

SEXUALITY AND SLAVERY AT THE CAPE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

by

Robert Ross

During the eighteenth century the Cape was a male-dominated society, at least in numerical terms. In 1749, for instance, the opgaaf lists reveal that among those taxed were 4,871 adult males (made up of 1,243 burghers, 75 free blacks, 83 knechts, who were soldiers and sailors released by the Dutch East India Company to work for burghers, and 3,470 slaves). In addition, there were 1,067 Company servants, ranging in status from the Governor, Hendrick Swellengrebel, to Hendrick Pieters van Gale, who had already spent 18 years as a prisoner on Robben Island, recorded in the muster rolls of the same year. (1) As against this, the opgaaf lists recorded 1,728 adult women, made up of 774 burghers' wives or widows, 7 unmarried adult whites (although at least one of these was unmarried only in law) (2), 91 free black women, of whom 23 were married and three widows, and 856 slaves. If only the recorded population is taken into account, then there were 344 men to every hundred women. Nor was this year exceptional. Essentially similar figures could be given for any year in the eighteenth century.

These figures perhaps overstate the imbalance in the sex ratio to a certain extent. They exclude both the Company slaves, probably around 650, whose sex ratio seems to have been more balanced than was that of the other slaves (3), and the Khoisan, a group which presumably had as many women as men but the number of whom within the orbit of the colony is impossible to estimate. They also exclude the women who were married to men in the service of the Company, perhaps 60 in all, and, for technical reasons, probably underestimate the number of white women. On the other hand, they also exclude the crews of the 75 ships which spent an average of about a month in Cape Town harbour during that year. (4) However, no amount of refinement or of correction of putative biases could lead to any conclusion other than that a large number of adult men could not have been able to find mates. Moreover, in the circumstances of the society, a very large number of these must have been slaves and, to a certain extent, the low-level employees of the Company, soldiers, woodcutters, and so on. This paper will deal with the consequences of this, particularly among the slaves.

The reasons for this imbalance are clear. Such a large proportion of the population were first-generation South Africans that the overwhelming number of men among the immigrants disturbed the balance that would otherwise have been naturally produced. This, at any rate, can be demonstrated for the whites. (5) With regard to the slaves, it can only be inferred from the figures I have presented above as, so far as I know, there is no way of discovering what proportion of slaves were born at the Cape. The only sources for this currently available, namely the birth-places of liberated slaves and of those arraigned on criminal charges (6), are so far from being representative samples of the slave population as a whole as to be nearly useless. Nor are there figures on the importation of slaves, which would allow greater light

to be thrown on the matter.

Whether or not it was a question of supply or demand - and in the long run it is almost certain to have been the latter - the slave owners of the Cape consistently possessed more male than female slaves, not only adult but also, surprisingly, juvenile. Presumably, a certain number of boys were imported, unless, as I suspect, a "slave meid" became a "slavinne" younger than a "slave jonge" became a "slaaf". On the other hand, the extent by which males outnumbered females was not constant throughout the slave population. Two major differences are discernible. First, as opposed to the overall rate of 405 adult men per 100 adult women among the burgher-owned slaves, in Cape Town there were "only" 235 men per hundred women. (7) This probably stemmed from the fact that a higher proportion of slaves were used for domestic service there than in the country districts, and those who were not were much more likely to have been craftsmen and thus more likely to have been at least second-generation South Africans. Secondly, for precisely contrary reasons, the larger the number of slaves in the possession of one master, the greater the discrepancy between the sexes was likely to be. Among slaves whose owners possessed eleven or more, there were 505 men for every hundred women. These slaves, of course, were generally on the larger wine and wheat farms, which were apparently worked mainly with imported gangs.

