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Preface

When I started this research I had just finished a research assistantship working on the *Mapping Slavery in the North* project. I made a database of locations in the province of Groningen that were related to the history of slavery. I noticed that many of those involved with slavery were from the same families, all part of the local urban elite, the rural nobility and the provincial sub-elite. I decided to make a genealogical database of all those involved with slavery, and soon started noticing that the various families started to connect with each other and form clusters. And then the clusters started connecting, until eventually nearly everyone was part of one huge network.

To explore the network I intended to make visualizations that would help identify significant structures within it. This network was so vast and heavily interconnected that I had great difficulties visualizing it. The traditional genealogical visualizations, such as family trees, offered little insight: the lines were so numerous, and crossed so often, that it was impossible to establish who was connected with whom. The names also became illegible. Even when printed on A0 size paper, the names would be impossible to read. It was clear that this network needed a digital interactive visualization. Such a visualization could be explored on the computer, enabling the user to select and view certain structures and search within the network. There was no easy solution to making such a visualization, however.

I realized that due to the scope of the network, combined with the technical challenges, this research would go far beyond the scope of a Research Master’s thesis. That is why I decided to focus on what made my research innovative: the method. The empirical section of this thesis is fairly traditional in tone and findings, but the innovation is in how I got there. The findings I describe in the empirical section could not have been made without the combination of genealogical research and the use of digital tools. These tools enabled me to construct and explore this vast and complex genealogical network, discovering (at times new and unexpected) relations between those involved with slavery.

In a sense this thesis is only a starting point. I have identified certain structures that should be explored further. My goal with this research was to identify the structures within the kinship network around slavery. Further research could now focus on analyzing the dynamics within the kinship network. What this further exploration could more precisely entail I comment on in the conclusion of this research.

Lieuwe Jongsma, December 2015
Introduction

Slavery has existed for as long as people could force others to do their work for them. It is not limited to a certain time or specific regions or cultures. The transatlantic slavery that arose after the discovery of the America's is special, however. Never before were such large groups of people transported across oceans, just to force them to work once on the other side. During the journey they were robbed of their lives, their homeland, one could even argue their humanity. All across Europe people partook in this lucrative endeavor. In the Netherlands, the West India Company was founded primarily for the slave trade. It had several chambers throughout the country, one of them in the city of Groningen. The city and province, like the many areas in Western Europe, had its stake in the slave trade. Many from both the rural nobility and the urban elite were involved in the West India Company, or were directly invested in slave trade or plantations in the West. When the Enlightenment and the modern nineteenth century came, there were also those who spoke out against slavery.

To the general public – and even to most historians, I must add – very little is known about Groningen's history of transatlantic slavery. Most will know that the Netherlands played an important role in the transatlantic slave trade, but it is often presumed that only Holland and Zeeland played a part in this history, while, in fact, over ten percent of all Dutch slave voyages was affiliated with the Chamber Stad en Lande in the city of Groningen.¹

Those in Groningen who were involved with Transatlantic Slavery often kept close ties with each other. They worked together in local politics and business, and they lived close to one another. Their families intermarried and functions related to the West India Company, or stock in plantations were passed down through generations. These plantations included enslaved men and women, who were considered part of the inventory. Thus, (partial) ownership of plantation equals the ownership of slaves, and involvement with the West India Company equals involvement with slave trade. This research explores the role of kinship in the networks around transatlantic slavery and slave trade in the province of Groningen in the Netherlands. I argue that kinship is a crucial formative factor of this network. The vast majority of those involved with transatlantic slavery were related through marriage or by blood. Those families who were not connected to the kinship network did not manage to gain a lasting foothold. Kinship, therefore, is crucial for lasting involvement with an elite network such as that around transatlantic slavery.

In recent years, there has been a shift in focus of academic research into the European involvement with transatlantic slavery. For decades there was little interest in the European involvement with slavery. The few scholars that wrote on the topic often focused on the role Europeans and their enslavement of Africans played in Africa and the Americas.

Dutch historian Piet Emmer wrote various works on the role of the Dutch in the Atlantic, and their role in slave trade in particular. His most important work is *De Nederlandse slavenhandel 1500-1850* (2000). In this book he discusses the Dutch trade of enslaved people mainly from an economical perspective. He argues that this trade was less profitable than is often thought, and that it was more risky than other investments at that. His colleague at the University of Leiden, Henk den Heijer, also wrote extensively about the Dutch slave trade. As a professor of maritime history, his focus was on the WIC, about which he wrote several works. He argued that it was not in the best interest of slave traders to treat those who they enslaved badly. After all, it would be foolish to damage your merchandise. Both Den Heijer and Emmer focus on the institutions around slavery and slave trade in their works, as did many before them. The role of individuals is hardly discussed, and even less the role of slavery and slave trade in the lives of individuals in the Netherlands.

Historian Gert Oostindie has also written several works on both slavery itself, and the commemoration of slavery. In 1989, he published his dissertation on the plantations Roosenburg and Mon Bijou in Surinam. While he does, at times, discuss the role of the individual with relation to the plantation, he hardly comments on the role the connection to the plantation played back in the Netherlands. In his work *Het paradijs overzee* (1997) he discusses the relation between the Netherlands and its Caribbean colonies, but he mainly focuses on the institutional level.


---

Africa, in this case as the source of the creole culture of the enslaved across the Atlantic. The African perspective is often neglected in the historiography of slavery. Lovejoy contributes to the historiography of those who were robbed of their history and culture by enslavement, and he makes subjects of those who are often discussed merely as objects. His perspective, therefore, has great symbolic significance.

In recent years, scholars such as Matthias van Rossem have demonstrated that slavery was certainly not an exclusively Atlantic affair. In his work Kleurrijke Tragiek: De geschiedenis van slavernij in Azië onder de VOC (2015), he discusses the scope of slavery and slave trade in areas governed by the VOC. He states that, at certain times, more people were enslaved in these areas than in the Dutch American colonies combined. My research, however, will focus on the Atlantic world, and only discusses involvement with slavery in Asia in passing.

The aforementioned scholars often wrote primarily about the institutions of slavery, such as the various slave trading companies. Their focus was also on the Dutch colonies and trading posts in Africa and the America's. The Netherlands were hardly mentioned, or only in an abstract sense as the site of governance of these institutions. The history of slavery was, in other words, externalized and institutionalized. I argue that this has contributed to the pain that is still felt in relation to this history.

Not only has the interest in slavery increased over the years, the academic gaze has also turned from the West, to Europe itself. People like Nicholas Draper and Madge Dresser in the United Kingdom, and the Mapping Slavery project in the Netherlands, showed that there were many tangible connections to slavery, often very close to home. They also often focused on the individuals involved with slavery, rather than just the institutions. For example, the Legacies of British Slave-ownership project, with which Nicholas Draper was involved, identifies individual families and people who were compensated when slavery was abolished. This compensation was for the loss of their slaves, who formed the living "furniture" of the plantations they held stock in. In her work Slavery Obscured (2001), British historian Madge Dresser shows that the impact of slavery on the British society has been underestimated. She discusses the role of city of Bristol as one of the country's most important slave trading ports. In a 2009 article, she discusses the way Bristol has dealt with this heritage of slavery. In another work, she examines the connections between slavery and British country houses.

9 Matthias van Rossum, Kleurrijke Tragiek: De geschiedenis van slavernij in Azië onder de VOC (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2015).
The *Mapping Slavery* project started in Utrecht. Historian Esther Captain published a guide for the sites related to slavery in Utrecht, *Wandelgids Sporen van Slavernij*, in 2012.\(^{12}\) This guide showed that ties to slavery could be found even in a city that did not have a strong history of transatlantic trade. It also highlighted the individual involvement of people in Utrecht with slavery, and the role that this involvement played here, in the Netherlands. Many similar *Mapping Slavery* initiatives have since been established across the Netherlands.\(^{13}\)

In 2007 Professor of Carribean History Alex van Stipriaan, in collaboration with Waldo Heilbron, Aspha Bijnaar and Valika Smuelders, published *Op zoek naar de stilte*, in which he also explored the traces of the Dutch heritage of slavery within the Netherlands.\(^{14}\) They showed that there is much material heritage that still reminds of slavery in the Netherlands, even though these traces often go unnoticed by both the general public and academia. They found these traces in Amsterdam, a city with close ties to the history of slavery, but also Leeuwarden, a provincial town in the North of the Netherlands with no particularly large role in the Atlantic world.

Thus, in recent years, the history of transatlantic slavery has gone from externalized and institutionalized, to internalized and individualized. While this is indeed progress, there is a risk that comes with the focus on the individual: the involvement with slavery could be interpreted as something that "only" a few individuals were involved in, while it was in fact something widespread and systemic. With this research, I aim to show exactly that. I study networks of kinship around transatlantic slavery in the province of Groningen, the Netherlands, from the establishment of the local chamber of the Dutch West India Company (WIC) in 1622, until the abolition of Slavery in the Dutch American colonies in 1863. The main question I ask is: what role did kinship play in the involvement with transatlantic slavery and slave trade in the province of Groningen between the establishment of the WIC chamber of Stad en Lande in 1622 and the abolition of slavery in 1863?

The province of Groningen was quite peripheral, and not as heavily involved with slavery as, for example, Amsterdam or Zeeland. There was a substantial group of people directly involved with transatlantic slavery, however. Most of them through the local chamber of the WIC, often as *bewindhebbers* (directors). Many others invested in plantations, or worked for the WIC in Africa and the America's. The most striking fact about these people is that they were nearly all related to each other.

The first goal of this research is to identify who were involved with transatlantic slavery and slave trade in the province of Groningen between 1622 and 1863. Because the network is too large and densely connected to discuss everyone in it, and all their interrelations, within the scope of

---


\(^{13}\) See: [http://www.mappingslavery.nl](http://www.mappingslavery.nl).

\(^{14}\) Alex van, Stipriaan, *Op zoek naar de stilte: sporen van het slavernijverleden in Nederland* (Leiden; Amsterdam: KITLV Uitgeverij; Nationaal instituut Nederlands slavernijverleden en erfenis (NiNsee), 2007).
research, I focus on certain exemplary cases. With these I illustrate the various modes and levels of involvements with slavery, and the various types and constellations of relations there were between those involved. I also analyze the network as a whole: what kind of network is the kinship network around slavery? Is it dense, or loosely connected? Is one big network or many smaller ones? Using statistical methods the main kinship network can be divided into various clusters. I discuss what the respective qualitative characteristics of these clusters are.

Although it goes beyond the scope of this research to go into detail, I do strive to shed light on what role kinship played within these networks. What were the effects of kinship on the involvement with transatlantic slavery? There are some striking examples where kinship seemed to dictate the mode of involvement with slavery which I discuss.

To study the development of the kinship network over time, I chose to study the entire period from the start of Groningen’s involvement with slavery in 1622, until the abolition of Slavery in the Dutch American colonies in 1863. This timeframe also implies a focus beyond the institutional: during this period, various institutions around slavery and slave trade were established and dismantled. What remained constant was the individual involvement with slavery of those within the kinship network. While I do discuss these institutions, and even use them as a starting point for my research, I subsequently abandon the institutional perspective in favor of the individual.

It is my aim with this research to provide a study that goes beyond regional history. In many ways Groningen is quite average: unlike Amsterdam or London, it was no global economic center. That makes this study suitable for comparison with other such areas throughout Europe.

I also aim to contribute to the current societal debate around the Dutch heritage of slavery. Acknowledging the past is a crucial first step, and acknowledgement is impossible without knowledge. In the past, it has been questioned whether the conclusions of similar research in the United Kingdom, on the involvement with slavery, was representative of society as a whole. I aim to show that the involvement with slavery was not peripheral, and that it was not something that only concerns a handful people, but that it was widespread and central to the elite networks in the region. Slave owners, traders and those who benefited from slavery and slave trade played a central role in the region in the seventeenth through nineteenth century. Because of this aim, I choose not to go into great detail with specific examples, but rather give broad strokes and illustrative cases of the entire network. This way I can demonstrate that the cases discussed are representative of the elite in Groningen as a whole. By discussing Groningen, I further demonstrate that involvement with

slavery was not limited to the most important slave trading ports and large cities, but was also present in rural areas, such as the Ommelanden.

For the past decades many studies about the Dutch involvement with transatlantic slavery have been published. Most of these dealt with the sites where the actual enslavement took place themselves: West Indies, Surinam, Brazil and the Dutch colonies in Africa. While I inevitably discuss these areas as well, my focus, however, is on Groningen. By analyzing the role ties to slavery played in society in the Netherlands, I aim to bring this subject, that has often been externalized, back “home”. My main focus in this research is on those facilitating slavery, participating in enslaving and those benefiting from enslavement, rather than the enslaved themselves. I do not discuss the situation in the Dutch colonies concerning slavery in depth, but only where there is a direct relation with the Groningen network.

This research consists of two parts: the first part, which focuses on the method, conceptual framework, and quantitative analysis of the network; The second part is a qualitative discussion of significant examples from the kinship network. This part is in turn divided into three chronological chapters, which each discuss roughly one century. The first chapter discusses the networks from the start of Groningen's involvement with transatlantic slavery, with the establishment of the local chamber of the West India Company in 1622, until the start of the eighteenth century. The second chapter discusses the networks throughout the eighteenth century until the end of the West India Company in 1792. The third chapter deals with the networks from the end of the WIC until the abolition of slavery in 1863. In these three chapters I discuss several illustrative cases, that show the various modes and degrees of involvement with slavery within the kinship network, as well as the various kinship configurations around slavery. Finally I review the findings from the previous parts and draw conclusions. I also reflect on possibilities for further research.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

To analyze the role of kinship within the elite networks around slavery in Groningen, it is important to firstly define the core concepts I work with. Firstly, to establish which group of people it is exactly that I study, I have to define the “regional elite”. Elites, simply put, are those in the highest social, economic, political or cultural strata. Hidde Feenstra identifies three “circles” within the regional elite of Groningen: (1) the rural nobility, (2) the magistrate (mayor and council) in the city of Groningen and (3) the “sub-elites”, both in the countryside and in the city. I use this model, with the small adaptation that I refer to the second group as the “urban elite”, to accommodate for those

---

who belong to the highest elite in the city, yet are not part of the magistrate. Generally, the political power in the province was held by individuals in the first two circles.

Secondly, the “connection with slavery” has to be defined. It is important to note that I do not consider all ties to slavery equal. I distinguish between several categories, defined by two dimensions. The first dimension is that of the level of involvement. While some built their entire career around slave trade, others merely buy goods produced with slave labor, or produce goods that are traded for slaves. The most important distinction here is whether individuals are directly involved or indirectly involved. Individuals are directly involved by investing in slave trade, the WIC or plantations, by directly or indirectly owning slaves, or by willingly and intentionally facilitating slave trade or slavery. Individuals are indirectly involved by indirectly profiting from (the system of) slavery and slave trade. I only discuss those directly involved in this research. The second dimension is the mode of involvement, meaning the different ways that one could be tied to slavery. This way I can distinguish between facilitators of slave trade, slave traders and slave owners, governance of colonies with slavery, and abolitionists. All groups are tied to slavery, but in different ways. All these modes of involvement will be discussed in this research.

The third central concept of this research is kinship. People have attached various meanings to kinship relations throughout history. In the seventeenth through nineteenth century, Luuc Kooijmans describes the kinship and friendship relations between various early modern Dutch families. He states that early modern friendship, was very different from what we know it as today. In the Early Modern Low Countries, friendship was closely related to kinship. It was a system based on reciprocity and solidarity, and financial security and material wealth were central. This was to insure survival in times of hardship. Kooijmans states: “if the institutional structures in a society were insufficient to insure social cohesion, stability largely relied on personal ties, and friendship fitted in a tradition that stemmed from classical and medieval times, in which friendship stood for fostering consensus, peace and solidarity. Solidarity was primarily tied to kinship, and the concepts of kinship and friendship overlapped”. Kooijmans argues that was not until the welfare state developed, in the late nineteenth century, that friendship evolved into what we know it as today: a relation based on intimacy and trust. Kooijmans illustrates his thesis with stories based on the family archives of the Huydecoper and Van der Meulen families. Many members of these families were successful merchants, diplomats and politicians in the seventeenth and eighteenth century Netherlands.

Pierre Bourdieu argues that the choice of a marriage partner is part of a strategy for social reproduction. He states that this unspoken strategy is determined by one's habitus, which is

---

17 Luuc Kooijmans, *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Bakker, 1997), 14. Translation is mine.
determined by the sum of cultural and material circumstances, society and upbringing. He criticizes earlier scholars who viewed marriage strategies from a legalistic perspective, as though the choice of marriage partners was determined by a set of unspoken rules. According Bourdieu this way of looking at marriage is too rigid. Marriage strategies can change immensely if it is in the interest of preserving valued social structures. He argues that, therefore, it is useless to try to identify the rules that govern marriage choices, but that we rather have to figure out what it is that these choices try to achieve. He states that marriage should be viewed as a system of “biological, cultural, and social reproduction”.

Based on the above, I interpret the marriages that are part of the analysis below as a tool for creating kinship ties, that is employed strategically for the improvement and preservation of mutual social and economic standing, or in other words: to preserve social, political, economical or cultural capital. The regional elite form several, relatively closed kinship networks, because it is not in their interest to marry outside of it. After all, this would lead to loss of social standing and wealth, especially if one marries outside the elite. The exact role of the ties to slavery with regards to these marriage strategies will be discussed later.

**Methodology and Method**

The archive of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande, the main source for this research, has regrettably not stood the test of time. It was most likely used to heat the house of Hendrik Gerrit van Bulderen, the chamber's last secretary, in 1803. Thus, there is a lack of direct evidence of the ties that Groningen had with slavery. While many slivers of proof remain in various family archives and such, the is no single place to start looking. The ties to slavery are many needles in various haystacks, which somehow must be found and put together. Luckily, much of the hard work was done by professor P.J. van Winter. In his *De Westindische Compagnie ter Kamer Stad en Lande* (1978), van Winter reconstructs the history of the chamber from various archival sources. Building on his work, it was possible to find the most important needles. Genealogical research was then used to “fill in the gaps”. Genealogy shows things that remain invisible in the sources. For example, the role of women is also made visible through networks of kinship. Because they never fulfilled any official roles, they were only visible as investors in the WIC, and in plantations. And even then far less frequently than men. Also, the focus on patrilineal succession, by looking at family names, blinds researchers from seeing matrilineal lines and other connections made via women. It was by connecting them that I
first noticed that there were not various kinship networks around slavery, but in fact one large one. As the familial relations within and between the various networks are numerous and complex, I will not be able to discuss them all. Instead, I aim to provide a selection of various cases that display the range of different modes of involvement with slavery, and the role that various kinship connections play in the network.

To analyze the marriage choices and kinship structures of the network around slavery, I employ methods from both social networks analysis and history. By quantitatively analyzing the kinship connections I can make several general observations about the density, complexity and modularity of the network. These quantitative methods alone would not yield satisfactory results, however. To explain why certain structures within the network exist, I take a closer look at specific illustrative examples. The analysis of kinship networks has its own particularities, different from general social network analysis, some of which pose a methodological challenge.

Thomas Schweizer and Douglas R. White argue that a network approach to kinship analysis enables researchers to analyze how social actions, such as the choice of a specific partner, “are embedded in a specific nexus of social actions. Embedding occurs not just in local networks but also in connections to larger […] contexts”. By looking at kinship on the scale of larger, multi-familial networks, marriage choices can be placed in a larger context. This enables comparison and identification of both the norm, as well as any cases deviating from it.

To study of the relation between the kinship network and ties to slavery, I need to identify the points of congruence of the genealogical and the non-genealogical. It is important to distinguish between significant kinship ties and non-significant kinship ties. If the scope of the kinship network is made large enough, all would be related to all others in some way. Only congruence of kinship and ties to slavery within a set number of degrees of separation should be studied. Furthermore, diachronous kinship has different significance than synchronous kinship. For example: while my partner’s little brother's mother-in-law and my second great grandfather are both separated from me by four steps, I see one of them at birthdays – and that isn't my second great grandfather. Therefore, I limit the scope of my study to fewer steps diachronously than synchronously.

A kinship network consists of two types of relations: filiation and marriage. The former


includes relations between parents and their children, and is usually a blood relation (exceptions such as adoption excluded). The latter is a relation based on choice. The question what the influence of the connection with slavery is on marriage strategies, and vice versa, is central to this research.

Traditional genealogical research often focuses on linear structures. The analogy of the tree is often used: you start at the root, and the family branches out to all sides. In this research, the studied structures are more like rhizomes. I do not focus on a single family, with a root, a trunk and branches, but rather try to explore the kinship connections between various families, like a rhizomatic root complex. Connections spread out to many sides, connecting various nodes with each other. A rhizome is difficult to describe in a linear fashion, because it is itself non-linear. While arborescent genealogies constantly cut lines and prevent retroactivity, rhizomatic kinship networks consist of many equally important connections, that enable exploration in all directions.

This rhizomatic approach comes with some additional benefits. Traditional genealogy often focuses on the family name, and thus on the male line. In this approach, the family name is of secondary importance to the kinship connection. That means that female lines are given as much importance as male lines. Male lines are still better represented in the research due to source limitations: there are simply fewer sources supporting research of the female lines. Still, this approach shows that families don’t “die out”, as is sometimes said about prominent families that are extinct in the male line, but that these are rather resumed in the female line. This makes women in history more visible, and an integral, vital part of historiography.

My approach to the kinship network is not only rhizomatic, but also diachronical, as it looks at a period of over 250 years. During this time the network underwent drastic changes. This gives rise to various methodological challenges. Due to the complexity of the network it is exceedingly difficult to visualize. When I first started this research, I made several attempts at visualizing the network in ways that were suitable for print. These static, two-dimensional renderings turned out to be useless. Not only are the networks so vast and complex that these static visualizations yield little new insight, rendering the network to a static 2D medium also discourages exploration. On a computer these networks can be explored by simply clicking from node to node. This quickly gives a good impression of the degree of interconnectedness within the network. One solution was to cut the network up into smaller sections, but this defeated the purpose of visualization, which was to show its complexity and degree of interconnectedness.

Several studies have been conducted on the visualization of genealogical data. McGuffin and

---

Balakrishnan suggest several methods for producing interactive genealogical graphs. These methods all proved unsatisfactory, because the network is too complex. Bezerianos et al. suggest the use of a GeneaQuilt, a visualization that, they argue, lends itself well for large genealogical networks. When printed – even on A0 paper – this graph was hardly legible due to the size of the network and its number of interconnections within and between family clusters, however. Rhizomatic kinship networks require a different approach than traditional, arborescent genealogies. The rhizomatic structures need to be explored in all directions. Arborescent structures, on the other hand, can be explored either from branch to root, or from branch to branch, but when a structure has several roots significant lines are cut when an arborescent perspective is taken. For example: in an arborescent family only blood relations and affines are included. But affines of affines, who are excluded, could also be significant. Another consequence of visualizing rhizomatic networks with arborescent models is that there is not enough “space” for the data.

In an arborescent model, the structure of a tree contains both information about relations between persons, as well as information about time. In a vertical graph that shows recent generations at the bottom and their ancestors at the top, the Y-axis can be used to contain time information. When the same model would be used for complex rhizomatic networks, too many lines would cross in between generations and the network would become unusable. Rhizomatic kinship analysis, therefore, requires different visualizations and different software. A three-dimensional visualization has an extra dimension to hold time information. The Z-axis of the graph could denote time, and the X- and Y-axis could be utilized to spread the network out evenly to prevent lines from crossing. Such a three-dimensional network would have to be explored digitally, instead of being printed on paper. This three-dimensional rendering of the network was not possible at present moment, So I settled for an interactive two-dimensional rendering. I discuss it, and how it was made, at greater length in the next section.

Sources, tools and techniques
So what does the above translate to in practice? To answer the questions I pose in this research, I compiled a database of those involved with transatlantic slavery in Groningen and the kinship relations between them. This database contains 1320 unique individuals, of whom nearly 200 are directly related to transatlantic slavery. The remaining circa 1100 individuals connect these 200 to each other. To be clear: it is well possible that there are some among those 1100 individuals also had a direct relation to slavery. I was just not able to establish a direct relation based on the sources available to me. It is not unlikely that this group contains further individuals with some connection to slavery.
To find those with a direct connection to slavery in Groningen, I started by reviewing what is already available in the literature. The only work that directly deals with one important aspect of Groningen’s history of transatlantic slavery is the work on the WIC chamber Stad en Lande by P.J. van Winter, mentioned above. In this work, Van Winter describes in great detail the history of the WIC chamber in Groningen, its bewindhebbers and its dealings. He also discusses the role the WIC and the West Indies played in the society of Groningen. This work provided the first list of names of those involved with slavery, most of whom were bewindhebbers. Subsequently I looked at literature about slavery for references to Groningen and people from the region, and vice versa. In a recent article, Okke ten Hove provides a list of members of parlement and senate, and their votes on abolition, which included a few people from Groningen. Okke ten Hove, together with H.E. Helstone, also compiled a database of people who were compensated when slavery was abolished in 1863, which listed a few Groningers. The Repertorium van ambtsdragers en ambtenaren 1428-1861, which can be found on the website of the Huygens ING, also lists several people from Groningen who held offices related to the colonies during times of slavery. The list of names that the review of the aforementioned sources resulted in already showed that several family names were more strongly represented than others. This list was the starting point for a genealogical research, which quickly connected many of those on it. Browsing through family archives, I often stumbled upon even more in these families involved with slavery, either through the WIC, by partial ownership of plantations, or at times through abolition or colonial governance. Because the network is so densely connected, many of the initial genealogical ties were quickly discovered. This formed a basic structure of the network, which hinted at where other connections could be found.

The genealogical database was compiled in GRAMPS, a software suite used for genealogical research. The kinship relations were also discovered and explored using methods borrowed from genealogical research. The resulting database is very different from a traditional genealogy, however. In most genealogical research, the focus is on one family, a certain lineage of family name. The resulting family tree is aptly named: it has a “tree-like” shape. There may be many branches and complex interconnections, but there is always a certain central axis, a trunk to which all branches lead. In my database, there is no such central axis. My goal was to explore the connections between the nearly 200 individuals involved with slavery, which results in a far less hierarchical network, which resulted in some very practical hurdles to take.

Software

While there are many software solutions for genealogical research and graphing out there, none of them exactly fits the type of research needed to answer the questions posed. Most genealogical software suites are geared towards the analysis of traditional family lines that lead from or to a single actor or family, or in other words: arborescent structures. Because I focus on a large number of different families that are connected in a complex rhizomatic manner, there are far more nodes and edges than in a traditional family tree. To manage the genealogical data, map and explore the networks and eventually visualize them in an insightful and attractive form, I used various different programs.

The database was constructed and managed using *Gramps*.\(^{26}\) This, in my experience, the most user-friendly program for data entry and management. It enables the user to easily add kinship ties and identify double entries. It can also be used to store notes and media relating to specific individuals or events. Gramps includes several functions for network exploration, of which the most useful is the “relationship calculator”, this utility calculates the kinship connection between two individuals. It is limited to blood ties, however. This is highly inconvenient, as affine connections are often some of the most significant.

Secondary analysis and troubleshooting was done with *Puck 2.0*. *Puck* (Program for the Use and Computation of Kinship data) is a program specialized at counting and analyzing matrimonial circuits.\(^{27}\) It can provide basic statistics about the genealogical database, and has several functionalities for analyzing patterns in marriage choices and relations between kinship and other characteristics.\(^{28}\) *Puck* also has several ways to assess the quality of a database. It can identify gender biases and inconsistent dates, and can show the user where there might be important information missing. It helped tremendously to diagnose database problems and troubleshoot. This program was also used to convert the data to a format more suitable for analysis with other programs.

Further analysis and graphing was done with *Pajek*. This program is widely used for social network analysis.\(^{29}\) Even though it lacks a graphic interface – and has quite a steep learning curve – it is quite powerful for certain types of analysis. I used it for initial exploratory graphing of the network.

Even though all programmes mentioned above are capable of making network visualizations, None of the results were satisfactory. *Gramps* can make several visualizations, of which the “family lines graph” is most relevant to this research. It draws a genealogical graph, based on a selection of individuals. The same type of graphs can be drawn with *Puck*, the difference between

---


\(^{27}\) See the following article about the possibilities of Puck: Klaus Hamberger et al., “Scanning for Patterns of Relationship: Analyzing Kinship and Marriage Networks with *Puck 2.0*,” *History of the Family (Routledge)* 19, no. 4 (December 2014): 564–96, doi:10.1080/1081602X.2014.892436.

\(^{28}\) Ibid.

the two being that those drawn with Puck can be fine-tuned: the program allows users to select the
degree of parent depth, partner depth and child depth, and whether or not affines are included. Puck
proved most useful for rendering sections of the network. Pajek is highly versatile, and can draw
many different types of networks. Its main drawback is more practical than methodological: it is
very bad at labeling nodes properly. Labels almost always overlap, unless they are shrunk down to
illegible proportions.

So finally, I used Gephi for making the final graph. Gephi is a piece of software specialized in
network analysis and visualization. It includes several algorithms for analyzing network data, such as
the network modularity, the average shortest path between two nodes, and the clustering coefficient.
The degree of network modularity shows how strongly the network is divided into various
subnetworks, which are often called modules or communities. The length of the average shortest
path is a measure for the tightness of the network. A short average path means that, on average,
those in the network are separated by only few other nodes. The clustering coefficient tells to what
degree those in the network form tight small clusters.

Utilizing the SigmaJS Exporter plugin for Gephi I exported the network to an interactive
network that is displayable online. Sigma is a Javascript library for drawing graphs with javascript in
web browsers.30 These graphs can be interactive, and can include search bars, legends and
commentary windows. This interactive visualization has several advantages over static, printed
versions. Firstly, as noted above, a static visualization of the entire network would simply be
unusable because of its sheer size and complexity. Visualizations of the various subnetworks would
have been a feasible alternative, but this would have resulted in the loss of insight into the
connections between these subnetworks. These interconnections are at the core of my argument, so
that was a compromise I was not willing to make. This interactive visualization makes the entire
network accessible and explorable.

There are several points that this visualization could be improved upon, however. Ideally,
those with direct involvements to slavery would be marked in the graph, so you could more easily
see where they are concentrated and how they relate to the network as a whole. Also, it would
benefit the ease of use if the information pane could contain more information on each person,
when selected. Also, ideally this network would be visualized in three dimensions, where the Z-axis
would be used to contain time information.31 This way the development of the network could be
better tracked through time. Also, diachronic connections have different significance than
synchronous connections: the relation between grandfather and grandson is different than that of
two cousins who lived at the same time. At this moment there is no software available that has these
features, however, and I lack the technical skill to add these myself.

31 See for a possible example: Walter Rafelsberger, Rhizome Navigation: Genealogy Visualization (12/2006), accessed
November 5, 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KGg2XLTvP_Co.
THE NETWORK

The network visualization can be found at [HTTP://WWW.LIEUWEJONGSMA.NL/SLAVERYNETWORK/](HTTP://WWW.LIEUWEJONGSMA.NL/SLAVERYNETWORK/).

When you look at the visualization of the network of those involved with transatlantic slavery in Groningen and their kinship interconnections, it is apparent that nearly everyone is connected. Most people can be connected to each other within a few steps. The circles represent persons and the lines their respective relations with each other. The circles vary in size, reflecting the number of connections they have. The colors of the circles is determined by to which group a person belongs. A list of these groups is given below.

The graph shows that, while nearly everyone is connected to the main network, there are some small clusters and even individuals that remain unconnected, floating around the sides. Some of these are indubitably related to the main network, but I have simply been unable to find the precise way they are. For example: near the top-right of the graph you can find Anna Tamminga and Derck Everts Coenders van Helpen. Both are, judging by their names, members of families that are prominently featured in the network, but I have not been able to establish their exact relation to it. Some other clusters are actually not connected to the main network because there is no kinship relation. An example of this is the cluster around university professor and bewindhebber Nicolaus Mulerius, in the top-left of the graph. He and his wife moved from Groningen from the Southern Netherlands, and his descendants all moved away from Groningen later without marrying into the network.

NETWORK METRICS AND CHARACTERISTICS

**General**

- Number of nodes (persons): 1320
- Number of persons directly related to slavery: 184
- Number of marriages: 576
- Number of parent-child ties: 1642
- Generational depth: 11
- Number of individuals in main network: 1245

Top 10 best represented families:
1. Clant (51 individuals)
2. Wichers (44 individuals)
3. Alberda (38 individuals)
4. Trip (36 individuals)
5. Gockinga (33 individuals)
6. Iddekinge (30 individuals)
7. Lewe (28 individuals)
8. Sichterman (24 individuals)
9. (de) Sighers (21 individuals)
10. Grujs (19 individuals)

Global clustering coefficient: 0.57

The global clustering coefficient measures the degree of interconnection between triplets, which are groups of three nodes connected by either two or three ties. If a triplet is connected by two ties, it is open. Only one of the nodes is connected to the other two, while the others remain unconnected from each other. If a triplet is connected by three ties, it is closed: all nodes are connected to each other. The value of the global clustering coefficient is calculated by dividing the number of closed triplets by the total number of triplets. It can range between 0 (all triplets are open; no clustering at all) and 1 (all triplets are closed: absolute clustering). The above value of 0.57 indicates that over half the triplets are closed, which indicates a high degree of clustering.

Communities

Network modularity: 0.873

The value for network modularity ranges from -1 to 2.1. A value of 0 or greater indicates that the number of edges (connections) is greater than that would be expected based on chance. Gephi uses an algorithm for network modularity to identify distinct communities within the network. The value of 0.873 indicates that these communities have significantly more internal ties than they would have had by chance, and have relatively weaker connections to the rest of the network. Qualitative examination of the various communities reveals that they all indeed have distinct characteristics. A list of communities with brief descriptions is provided below.

- Group 1 (65 members): urban elite, including many members of the Werumeus and Gockinga families. The Gockinga family was officially part of the rural nobility, but had strong ties to the urban elite and the city of Groningen.
- Group 2 (67 members): rural nobility, including members of the Van Inn- en Kniphuisen, Alberda, Lewe and Clant families.
- Group 3 (49 members): urban elite, including members of the Wichers, Trip and Gockinga families.
- Group 4 (32 members): urban elite, including members of the Sichterman and Wichers families.
- Group 5 (62 members): urban elite, including members of the Van Iddekinge, Trip and Van Swinderen families.
- Group 6 (22 members): urban elite, including members of the Veldtman, Berchuijs and Sighers families.
Group 7 (48 members): rural nobility, including members of the Gaykinga, Van Ewsum, and De Mepsche families.

Group 8 (62 members): urban elite, including members of the Quintus, Altingh, Emmen, and Wichers families, but also several individuals from the noble Lewe and Alberda families.

Group 9 (5 members): this group is not connected to the main network. There is the possibility that it connects Arij de Graaff’s wife, Gesina Barlinkhoff, to the network of the urban elite, via the Elama family, but I have not found direct evidence for this beyond corresponding family names.

Group 10 (35 members): urban elite, including the Sibenius, Tammen, and Lohman families. Also includes the Rufelaert family, who moved to Groningen from the southern Netherlands and owned a Borg in Ten Boer, but nonetheless married into the urban elite network.

Group 11 (29 members): a meeting point of urban elite and rural nobility, including many members of the Clant family, but also the Van Royen/Van Viersen cluster and outsiders like Erhard Ehrenreiter.

Group 12 (50 members): mainly urban elite, with many members of the Trip, Keiser and Quintus families, but also members of the Lewe family.

Group 13 (77 members): rural nobility, including many members of the Horenken, Alberda, Coenders, Lewe, Rengers, and Clant families. This is perhaps the most purely noble cluster.

Group 14 (19 members): rural and urban sub-elite, including the Muntinghe, Appius, and Geertsema families.

Group 15 (37 members): rural nobility, including members of the Eeck, Sickinghe, and Tamminga families. Also includes some representants of the urban elite from the Van Iddekinge, Wichers and Van Swinderen families.

Group 16 (47 members): urban elite, including members of the Altingh, Emmen, Schonenborgh and Verrucius families. Also includes a smaller sub-cluster with members of the De Sighers family, who technically belonged to the rural nobility but had a lot of connections to the city and urban elite.

Group 17 (28 members): this group revolves around the Feith family, who moved to the city of Groningen around the turn of the nineteenth century.

Group 18 (55 members): urban elite, including members of the Trip, Julsingh and Van Vierssen families.

Group 19 (49 members): urban elite and rural sub-elite, including the Laman and Keiser families, who were prominent in the city, and the Wildervanck family, who had a large stake in peat extraction in the east of the province.

Group 20 (22 members): rural and urban sub-elite, revolving around the Star/Star Lichtenvoort/Star Numan family.

Group 21 (35 members): urban elite, including members of the Emmius, Nijsingh, Wijchgel and
Ten Berge families.

Group 22 (35 members): mainly rural nobility, including members Lewe, Tamminga, Rengers and Alberda families.

Group 23 (32 members): urban elite, including members of the Trip and Wolthers families.

Group 24 (43 members): urban elite, including the Van Iddekinge and Sichterman families. Also includes a smaller cluster of rural nobility, tied to the group by a marriage between Josina Petronella Alberda (1724-1804) and Anthony Ewoud Sichterman (1722-1756).

Group 25 (25 members): Rural nobility, revolving around the Gruijs family.

Group 26 (5 members): a small, unconnected group with members of the De Mepsche and Verrucius families. This group should be connected to the main network, but I have not yet found sources to support how exactly.

Group 27 (41 members): urban elite, revolving around the Van Iddekinge family.

Group 28 (7 members): a small, unconnected cluster revolving around Nicolaus Mulerius (1564-1630).

Group 29 (18 members): a small cluster of urban elite, including members of the Lewe, Coenders, Clant and Rengers families, connected to the urban elite by the Ludolphi family.

Group 30 (43 members): rural nobility with strong ties to the urban elite, including members of the De Sighers, Alberda, Horenken and Gruijs families.

Group 31 (22 members): this cluster revolves around the Blencke/Van Bulderen family, connected to the urban elite by the Keiser family.

Group 32 (33 members): urban elite, including members of the Emmius, Berchuijs, and Isebrants families.

Group 33 (3 members): a small, unconnected cluster including bewindhebber Jan Willem Folckers (1697-1777). This cluster is probably connected to the urban elite, together with bewindhebber Folckert Folckers (1606-1680), but I have not been able to establish how.

Group 34 (22 members): urban elite, including members of the Veldtman and Emmen families.

Group 35 (41 members): cluster revolving around the Woortman family, and connected to the rural nobility through Wendelina Cornera Lewe (1806-1889).

Group 36 (8 members): a small, unconnected cluster revolving around the Scharff family.

Group 37 (2 members): Derck Everts Coenders van Helpen and Anna Tamminga. This couple is also described above. It should be connected to the rural nobility, but I was not able to establish how exactly.

Group 38+40 (20 members): these unconnected clusters together span from Thomas van Seeratt to Arij de Graaff. They are not connected to each other because I was not able to establish the exact relation between van Seeratt and Lindenber. Sources state that they are uncle and nephew, but I
have not been able to verify how exactly.

Group 38 through 51 all have fewer than 5 members and are not connected to the main network. Most of these should be connected, but I was unable to establish in what way exactly.

*Circuit census*

One could argue that, so long as you add enough people to a kinship network, you can connect virtually anyone to anyone else. To show that the kinship relation between those related to slavery is significant, I have compiled a list of various kinship circuits between two persons with a direct relation to slavery. These are called a non-matrimonial relation circuits, which can be identified using *Puck* 2.0 with what is called a “circuit census”. It searches for circuits where individuals are both related through their involvement with slavery (in other words they were assigned the tag “directly related to slavery”) and are related through marriage or by blood. The program was instructed to look for circuits that fall within four categories of degrees of separation: (1) within one consanguineous group up to a depth of four generations (second cousins); (2) between two consanguineous groups up to a depth of three generations (first cousins); (3) between three consanguineous groups up to a depth of two generations (siblings or parents and children); (4) between four consanguineous groups within a single generation. Illustration 1 below gives a visual presentation of these circuits. Of all these together, *Puck* found 940 different circuits of 199 distinct types. A complete list of these circuits can be found in a separate spreadsheet accompanying this document. The circuit census shows that those connected to slavery are often closely related to each other through either kin or by blood.

![Diagram of circuits](image)

*Illustration 1: The four categories of circuits included in the non-matrimonial relation circuit census. The star represents “slavery.”*

32 Some of these circuits may connect the same two individuals, but in different ways.
FROM CONCEPT TO EMPIRICAL REALITIES

The statistical network analysis above is quite abstract. It shows that there was a complex and vast network around transatlantic slavery, within which several clusters can clearly be discerned. The information given is quite binary, though: within the network illustration, relations between two people have little to no qualitative value. We don't know whether they were emotionally close or distant, just that they were related.

The section below qualitatively discusses the empirical realities of the network around slavery. Who were these people within the network, and how exactly were they involved with slavery, and with each other? What role did their choice of marriage partner play with regards to their relation to slavery, and how did lineage influence access to the institutions around slavery?

The following section is divided into three chronological chapters. The first chapter discusses the seventeenth century, in which the WIC was founded, went bankrupt, and was relaunched soon after. The second chapter is about the eighteenth century, in which the WIC lost its monopoly on slave trade. At the end of this century the company was finally dissolved. The third chapter is about the nineteenth century, in which we see the rise of abolitionism, the transition of colonial governance into the hands of the state and finally the abolition of slavery and associated compensation of former slave owners. The respective chapters are divided into several sections that each discuss a distinct circle within the network. These circles start off following the distinction rural nobility/urban elite/regional sub-elite, but as this distinction loses its significance the chapters are divided along different lines. As the rural nobility had lost most of its importance in the nineteenth century, and by that time had mostly integrated with the rest of the regional elite, that chapter is divided into sections based on the mode of involvement with slavery. Each chapter has a brief general historiographical introduction and a brief conclusion discussing the most important developments.
Pride and Prestige

The history of Groningen's ties to transatlantic slavery is intertwined with the history of the Chamber Stad en Lande of the West India Company. But before we look at how Groningen got its own chamber of the WIC, first it is necessary to briefly discuss the events leading up to that moment.

What today is the province of Groningen, was known as the province of Stad en Lande during the Dutch Republic. It was born during the Dutch Revolt, after the city of Groningen was recaptured from catholic sympathizers by the troops of the Prince of Orange in 1594. This event, called the “reduction” of Groningen, would bring about many changes in the society of Groningen. Before the reduction, the region could be divided in two parts, that often faced each other in disputes: one was the city of Groningen, and several areas that it governed (the Gorecht, near the city itself, and the Oldambt in the East of the province); the other part was known as the Ommelanden, which were the areas to the West, North-West and North-East of the city. These areas were traditionally governed by the rural nobility, called Jonkers. Their noble rights were not tied to their family names or noble descent, however, but to their large houses, called borgen. Whomever would own a borg, would have control over the powers that came with it. Political power was also tied to ownership of land. If a person owned a certain amount of land, of sufficient value, he could take part in the Diet, the regional representative assembly. Both the Ommelanden and the City had their own governments (states), which were combined in the provincial states of Stad en Lande after 1595. While there was influx in the city of protestants from Ostfriesland, who had fled Groningen the decades before, the old opposition between City and Ommelanden remained.

After various disputes between the two areas, the States General sided with the Ommelanden and built a castle onto the south city walls in the year 1600 to force the City into submission. After the reduction, the region had entered a period of rapid growth and high ambitions. In 1614, a new university was founded, and the City expanded its trade in Baltic. There was a great sense of disappointment when Groningen was not invited to participate in the VOC in 1602, and the Noordsche Compagnie in 1614. When it became clear that there were plans for a West India Company, participating in it became a matter of pride for Groningen.

Founders of the WIC in Holland suggested that Groningen could not secure the funds necessary to participate. Groningen, in turn, took this as an insult. Schroor argues that this made the participation in the WIC a matter of regional honour and prestige from the get-go.33 Initially it was

proposed that Groningen and Friesland would get one chamber for the both of them. Eventually, Friesland decided against participation, and the chamber Stad en Lande was founded in Groningen. Many authors that the Chamber Stad en Lande was the chamber of Groningen and Friesland, but this is incorrect. There were some Frysian participants initially, but it quickly became a purely Groningen affair.  

Participation in the WIC was not only a matter of regional pride, but also of personal prestige. Berend Alting, grandfather of bewindhebber Bernard Gerlacius (1660-1729) and father in law to bewindhebber Johan Wichers (1662-1739), sheds light on the motivations for participating in the WIC in his book Pilaren en Peerlen (1648). In the book he described how one could rise in social standing in Groningen at his time, by first accumulating wealth, then purchasing goods and real estate that symbolize one's status and wealth, and finally fulfilling political roles in the region. Being elected bewindhebber can be seen as part of this last stage of climbing the social ladder. Boels and Feenstra, too, argue that the position of bewindhebber was sought after mainly because of the prestige that it had associated with it. Furthermore, there were various ways to make good money through slavery, for example through private trading. Examples of this will be discussed later.

35 Bernhard Alting, De pilaren, ende peerlen van Groningen: tractaet, bethomende waer op de welwaert van die stadt is staende, ende waer door zy meest is geciert (Tot Groningen: Gedruckt by Samuel Pieman ..., 1648); Johan de Haan, “Hier ziet men uit paleizen”: het Groninger interieur in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw (Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 2005), 54.
The Seventeenth Century: Beginnings, High Hopes and Disappointment

Regional historian Meindert Schroor states that the seventeenth century was initially a period of recovery and growth for Groningen. The province had suffered from the war in the last twenty years of the sixteenth century, but due to its wealth in natural resources had slowly but steadily began to grow. By the middle of the century, however, unrest had begun to rise in the province. These were in part due to the old quarrels between the city and the Ommelanden, and in part because of problems between the city and its vassal, the Oldamt. This area, in the east of the province, was de facto property of the city, and remained so after the reduction of 1594. The city governed the area through proxies in the area. Both the Ommelanden, and to a lesser extent the Oldamt, started to challenge the dominance of the city.

Two parties in the conflict of the mid-seventeenth century were lead by Jonker Osebrand Johan Rengers of Slochteren (1620-1681) and Jonker Schotto Tamminga (1598-1652), who was from a family that was deeply involved with the WIC, and who himself had been a bewindhebber since 1643. Tamminga was responsible for having Rengers removed from the landdag. In 1646, Rengers succeeded in doing the same to Tamminga, who had previously been appointed Lieutenant for life of the same landdag. Tamminga did so by proposing to appoint a new lieutenant every two years, to which the majority of the meeting agreed. Tamminga and Rengers both represented different factions. To Renger's faction belonged, among others, Rudolph Wilhelm van In- en Kniphuisen. He manipulated the guilds into pillaging the houses of mayor Johan Tjassens and council member Gerhard Buining, and into supporting the ousting of Tamminga and mayor Johan Coenders. This decided the conflict between the city and the Ommelanden for the time being. The Ommelanden emerged as victors, and Rudolph Wilhelm van In- en Kniphuisen was appointed lieutenant of the city. As such, he later refused to defend the rights of the guilds. The guilds realized they were used as pawns in this battle. They switched sides and now supported the faction of the urban elite. In 1658 mayor Coenders was reinstated with their support. In 1649, Rengers, too, became a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande.

38 Ibid.
41 Winter, De Westindische Compagnie ter kamer Stad en Lande, 260–263.
Schroor shows that during the seventeenth there was a distinct process of increasing oligarchisation in the province. From this time onward, for almost the next two centuries, nearly all power in the province belonged to a few families from the rural nobility and urban elite. Many of these, too, are those we see in the network around transatlantic slavery. In the mid-seventeenth century, the guilds in the City of Groningen rose up against the regents. This led to increased suppression of dissident voices, and eventually to an even stronger increase in oligarchisation. This in turn leads to the tight family networks around slavery and the fact that almost no merchants or craftsmen participate in the network, especially after the seventeenth century.

Network developments: Newcomers and the Usual Suspects

The Dutch Revolt and the Spanish inquisition had caused several protestant families to move to the Ommelanden, where they found safe harbor. Examples of this group are the Van Iddekinge and de Mepsche families, who originally came from Drenthe. The Emmius family from Ostfriesland came to Groningen after the reduction, along with many repatriating protestant refugees. The Trip and De Geer families moved to Groningen from Amsterdam, via Sweden. They settled down in the East of the province because of the money that could be made in peat extraction. They slowly mixed with the old regional elite in both the City and Ommelanden.

Political functions were divided amongst the regional elite. In the early seventeenth century, these were mainly noble families from the Ommelanden. To prevent all out nepotism, rules were put in place that forbade certain two individuals with degrees of kinship between them from holding office simultaneously. Such rules were initially drafted for the WIC as well, but they were never voted on. This was one of the reasons for the large amount of close kinship connections around the WIC. In some cases, there is an uninterrupted string of fathers and sons who held the office of bewindhebber, from nearly the start of the WIC until its demise in 1792.

RURAL NOBILITY

The rural nobility played an important role in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande, especially in the seventeenth century. Most of those involved with the WIC belong to a few tightly knit sub-clusters or communities within the network, such as groups 13 and 2. These are large groups, that have many interconnections between the members, and relatively few connections to other communities. This means that the marriage strategy of the rural nobility was to marry within the network of rural
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42 Ibid., 234–243.
43 Ibid.
44 Feenstra, Spinnen in het web, 34–41.
45 Winter, De Westindische Compagnie ter kamer Stad en Lande, 9n.
nobility. As there are certain noble families that are hardly featured in these networks, and that are hardly connected to slavery, it seems that only a specific subset within rural nobility had access to the network around slavery.

Christoffer van Ewsum (circa 1600-1644) was one of he founding bewindhebbers of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1622. He was married to Anna Sickinghe (?-1643). Their son, Ulrich (1623-1706) was one of the main participants in the chamber in 1649. He married Johanna Emilia MacDowell, the daughter of a university professor. Their daughter, Johanna Amelia van Ewsum (1659-1719), married Rudolf Polman. The marriage between their daughter, Ida Polman, and Berent Grujs (1693-1733), meant the start of the Polman Grujs family, which was given knighthood in 1814. Berent was the son of bewindhebber Hilbrandt Grujs (1670-?), as his father, Berend Grujs (1646-1724), and his grandfather Hilbrandt Grujs van Lellens (?-1671), were before him. This last Hilbrandt warned in 1638 that the chamber Stad and Lande had entered into a “leonina societas”, or unequal alliance, with the chamber of Amsterdam. Amsterdams de facto used Groningen as a puppet, and he warned that it threatened to gain monopoly at the cost of the other chambers.

Bewindhebber Berend Grujs was married to Cecilia Tamminga (1643-1717), daughter of Schotto Tamminga (1621-1663), a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1643. He was married to Catharina Sickinghe, daughter of Johan Sickinghe (1576-1652), one of the founding bewindhebbers in 1622, and also one of the main participants in 1643, with a stake of £20000, one of the largest stakes. Catharina's brother Hendrik was married to Anna Tjarda van Starkenborgh, granddaughter of bewindhebber Lambert Tjarda van Starkenborgh.

Schotto Tamminga was second in a long line of bewindhebbers from the Tamminga family. His father, Onno Tamminga (1577-1652) was a founding bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1622. He does not reappear on the list of 1649, and has probably stepped down prior. Schotto's brother, Onno Tamminga II (circa 1614-1684) was elected bewindhebber from 1679, until he resigned a year before his death. Schotto's son, Onno Tamminga III (1650-1689) was a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1683. Even though there officialy were no forbidden degrees of kinship, his appointment does coincide with the resignation of his uncle. This suggests one of two possible scenario's: either his uncle resigned willingly, perhaps forced by the ailments of old age; or perhaps his uncle resigned because it was against custom to have an uncle and nephew as bewindhebbers at the same time, and Onno II resigned to make place for Onno III.
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Schotto and Onno had a third brother, Eger. His son, