry or to baptise had to apply for permission of the governor in his guise as 'ordinary' of the Anglican Church.<sup>12</sup> I am unable to say if applications were made to an official before that date.

\*I have left for last the point that both parents, and not the mother only, should be identified prior to a child's baptism. But fathers - presumed to be central to a child's access to baptism - are often absent in the records. Nevertheless, fathers and reputed fathers figure largely in naming and identity creation.

The fact that the Cape was a slave society was crucial to baptism policy in certain ways. Historians have reached a fair consensus as to the official policy from the time of Wagenaar (the 1660s) which resulted in the near-universal baptism of Company-owned slaves, and also as to the small numbers only of slaves in private hands who were Christianised and manumitted. My own investigations came about as part of a project concerned with illegitimacy, undertaken by the Centre for Socio-Legal Research at the University of Cape Town. It is safe to say that before the abolition of slavery the majority of children were born out-of-wedlock: slaves could not contract legal marriages; the marriages of non-Christians (Muslims, Jews) had no legal standing; and, before the 1800s, little effort was made to convert the indigenous people to Christianity. European settlers and birds of passage added substantially to the numbers of out-of-wedlock births. The baptism of illegitimates was thus an issue for the population as a whole and not primarily for an underclass.

Shell cited Anders Sparrman (mid-1770s) to the effect that no illegitimate children were baptised 'except in case that any one should present himself as the father, and make a point of the child's being baptized, and *thus give the infant the right of inheritance*.'"<sup>13</sup> This appears to conflate two events: baptism, with or without a father's presence, laid the foundation for the child's own future Christian membership and marriage; but the subsequent marriage of a bastard's parents was the principal means of establishing his or her right to inherit from the father as well as from the biological mother (*eene moeder maakt geen bastaard*).<sup>14</sup> The curious expression, 'baptised Bastard' – though it might be used indiscriminately – reflected the fact that baptism alone did not confer legitimacy. It followed that baptism could not remedy a bastard's disability respecting inheritance – that is, to intestate succession, for a father making out a will could, of course, include out-of-wedlock offspring if he wished.

There are a fair number of examples in the Reformed - and, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, other - Church records of unmarried mothers who succeeded in having their out-of-wedlock children baptised without an acknowledgement of paternity (in some cases, such mothers were baptised with, or shortly before, their children). In 1676 Maria Everse, a black woman (*swartmeid*), was baptised with her daughter, Alma, whose father was unknown (*de naamd der vader onbekend*). Even the requirement of at least one

sponsor – who should be a church member in good standing - appears to have been waived. In 1696 a second daughter was baptised – again without a father named, although in 1679 Maria Everts had married a man from Angola.<sup>15</sup> The Everts, or Everses, are of particular interest and I hope, in time, to establish a link between this woman and a certain Rosina Catharina Wilhelmina Everts of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, whose situation I will mention in due course. In the first volume of *NHK* baptismal records (1665-95), the free are not distinguished from the unfree but a tiny “x” appears next to the names of persons who were probably black or of mixed race. These may have been added at a later date, for reasons which are unclear though they may be guessed.<sup>16</sup>

During the early 18<sup>th</sup> century one finds - among a fair sprinkling of adult free black baptisms - a few infant baptisms where no father is identified as well as examples of mother/child joint baptisms: in 1713 Catharina Smit's son Hendrik (*de vader onbekend*) and the adult free person Elizabeth, with her son Cornelis, were baptised. This illustrates the fact of exceptions to what was in theory a firm rule, that fathers present themselves and contribute to the bastard child's support. In the early years it appears to have been difficult to find sponsors for these children: Georg Joel's reputed father was named but his mother (*de kinds moeder*) Cornelia Heining doubled as witness (*getuig*) – a not uncommon arrangement. Unusually, in 1743, the registrar was able to give a *zoogesege vader* for all 11 out-of-wedlock children recorded that year. It may be noted that the 1720s saw two adult Muslims baptised in the Christian faith – rare instances of conversion from Islam.<sup>17</sup>

In H.D. Krause's words, 'The most important problem area in any system of law dealing with the illegitimate is the procedure for ascertaining paternity, when the accused man denies it.'<sup>18</sup> Krause wrote in 1967, before DNA became a tool. In 1757 a man named by Christina Scholtz as the father of her daughter had his name expunged from the *Doopregister* by order of the Court of Justice.<sup>19</sup> At another extreme, it was not impossible to secure the simultaneous baptism of out-of-wedlock children fathered by different partners: in 1779, Pieterella *van de Caap* named Johannes Blauw and Daniel Swart as fathers of her first and second child respectively. In 1810, sponsors were found for two children of Elisabeth Kraus: Erich Daniel, child of Daniel Rinquest, and Catharina Christina, fathered by Jan Scholtz.<sup>20</sup>

The Roman-Dutch law permitted the subsequent legitimation of a bastard by the parents' marriage – which British common law did not condone, on the grounds that it encouraged immorality. When the man whom Hester Magdalena Potgieter named as father of her son, Fredrik, upon his baptism in 1786 agreed to marry her in 1794, the church officials went back to the 1786 entry to note this change in status: *Dit kind is door het huwelijk geEgt den 20 Julij 1794*. Wilhelmina Dorothea Hendrikse's three children, baptised in 1822, were legitimated by the parents' marriage sixteen years later, in 1838.<sup>21</sup> Fifteen of the 41 children of out-of-wedlock birth who were baptised by the *NHK* in 1813 were legitimated afterwards by marriage – a proportion higher than the average.

Many queries arose respecting baptism. In 1824, when the *NHK* synod records begin, it was asked how to deal with members who neglected to baptise, and also with non-members who presented children.<sup>22</sup> These questions had been answered by the Lutherans in 1807 when a member complained to the government that their minister refused to baptise his child by a widow – a member of the Dutch church: as he explained, neither wished to marry. The consistory set out the conditions by which three classes of illegitimates might qualify for baptism. In the case of members, baptism took place

as soon as the father, or in his absence the mother, made suitable declarations to the consistory or the minister, testifying their repentance of what has happened, their resolution to amend their lives, and to bring up their child in a becoming manner, giving ... security, that such child shall not become a burden to the poor's funds of the Parish - within the space of twenty years.<sup>23</sup>

Next, 'people of colour, born free, but living in a servile condition, or being lately emancipated', who wanted baptism as a step to membership, had to be of age to 'answer for themselves' and guarantee their maintenance. Finally, the bastard children of non-members might be baptised if the parents converted to 'good morals', or if they themselves applied when they had come of age. Scandalised by the 'strange conduct' of the pair who raised the complaint the church stood firm, withholding baptism until they married – and, ultimately, produced six children who were baptised here in Stellenbosch.<sup>24</sup>

What part, then, did baptism play in the creation of identities? This question is especially relevant to slaves and persons moving from slavery into free society. In his 'Cryptology of Household Names', Shell explained the Dutch custom of given-name-plus-toponym – noting that the Afrikaans word for surname is 'van', meaning 'from'. He also discussed the naming of slaves: Ziena van Ceijlon, Valentijn van Madagascar, and so forth.<sup>25</sup> As time went on, and more slaves were Cape-born, the toponym *van de Kaap* appeared with greater frequency in the records. Very many such persons, whether in slavery or manumitted, had at least one Christian (construed as European) in their ancestry. Although everyone might be described as a work-in-progress with respect to identity, the 'free blacks' are of particular interest for this discussion.

Under Dutch law, married women kept their maiden names while the children of a marriage took the father's surname. An illegitimate child bore its mother's surname or relevant toponym unless one of several options was presented:

\*As seen, parents might marry subsequent to an out-of-wedlock birth, or births. In 1817, Maria Louisa *van de Kaap* was baptised and married Nicolaas Raaff. A few weeks later their seven children, born *van de Kaap*, were baptised with their father's surname, Raaff.<sup>26</sup>

\*A father might withhold legitimation but bestow his name. Johann Jacob Will acknowledged paternity and gave his name to children procreated with Sarah Wilhelmina van Malabaar, whose manumission he purchased in 1801. The children (*alle bygenaamd Will*) and their mother – whom he seems not to have married – were made beneficiaries of his 'testament', filed with the Orphan Chamber in 1810.<sup>27</sup>

\*Slaves might acquire the names of owners, or of other Christian inhabitants. The same J.M. Will bequeathed his slave (*zyn mansslaaf*), Coenraad Hofmeester, to his concubine (*de vryevrouw Sara van de Kaap*). There was a Simon Hofmeister who, like Will, was a German immigrant, and bearer of this surname to the Cape, but nothing firmly links him with Will's slave. Similarly unexplained is the naming of the slave Jephta *van de Kaap* as Willem Daniel Godschalk upon his baptism. When the former slave, Petronella (*nu vrij gegeven, gedoopt en Lidmaat*), presented her son he received the name of his deceased father, Johannes Joachim Theron. Fifteen-year-old Julia Maria Georgina Petronella Deich, a child of apprentices Achilles & Spasie, received the surname of their mistress, Maria Cornelia Deich, who stood as witness. That same year the *predikant* of Stellenbosch inquired how to act when a parent appropriated a well-known family name for an out-of-wedlock child, to which the Synod answered it could find no reason to deny that choice. Questions abound: on what grounds did the slave, Carolina Johanna Elizabeth, name her son (baptised with herself) Joseph Johannes Christoffel Fox?<sup>28</sup>

The records afford intriguing hints of the ways by which former slaves and others of mixed racial ancestry passed – sometimes abruptly but usually by stages - from names incorporating slave toponyms or other status indicators<sup>29</sup> to a more neutral identification, facilitating merger in the society of free persons. Baptism was central to this process: on the one hand it was a crucial step towards citizenship, and access to the freedom and legitimacy available to Christians; on the other, the careful record keeping by church officials involved a reference to the subject's ancestry – a prime source for much subsequent race-focussed research by historians and genealogists.

Numerous examples can be found of individuals already moving in society with neutral surnames, whose origins are identified in the baptismal records. I must qualify 'neutral' by noting that the surnames adopted by the newly-free – for example, those with the suffix 'se', as in Arendse and Davidse - may themselves suggest a lineage.<sup>30</sup> But the intention of those in process of assimilation appears clear. Looking at the marriage registers, one notes that the lineage of the brides- and grooms-to-be was distinguished by the terms *van de Kaap* and *van de Kaap de Goede Hoop*, the latter referring to persons deemed to be of Christian/European ancestry. In one instance, Maria Magdalena *van de Kaap* became ~~*de Kaap*~~ *Caap de Goede Hoop*. There is no evidence to show whether she or the church initiated this identity change, but it clearly had significance for one or both.<sup>31</sup>

Language played a part in all of this. The English church substituted 'free native' for the toponym *van de Kaap*. In 1807 Elizabeth Quinsey, a 'free native' and the natural (illegitimate) daughter of Capt. Quinsey, lately of the Dutch service, was baptised by the English church. The Anglicans also baptised her bastard son in 1812 when Major Alexander Gordon of Britain's 93<sup>rd</sup> Regiment acknowledged paternity. On her marriage to Joseph Karkus, in 1818, she was called Elisabeth Quinse *van de Kaap* - this due to the fact that she married in the Lutheran Church which (until the mid-1820s) kept its records in Dutch. Quinsey was an adult when baptised, thus her mother was not named, but her history

suggests an association with the garrison, both Dutch and British, where her mother was perhaps a slave.<sup>32</sup>

In a society where Christian baptism was integral to status it is notable that numbers who, on one or other ground, were eligible remained unbaptised. If no minister was at hand, accredited midwives could administer the rite to new-borns which they knew would not survive. But many births were attended by unqualified helpers and some neonates of Christian parents died *ongedoopt* (unbaptised).<sup>33</sup> The churches chased after members who neglected to christen their children, but failed to motivate them all. As said, the vast majority of slaveowners shirked the obligation to catechise their slaves, and the pattern of out-of-wedlock births established under slavery persisted among many who were freed. The Dutch and Lutheran churches censured unwed mothers, and tried to hold the fathers to account when they were known, but ultimately they bent the rules to baptise bastards – even, on occasion, when appropriate sponsors could not be found. (The early British chaplains seem to have regarded baptism as a rite which was also a right, with no strings attached.) It appears that, among the newly freed, baptism might be regarded not only as a sign of faith but of ‘respectability’ – which others (in unknown proportions) rejected or ignored. As Schutte has said, ‘Christianisation and social position were interlinked’ – a fact of which the church and the socially mobile were well aware.<sup>34</sup>

Did some simply ‘fall through the cracks’? Earlier, in connection with Maria Everse’s baptism with her bastard child in 1676, I mentioned the case of Rosina Wilhelmina Catharina Everts. In 1809 Everts, the mother of five out-of-wedlock children, made bold to object when their father, Johan Anthon Rietmuller, approached the Matrimonial Court in order to marry someone else. Her concern was baptism and support for their children, aged two to 12, which he had promised but not performed. Though Rietmuller’s response strikes one as vague, the court – and, by the record, Everts herself, who had not in principle opposed the marriage – took him at his word and let him marry. Meanwhile, the Reformed church censured Everts and held her application ‘on advice’, until it ruled that she approach the Lutheran (Rietmuller’s) church.<sup>35</sup> In 1811, Everts died. No evidence that her five children were baptised has come to light. As seen, the civil disabilities flowing from this failure were not insignificant. The fate of her children is obscure but a few likely leads point to their ongoing marginalisation.

This account of baptism has briefly considered its role in the creation of identity, and attempted to understand the interests of church and state, and of the individuals involved.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> G.J. Schutte, ‘Between Amsterdam and Batavia, Cape Society and the Calvinist Church under the Dutch East India Company’, *Kronos, Journal of Cape History*, 25 (1998/1999), pp. 17-49; J.N. Gerstner, ‘A Christian Monopoly: The Reformed Church and Colonial Society under Dutch Rule’, in R. Elphick and R. Davenport (eds). *Christianity in South Africa: A Political, Social and Cultural History* (Cape Town & Oxford: David Philip & James Currey, 1997), pp. 16-30; R. C-H. Shell, *Children of Bondage, A Social History of the Slave Society at the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1838* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 2001), Ch.11 & *passim*.

- <sup>2</sup> Gerstner, 'A Christian Monopoly', p. 25.
- <sup>3</sup> Schutte, 'Between Amsterdam and Batavia', pp. 26-27.
- <sup>4</sup> Cape Archives Repository [CAR], Accessions [A]2362, 1/2/2/1/4, Nos. 57 & 58, 5 Sept. 1832; N. Worden. *Slavery in Dutch South Africa* (Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 143.
- <sup>5</sup> Schutte, 'Between Amsterdam and Batavia', p. 39.
- <sup>6</sup> CAR, Verbatim Copies [VC]604, Kaapstad Doop, 1695-1712.
- <sup>7</sup> Schutte, 'Between Amsterdam and Batavia', p. 35.
- <sup>8</sup> Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk Argief [NGKA] 1/8, Resolusieboek, 1802-1812, Notule, 6 Mar. 1809, p. 320 and G.1 11/1, Doop Actens van Onechte Kinderen, 1809 tot 1813. For early 19<sup>th</sup> century NHK policy, see K.J. Pedro, 'Die Doopbediening aan Slawe en Vryswartes in die Kaapse Kerk, 1802-1812', *Kronos* 9, 1984..
- <sup>9</sup> J. Buchanan (ed.). *Cases Decided in the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope as reported by the Hon. William Menzies Esq. [Menzies Reports]* (Cape Town: J.C. Juta, n.d.), 1, Pt 2. Marriage and its Incidents, Richter v. Wagenaar, 20 Mar. 1829, pp. 262-65.
- <sup>10</sup> *Menzies Reports*, 1, Richter v. Wagenaar, p. 265. The wife had, in fact, named a father (not her husband) at her child's (Catholic) baptism, which was disqualified as proof on various grounds. Shell's summary of civic enfranchisements by baptism (which Schutte contests) includes 'bearing witness', *Children of Bondage*, p. 332.
- <sup>11</sup> CAR, Colonial Office [CO] 1, Churches, etc., Nos 56, 57, 58 & 91, 1806; CO 4821, Letterbook, 1806, pp. 60-61, 69-70.
- <sup>12</sup> O.M. Suberg, *The Anglican Tradition in South Africa, A Historical Overview* (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1999), 2.2. This source explains in simple terms the matter of an 'established' church at the Cape, before and after the British occupation.
- <sup>13</sup> Shell, *Children of Bondage*, p. 363. Shell added the emphasis.
- <sup>14</sup> In rare instances, legitimacy was conferred by a special act, J. van der Linden, *Institutes of the Laws of Holland* (London: Stevens, 1828), pp. 93-94.
- <sup>15</sup> CAR, VC603, Doopregister, 1665-1695, 29 Mar. 1676 & Huweliksregister, 5 Nov. 1679; VC604, Kaapstad Doop, 27 May 1696. These records appear to refer to the same person, although the 20-year gap between births may suggest otherwise.
- <sup>16</sup> CAR, VC604, Doop Registers, 1695-1712.
- <sup>17</sup> CAR, VC605 (1713-42) & VC606 (1743-56). The two conversions involved Abraham Aldahaan [?], a free-born adult 'Mahomitaan' (1721), and Maria Dorothea Soltania, the adult daughter of 'Muhammedan' parents (1726).
- <sup>18</sup> H.D. Krause, 'Bastards Abroad – Foreign Approaches to Illegitimacy', *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 15, 1966-67, p. 742.
- <sup>19</sup> CAR, VC607, 1757-79, 10 July 1757.
- <sup>20</sup> CAR, A2362, 1/1/2/1, No. 31, 28 June 1810; VC607, 25 Apr. 1779.
- <sup>21</sup> CAR, VC615, 1822 & VC623, 11 Dec. 1838; VC610, 1786-95, 9 July 1786.
- <sup>22</sup> NGKA, Acta Synodi, 1824-1915, pp. 11, 18.
- <sup>23</sup> CAR, CO1, No. 98, Lutheran Consistory to Governor, 25 Mar. 1807, pp. 705-09. One notes that, failing the father, the mother could approach the Lutheran Church.
- <sup>24</sup> J. Hoge, 'Personalialia of the Germans at the Cape, 1652-1806', *Archives Yearbook of South African History* (Cape Town, 1946); CAR, CO1, No. 98, 25 Mar. 1807, pp. 705-09. The reference to 'lately emancipated' seems a clear indication of persons who gained freedom without prior conversion and baptism.
- <sup>25</sup> Shell, *Children of Bondage*, pp. 229-32 & n. 6.
- <sup>26</sup> CAR, A2362, 1/2/2/1/1, [Lutheran] Doop Register, 31 Aug. 1817; A2362, 1/1/1/1, Huwelyks Gebodebrieven, 27 Sept. 1817; A2362, 1/2/2/1/1, 12 Oct. 1817.
- <sup>27</sup> CAR, Master of the Orphan Chamber [MOOC] 7/1/59, Testaments, 1813, No. 59, 15 Oct. 1810; A2362, 1/2/2/1/1, [Lutheran] Doop Register, 1800-1818, 8 Feb. 1801, No. 3 (adult), Sarah Wilhelmina & two children, Nos. 11 & 12 (*zynde vrygekocht en adoptirt door den Ingezetenen Johann Jacob Will*); A2362, 1/1/2/1, No. 17, 30 Jan. 1801.
- <sup>28</sup> NGKA, Acta Synodi, p. 134; CAR, A2362, 1/2/2/1/4, 1831, No. 26 & 1837, No. 69; A2362, 1/1/2/1, No. 67 & No. 102; MOOC 7/1/59, Testaments, 1813, No. 59. Coenraad Hofmeester is named but not included as a member of Simon Hofmeester's family by J.A. Heese and R.T.J. Lombard, *South African Genealogies* (Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 1986), 7 vols, 3, p. 426. 'Apprentices' were former slaves committed to indenture with their owners from 1834 to 1838, when they were finally freed in terms of the Abolition Act. It appears that Sarah Wilhelmina van Malabaar and Sara *van de Kaap* were one and the same.



---

<sup>29</sup> E.g. in 1809 a certain *Lena van de Kaap* was referred to as 'Lena of the Cape (a female Hottentot)', CAR, CO14, Churches etc., 1809, No. 83.

<sup>30</sup> Hans Heese has pointed this out in his 'Die Inwoners van Kaapstad in 1800', *Kronos* 7, 1983, p. 46.

<sup>31</sup> CAR, A2362, 1/1/1/1, 13 Mar. 1819. The bride did not acquire a surname at the time of this amendment.

<sup>32</sup> CAR, A2362, 1/1/1/1, 15 Nov. 1818 (1819?); A1939, 2/1/1, 20 Dec. 1807 & 28 July 1812

<sup>33</sup> CAR, MOOC 6/3, Death Register, 1822-1833.

<sup>34</sup> Schutte, 'Between Amsterdam and Batavia', p. 39. Not considered here are the numbers of free persons who committed to Islam.

<sup>35</sup> NGKA, G.1 1/8, Resolutie Boek, Jan. 1810, pp. 367, 404-05. Rietmuller pleaded poverty, which was authentic if an 1810 insolvent sale of goods of 'Anthony Rietmulder' refers, see CAR, MOOC 2/38, No. 318, 29 Jan. 1810.

<sup>36</sup> CAR, MOOC 6/2, Death Register, 2, 1804-1821, 11 Sept. 1811; NGKA, G.1 8/12, pp. 95, 183.

## CHRONOLOGY

- 1618 – questions raised at the Synod of Dorcht re pagan baptisms, and answered ambiguously; slaves to be regarded as members of the owner's household
- 1622 – Christians not to sell slaves to heathens or Muslims, and such persons to hand Christian slaves to the Company for sale to Christians
- 1664 - Council of Batavia ordered slave baptism and the Christian education of slaves
- 1665 – resident minister of the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk appointed at the Cape; a 'doopregister' from that date
- 1666 – slave children with a Christian parent to be baptised & those without to be educated in Christianity; all Company slave children to be baptised, with the Company as their sponsor
- 1673 – College of the Orphan Master (Orphan Chamber) established
- 1676 – reiteration of 1666 provisions; Matrimonial Court established
- 1678 – prohibition on fornication and concubinage confirmed (but still weakly enforced)
- 1685 – baptised Company slaves allowed to marry other Christian slaves (according to their practice, which lacked legal standing), whether in or outside the slave lodge.
- 1695 – introduction of a separate list for slave baptisms
- 1708 – the expressions 'heelslag' and 'halfslag' made their appearance in the baptismal register of Company slave children
- 1714/15 – reiteration of 1622 provisions: slaves of Christians to be sold only to other Christians
- 1732 - governance of Cape assumed by VOC (ending rule from Batavia)
- 1735 – children of Christian parents to be baptised, whether legitimate or not
- 1770 – Statutes of India (applied at Cape in 1772): children begotten by a master with a slave not to be sold; slaves catechised and confirmed in the Christian faith not to be sold (see 1812)
- 1780 – Lutherans permitted public worship
- 1795 – first British occupation of the Cape; end of the VOC; baptisms performed by British chaplains to the forces (as well as by the NHK and Lutherans)
- 1803 – Cape returned to the Netherlands, now called the Batavian Republic
- 1806 – second British occupation
- 1811 – Anglican chaplain appointed to serve British settlers
- 1812 – repeal of clause of 1770 statutes to the effect that Christian slaves could not be sold
- 1817 – arrival of Catholic priests (and the gradual establishment of new Protestant denominations: Wesleyan, Congregational, Presbyterian and so on from around that time)
- 1826 – Ordinance 19 established a Slave Guardian, facilitated legal slave marriages, etc.
- 1828 – English jurisprudence, judges and a new system of district governance introduced
- 1833 – Britain's Act of Abolition provided for slave emancipation throughout the colonies
- 1834 – Cape slaves entered a period of apprenticeship in terms of the 1833 Act
- 1838 – slaves freed
- 1839 – Britain's Marriage Order-in-Council of 1838, dealing with certain consequences of slave emancipation, came into effect at the Cape