Despite the general superfluity of males among the population, there is some evidence that slave-holders realized that the fertility of their female slaves was an asset and, at the very least, that they did nothing to hinder it. For example, in the late stages of her pregnancy, Hagar van Mandhaar was sent to Jan de Timmerman by her master, Joachim von Dessin, presumably because she would be cared for there better than at home. Twelve days after leaving home, she gave birth to a girl and remained with de Timmerman for another month before returning home. De Timmerman received 24 Rijks dollars as his fee. Moreover, when she once again became pregnant, a year later, von Dessin gave Hagar a large amount of cloth for nappies and baby clothes. Similarly, it seems clear that fecund slave women fetched high prices in the slave market. (8) The admittedly apocryphal extreme in this regard came early in the nineteenth century when a certain slave-holder hired an Irishman "for no other purpose than to improve his stock", apparently because slaves with a European father were more valuable. (9)

Nevertheless, it can be seen that most men and women had little chance of marrying and living in reasonably stable nuclear families. Some were luckier than others, of course. A number of masters owned what appears to have been a family unit, or perhaps two such. For example, Jan Lategaan and his wife, Beatrix Olivier, who worked a small wine farm, Het Doolhof, in Drakenstein district, possessed one adult male and one adult female slave to help tend for their two teams of oxen and their 8,000 vines (in reality probably rather more), and, no doubt, to help look after their three small children. (10) But such a situation was comparatively rare, especially outside Cape Town, as can be seen from the fact that in 1749 only a quarter of the women slaves in Drakenstein district either outnumbered or equalled the males in their master's possession. What is more, it cannot be shown that even those masters who maintained a balance among their slaves did so from choice, or from any policy of fostering slave family life. I do not know of any case in which a farmer purposely bought one of his slaves a spouse, although Sparrman comments that if a master did not provide a slave with a wife he stood a high risk of being murdered. On the other hand, there is no information to hand on the frequency with which slave families were broken up by sales. At times they clearly were not, as when, at the liquidation of von Dessin's estate at his death, Joris van Bengal, "sy beminde" Marie van de Caab and their son Piet were sold as one lot. (11) Nor, of course, is it certain that Lategaan's slaves on Het Doolhof were man and wife. If they were estranged, unfriendly towards each other or, for that matter, of wildly differing ages, then they could not be described as a genuine family unit. In this case they are unlikely to have been so, as Lategaan had been a farmer for only about six years, but not infrequently there must have been tensions between the sexes, even on farms where their numbers were equal.

As regards the slaves, the use of the terms "marriage", "husband" and "wife" is rather loose. The legal position of South Africa with regard to slave marriages seems highly unclear, but it does not seem that slaves ever availed themselves of the right to marry, if they had it (12), even though a fairly large number of them,

especially among the Company slaves, were baptised Christians. (13)

Despite the various obstacles placed in their way, many slaves did succeed in establishing relatively long-lasting relationships, talking of their partner as their "mann" or their "vrouw". What sort of ceremonies signalled this cannot be established, although, at least among the Islamic section of the population, the Muslim customs later to be characteristic of the Malay quarter were already in use. (14) It is also uncertain how many slaves married and at what age. Equally, the fertility of the slave population cannot be established. This might have provided some sort of index of the level of sexual activity among the female population and of the number who remained chaste. H. P. Cruse argued that the fertility of the slaves was very low, at least in comparison to that of the whites, a fact which he attributed to the prohibition on lawful marriages. Now it is true that the opgaaf lists show that the slave women consistently outnumbered the slave children. In 1749, to take the same sample year, there were 856 slavinnen as opposed to 450 slave jongens and 360 slave meisjes. In contrast to this, the 781 white women had a total of 2,324 children, while the 91 free black women had, between them, 148 children. Unfortunately, analysis of the opgaaf lists presents too many technical problems to allow the obvious inference to be drawn from these figures. Moreover, even if the fertility of slave women can be shown to be less than that of their white sisters - it can hardly have been more (15) - it would remain an open question whether this was due to less sexual activity or to such other causes as poor health or prolonged breast-feeding.

Among an unknown, but certainly not negligible, proportion of slaves, long-lasting, monogamous relationships formed both the ideal and the general practice. Here, again, evidence is extremely difficult to assemble. Travellers and residents who wrote accounts of the Cape rarely mentioned it. Were only their testimony to be taken into account, the impression would be given that, with few exceptions, the slaves were abandoned to prostitution and promiscuity. To counteract this view, which is, anyway, undoubtedly partially correct, there are scarcely any records from the slaveholders themselves, which might give some idea of the actual circumstances of their bondsmen and women. It is thus necessary to fall back on the voluminous records of the court of justice. The disadvantage of so doing is evident. Only when things had broken down to such an extent that serious crimes, such as murder or assault, were committed did the Court receive information as to what was going on. Moreover, although the depositions of witnesses and the confessions of criminals survive, they tend to have been altered by the conceptions of the secretary of the Court, who took them down and prepared them for the judges. Nevertheless, particularly in the relatively frequent cases of crime passionnelle, a clear impression can be gained of what life was like in the slave quarters.

Sometimes, there is merely incidental information which shows, for instance, the bandiet Samuel van Batavia living peacefully together with his wife, apparently in reasonable privacy even in the crowded conditions of the Company slave lodge. (16) On other occasions, things came to a head because the slave couple remained faithful to each other. For example, in February 1787, Daniel Dikkop, a Khoi living on Hendrik van der Wat's farm on the Groot Brakrivier, near Mossel Bay, where he was a cowherd, was hung for murdering Cathryn van Batavia, a slave of van der Wat. She lived there as the wife of a fellow slave, Damon van Bengal. In August 1786, Damon had been sent by his master to fetch some food, and had to be away for several days. While he was away, Daniel asked Cathryn to sleep with him, and, when she refused, knocked her out and then strangled her, later mutilating her body to make it seem that she had been killed by a leopard. (17) Moreover, marriages could survive in the most adverse circumstances. For instance, Lea and Jochem, two Cape-born slaves, the former belonging to the Company, the latter to Gerrit Victor, lived together as man and wife for several years as runaways, initially at Hout Bay and then in a fairly large community of fellow escapers at Hanglip on the eastern shore of False Bay. Lea's devotion was such, indeed, that, after Jochem was killed in a fight, she left the comparative safety of Hanglip, where life was clearly now intolerable for her, and moved to around Gordons Bay and the mouth of the Eerst river, where she was later caught and sentenced to spend the rest of her life chained to a block. (18)

Although devotion and faithfulness may well have been the rule among married slaves, the crime records tend to show another picture. A large proportion of those slaves who murdered other slaves did so out of jealousy or because a marriage had broken up and they wished to get their revenge on their former partner. A typical case occurred in 1755. After living with Maert van Maccassar for several years, Philida van Mallebar left him. Instead she now began to sleep with Samson, a man from Natal. As all three were slaves of the same master, Casper Badenhorst, they remained very close together, so that Maert must continually have been reminded of his loss. Moreover, Philida seems to have been the only female slave on Badenhorst's farm near Stellenbosch, so that Maert can have had little opportunity to find another wife. In time the tension grew so great that, one day early in February, he left his sheep flock, went to the field where Philida was working, and strangled her. Captured almost immediately by his fellow slaves, he was tried, convicted and broken on a cross with - for this at least we may be thankful - the coup de grâce. (19)

With different principals and slight variations, this tragedy was repeated many times during the century. On one occasion, a man had been sold away from his wife, but continually ran away from his new master to see her, until he saw her with another man and went for her with a knife. Significantly, his former fellow slaves had been protecting him up till then, but then abandoned him to be caught by the whites. (20) Once Jan de Wit forbade a certain Caffer (or hangman's assistant) to continue his association with Sanna van Bengal, one of de Wit's slave women. The Caffer, Tagal van Bali, refused to accept this, and one evening broke down de Wit's front door and attempted to beat up his slaves before he was overpowered. (21) On another occasion, a slave went to his master to persuade him to force his wife to return to him, but when the master refused to intervene he killed both his wife (as he undoubtedly saw her) and her new man. (22) It was not always the cuckolded man who took vengeance. Alphasie van Madagascar, a 40 year old slave woman of the Company, assaulted a fellow slave for sleeping with the woman she considered to be her daughter-in-law. (23) Again, Bitjoe van Batavia was not the only one who killed himself after attacking his unfaithful wife, thus saving himself from the terrible death at the hands of the executioner. (24) Many more, like July van Ternaten, must have left their farm for a day or two to avoid doing anything rash in the heat of anger and then, unlike July who had a murderous row with another slave on his return, come slowly and painfully to accept their enforced celibacy and their estrangement from their wives, with whom they were still in contact and who, perhaps, even slept in the same room. (25) There was, so it would seem, even a ceremony whereby the cutting in half of a candle signified divorce. (26)

Clearly, murders inspired by sexual jealousy, by the breakdown of marriages or by the failure to persuade someone to agree to a marriage occur in every society. In modern Britain, a wife is much more likely to be murdered by her husband (or vice versa) than by anyone else. The slaves of the Cape Colony were not in any way exceptional in this. Nor, for reasons of registration, is it possible to tell if the rate of crimes passionnelles was particularly high among them. Many, perhaps most, slave marriages survived without being disrupted by the decision of one of the partners, by mutual consent or by sale of a slave far away from his or her spouse. Nevertheless, despite the barbarous punishments inflicted on murderers, slaves regularly did kill in cold blood those they felt to have betrayed them sexually. This is further evidence to show that the psychological damage of slavery was not restricted to tearing people away from their homes, and their subjection to the will and the sjambok of foreign masters and mistresses.

As against this, a number of slave women were able to exploit the relative scarcity of their sex to achieve upward mobility for themselves and their offspring. Between 1657 and 1807, 480 women of apparently "black" descent married into the white population. (27) Most of these must have been brought to the Cape as slaves - or at least their parents must have been. (28) Slowly their masters recognized that they were not just slaves, and so they were incorporated into the white community. (29) Their descendants could reach the highest positions in the Colony, as, for instance, occurred with the Bergh family. (30) Others again never married, but nevertheless lived with soldiers, sailors, knights and respectable burghers. Even if they never married (31), the woman must have enjoyed an easier life than many other slaves, and the children of the couple are likely to have been freed.

Rather more slave women were more actively exploited sexually. It was, so it would appear, far from unusual and not considered reprehensible (by the white community) for a young white man to begin his sexual activity by seducing slave women, and the woman in question no doubt had little choice in the matter. (32) These escapades do not seem to have continued to any large extent after the white man had married, unless, that is, the mores of the society accepted black mistresses to such an extent that regular liaisons were never construed as adultery. There is no evidence for such an attitude in eighteenth century South Africa, at least to my knowledge, and it seems too much at variance with other features of the society to have been the case. Moreover, in at least one case, a prominent member of the white community, Diederik Bleumer, who at the time was an officer in the Stellenbosch militia and married to the widow of a heemraad, was fined 100 Rds and deprived of his rank for committing adultery with a Bastard Hottentot woman, Lys, and two of his own slaves, Clara and Eva. He had threatened to whip and manacle them if they did not comply with his wishes, and they had consequently informed their mistress. However, this seems to have been a unique case, and the absence of other such prosecutions would seem to suggest that Bleumer's behaviour was rarely followed by other white men. (33)

There were also certain slaves who used their power within the slave community on a farm to demand sexual favours from the female slaves under their authority. For instance, it cannot be chance that Willem van de Caab slept in the meyden kamer (women's quarters) of the farm Elsenburg, which was owned by Marten Melk and was one of the largest in the south-west Cape. He was the mandoor - a term which would be translated into American English as driver - and thus literally held the whip-hand over the other slaves. (34)

Although there were thus a few men who used their power to gain sexual access to women, there were many more who used their cash. According to contemporary reports, a large number of slave women of Cape Town, in particular, were prostitutes, and a certain proportion of the slave men acted as pimps. The Company's slave lodge acted as the main brothel, mainly serving the soldiers and sailors of visiting ships. Moreover, these relationships, and even some with the overseers on the farms, were conducted on a purely business basis. According to Mentzel, the motto of these women was "Kammene Kas, Kammene Kunte". (35) The sailors recognized this. Once, one said to another, rejoicing that they were nearing the Cape: "Then you will be able to have a good time with the black women, if you have the money." (36)

This view is perhaps somewhat exaggerated, but is far from being completely untrue. On the one hand, it was general for the Company to identify its Cape-born slaves by matronymics, suggesting that it considered the paternal tie to be weak and uncertain. (37) On the other hand, there is clear evidence within the criminal records of slaves who worked as prostitutes, and that almost any slave woman on the streets of Cape Town was considered no better than she should be. This assumption was occasionally proved false, as when Fortuyn van Ceylon offered Sara van de Caab 6 schellingen to let him lie with her. He was rebuffed with the crushing comment: "Jouw swart canailje, wie wil met jou te saamen gaan." Not unnaturally, he thereupon tried to rape her. (38) What cannot be established, unfortunately, is whether she refused him because he was a dark-skinned man and thus, presumably, a slave, because she was in general not in that line of business, or because he got the price wrong.

It would seem that prostitution was generally a relatively ill-organized affair, relying mainly on personal initiative, although the evidence for this is scanty. Suffice it to say that I have found no clear example of a master forcing his slaves to work as whores. Given the frequent pattern of slaves being allowed to work independently, paying their master a fixed sum (Koelie geld) at the end of the week, this was probably not necessary anyway. Nor do commercially run brothels seem to have been at all common, or at least their madams were almost never prosecuted. On one occasion one was, but that was mainly because one of her girls was a runaway. Even in this case it is clear that the establishment run by the free black, Flora van Rio de la Goa, was small, with just two or three rooms, and that her share in the business came mainly from renting rooms to sailors and to slave girls who required them. (39)

Provided they were not accompanied by force, inflicted on young girls or adulterous, heterosexual relationships were never per se illegal. Slaves do not even seem to have been persecuted for having sex with a white woman, perhaps because such acts occurred exceedingly rarely. Other forms of sexuality, in contrast, were heavily punished by the Dutch at this time. This was not a uniquely colonial phenomenon. The Republic itself was periodically swept by epidemics of persecution against male homosexuals. In the years 1730 to 1732, more than 200 men were convicted of homosexuality in one of the greatest of these razzias, and at least 76 of them were put to death. (40) In South Africa, the soldiers and sailors on the ships were the main victims of this prejudice. Indeed, even before the foundation of the Colony, a sailor had been drowned in Table Bay for homosexuality, and throughout the Dutch period men were arraigned before the Court of Justice for "sodomie" committed on board ship, although the punishment seems to have become less severe during the eighteenth century. Slaves, on the other hand, were still drowned for this offence, although in fact very rarely. My impression is that the slave community was very infrequently willing to inform on one of its own members, and many masters also seem to have kept the matter quiet when it came to their notice. After all, homosexuality was not a threat to their authority, and to give information to the fiscaal would entail the loss of a valuable part of their property.

When slaves were no longer under their master's control, and working for his profit, these considerations did not of course apply. As in all prisons, there seems to have been a definite homosexual culture on Robben Island. (41) Even there it did not come too often to the court, perhaps because the prisoners were able to conceal the details of their life from their warders. Nevertheless, it would seem significant that within a week of their arrival on the Island, both Christoffel de Koning and Frans Dollink were importuned by the bandiet Hendrik Pothooven. Hendrik seems to have been too hasty in attempting to claim them as his own, and therefore they informed against him. (42) It also seems significant that the only clear cases of interracial homosexuality occurred on Robben Island. (43) Racial pride can have been hard to maintain among people condemned to spend the rest of their lives dragging chains on their feet round the island.

It may, of course, be that here and in general too much can be read into isolated incidents. An alternative explanation is in fact quite in keeping with the evidence. It may have been that homosexuality was exceedingly rare among the slaves at the Cape and that all infractions against this code were dealt with severely, both by the slave community and by their masters. Nevertheless, given the horrifying sexual imbalance in the society in which they lived, this seems unlikely. That many men cannot have been that controlled that much of the time.

Rather more commonly than for homosexuality, slaves were prosecuted for bestiality. In the eyes of the Dutch, indeed, the two offences were described by the same term ("sodomie") and the punishment was the same. The unfortunate man was rowed out into Table Bay, with enough heavy weights attached to him to make certain that he would sink, and thrown into the water, frequently tied to his correspondent in the deed. Analytically, however, a distinction can be made between homosexuality, which is, at least in part, the expression of the affection between two men, and bestiality, which would seem to be little more than the desperate release of tension and lust. Perhaps it is just an example of the degree to which I am culture bound, but I cannot believe that if a man violated an animal, an action for which he knew he would be executed, without being drunk and without taking stringent measures to avoid being discovered, he could be in any other than an exceedingly disturbed mental state. Nevertheless, adult male slaves, generally living on a farm (44), did this. Moreover, in at least one case, the man in question was so overcome with shame at what he had done that he admitted the deed himself. More frequently, the master handed his slave over to justice, but often only after the affair had apparently become public knowledge and could not be hushed up any more. (45)

The finest example of the quality of relationships and of the jealousy, envy and sexual frustration that could exist on a slave-owning Cape farm is perhaps provided by the trial and eventual release of Patentie van Ceylon in 1774. Patentie was a 33 year old slave of Johannes Louw, one of the biggest farmers in the Cape district. He

lived on a farm in the Tygerberg, which produced large quantities of wine and wheat and a certain amount of barley. Louw also possessed a good number of horses and cattle and a large flock of sheep, although it is not certain whether these were kept in the Tygerberg or, as is more likely, on a veeplaats elsewhere in the country. Patentie therefore lived in one of the most thickly populated and richest areas of the Cape countryside. There were many other farms in the neighbourhood, and Cape Town itself was not too far away, although no doubt it was out of bounds to Louw's slaves except when they were driving waggons loaded with wine and wheat to the market.

Louw possessed a total of 18 slaves; 11 men, 3 women, 2 boys and 2 girls. Probably one or two of the men lived elsewhere, looking after Louw's sheep, but most of them must have been in the Tygerberg, with Louw, his wife and his four young sons. There were also a certain number of Khoisan living there, including a woman called Rosalyn, with whom Patentie seems to have been intimate.

On 26 March 1884, Patentie got drunk and went to sleep off the alcohol in a barn. Also asleep in the barn was a black dog. The other slaves on the farm thereupon accused Patentie of bestiality with the dog, and called Louw and his son to witness what was going on. In fact, these two, and three slaves, gave evidence in court. However, there is absolutely no evidence that Patentie even touched the animal, let alone committed the offence of which he was accused. This, indeed, was the opinion of the fiscaal, and it convinced the court before which Patentie was brought. Not that the court required much convincing. Very rarely did its verdict differ from the opinion of the prosecutor, although it frequently imposed a lesser punishment than that demanded. The court therefore ordered that Patentie be released and sold inland, and that Louw pay the costs of the case. (46)

Perhaps the examining officers deliberately suppressed information or refused to ask the witnesses the necessary questions to establish a prima facie case against Patentie strong enough to commit him to torture and thus extort a confession from him. This seems unlikely, however. The legal officers of the Dutch East India Company were not renowned for their leniency and would have had no reason to support a slave against his master. Indeed, the length of time between his arrest and his trial makes it seem plausible that they kept Patentie in custody in the hope that he would break down and provide them with the evidence required to convict him. That being the case, the problem remains why he was brought to trial in the first place. It can only be that Patentie had made himself extremely unpopular with his fellow slaves and that they set him up in the most convenient and, so far as they were concerned, safest way. After all, no one, not even the dog, got hurt. The whole case is reminiscent of the way in which Griquas in the nineteenth century used to accuse missionaries of adultery when, for one reason or another, they wanted them out of the way. (47) But why was Patentie unpopular? That question cannot be answered in detail. It is extremely unlikely that historians will ever be able to make a full description of the social relationships and tensions on this or any other farm in the eighteenth century Cape. Even when the legal investigations of the fiscaal or one of the landdrosts shed a certain amount of light on these matters, they shed very little, and the time depth of their investigations was much less than that of the slaves' memories. Nevertheless, one plausible reason can be propounded, namely, of course, Patentie's connection with Rosalyn, of which other slaves must have been jealous. This is certainly in keeping with the general atmosphere of social relations within the community. As this paper has tried to argue, sexual tensions among the slaves were very considerable. Slave men were prepared to kill others in their competition over women, and some may well have been prepared to send others to torture and death in a quarrel over women. After all, there were very few slave women, and many of these were appropriated by others of greater power and wealth in the strongly stratified society of the eighteenth century Cape of Good Hope.

Notes

[The abbreviation KA stands for the series Koloniale Archief (VOC) in the Algemene Rijksarchief, Den Haag.]

- (1) KA 4155 and KA 9044. The number of Free Blacks is not given in the totals, but can be deduced from the lists, at least for Cape Town, as, from around 1720 on, this group was enumerated separately and placed together at the end of the opgaaf list for the Cape District. In addition, they are not credited with possessing arms, although not too much should be read into this as, from about 1710 onwards, the number of guns a man possessed was not accurately recorded, each white man being, clearly erroneously, described as having one flintlock and one pistol.
- (2) Dirk Marx, a noted elephant hunter in the Swellendam district, lived with Dorothea Becker for many years and had 6 children by her, without their ever marrying.
- (3) In 1710, according to Governor Louis van Assenburg, the Company owned 127 male and 183 female adult slaves, and 130 children. See F. Valentijn, Beschrijving van Oud en Nieuw Oost-Indien ..., 5 vols (Dordrecht and Amsterdam, 1724-6), V, Book 10, p. 145. Although breakdowns by sex of the Company slave holdings probably do exist for other years, I know of none until 1784, when the slave lodge contained 472 men (both slaves and bandieten, 176 women and 89 children. See H. P. Cruse, Die Opheffing van die Kleurlingbevolking (Stellenbosch, 1947), p. 201.
- (4) C. Beyers, Die Kaapse Patriotte, 1779-1791 (Johannesburg, 1930), p. 210.
- (5) See Robert Ross, "The 'White' Population of South Africa in the Eighteenth Century", Population Studies XXIX (1975), pp. 210-12.
- (6) For the former, see Cruse, Opheffing, 269; for the latter, J. M. L. Franken, "Vertolking aan die Kaap in Maleis en Portugees" in Taalhistorise Bydraes (Amsterdam and Cape Town, 1953), pp. 42-44.
- (7) Since place of residence is not specified in the lists, I have considered as Cape Town slaves all those who lived in the Cape District and whose masters possessed no agricultural property.
- (8) J. M. L. Franken, "'n Kaapse Huishoue in die 18<sup>e</sup> Eeu uit von Dessin se Briefboek en Memoriaal", Archives Year Book for South African History (1940), I, 63, pp. 66-7.
- (9) J. S. Marais, The Cape Coloured People, 1652-1937 (Johannesburg, 1957), p.10.
- (10) See opgaaf list 1749, in KA 4155, and C. C. de Villiers and C. Pama, Geslagsregisters van die Ou Kaapse Families, Vol. II (Cape Town, 1966), p. 463.
- (11) Franken, "Kaapse Huishoue", p. 66. Anders Sparrman, A Voyage to the Cape of Good Hope ..., edited by V. S. Forbes (Cape Town, 1975), p. 102.
- (12) The laws of neither Batavia nor the Cape specifically allowed slaves to marry. Theoretically, then, the Roman law that slaves could not marry was still in force. In 1693, however, the Raad of Batavia, whose edicts held good at the Cape, decreed that slaves were exempt from paying the fee for permission to marry, and in 1696 it was laid down that a slave could not marry a free person or another master's slave without permission from the master. See Nederlandsch-Indisch Plakaatboek, 1602-1811, ed. J. A. van der Chijs, Vol. IX (Batavia, 1891), pp. 402-3.
- (13) This is demonstrated in the introduction by Richard Elphick and Herman Giliomee to their edition of essays on the 17th & 18th century Cape, The Shaping of South African Society (Longmans, forthcoming).
- (14) I. C. du Piessis and C. A. Luckhoff, The Malay Quarter and its People (Cape Town and Amsterdam, 1953), p. 71.
- (15) See Ross, "White Population", and Cruse, Opheffing, p. 204.
- (16) Case against Antoni de Noose, 4 October 1725, KA 4077.
- (17) When he was asked if he knew that such a crime deserved death, Daniel Dikkop's comment is instructive. He claimed that he did not, "because sometimes this sort



- of murder remains unpunished and Europeans shoot Hottentots dead without anything being done about it". Case of 3 February 1787, KA 4314.
- (18) See Cases of 9 November 1730, KA 4093, No. 19, and also of 15 August 1737, KA 4113. Although it is scattered, evidence on this fascinating runaway community is quite plentiful, especially in the crime records for 1733 (KA 4101), and I hope soon to write it up.
  - (19) For the trial, see Case No. 7, 1755, KA 4078. For Badenhorst's holdings, see KA 4071, opgaaf list for 1753.
  - (20) Case of 27 March 1721, KA 4066.
  - (21) Case of 3 August 1752, KA 4168, No. 10.
  - (22) Case on 10 July 1760 against Pieter van Bali, slave of Gysbert Rogiers, KA 4201, No. 10.
  - (23) Case of 25 May 1747, KA 4151, No. 11.
  - (24) Information in Court, 17 March 1761, KA 4205.
  - (25) Case of 30 July 1772, KA 4249, No. 10.
  - (26) Information given in court, 30 March 1766, KA 4230.
  - (27) Ross, "White Population", pp. 222-23.
  - (28) It is significant that all the four women with obviously black names who were recorded as the wives of white men in 1749 were known as van der Caab, which indicates that they had been born in South Africa.
  - (29) For a fascinating example of this process, see Margaret Cairns, "Geringer and Bok - a Genealogical Jig-saw", Familia, XIII (1976), No. 2.
  - (30) The stamvader Olof Bergh married Anna de Koning, daughter of Anna van Bengal. One of his descendants became landdrost of Stellenbosch and another a burgher lieutenant.
  - (31) The high proportion of unmarried women among the Free Blacks suggests that many concubines were emancipated but did not marry their lovers.
  - (32) O. F. Mentzel, Description of the Cape of Good Hope, ed. H. J. Mandelbrote, Vol. II (Cape Town, 1924), 110, Vol. III (Cape Town, 1944), pp. 118-19.
  - (33) Case of 21 August 1777, KA 4266, No. 7.
  - (34) Case No. 16, 1768, KA 4234.
  - (35) Mentzel, Vol. II, p. 125, Vol. III, p. 99; Abbé N. L. de la Caille, Journal Historique du Voyage fait au Cap de Bonne Espérance (Paris, 1776), pp. 309-12.
  - (36) V. de Kock, Those in Bondage (London, 1950), p. 45.
  - (37) It is significant that the six mandoors in the Company Lodge in 1795 included Johannes van Lea, Johannes van Maria Angola, Johannes van Maria Suede, and Roeloff van Susanne. See Comité van de Zaken van de Oost Indische Handel en Bezittingen, Vol. 152A, Algemene Rijksarchief, Den Haag.
  - (38) Case of 29 November 1742, KA 4133.
  - (39) Case of 13 November 1766, KA 4230, No. 27.
  - (40) L. J. Boon, "De grote sodomietenvervolging in het gewest Holland, 1730-1731", Holland, VIII, 3 (1976), pp. 140-152.
  - (41) of Charles van Onselen, "South Africa's Lumpenproletarian Army: 'Umkosi wa Ntaba' - 'The Regiment of the Hills' - 1890-1920", Paper presented to this seminar, March 1976.
  - (42) Case of 23 April 1739, KA 4120, No. 11.
  - (43) Case of 23 December 1751, KA 4163, No. 12, and of 18 August 1735, KA 4106, No. 12.
  - (44) In only one case out of 22 did the "criminal" live in Cape Town. Case of 29 March 1764, KA 4128, No. 6.
  - (45) For the inquisitive, the animals with which the offence was committed included hens, turkey hens, male and (more frequently) female dogs, goats, ewes, pigs, cows, she-asses and mares.

- (46) Case of 15 September 1774, KA 4257, No. 12. For Louw's holdings, see opgaaf list for 1774, KA 4254, Cape District, p. 22.
- (47) See Robert Ross, Adam Kok's Griquas. A study in the development of stratification in South Africa (Cambridge, 1976), Chapter 4.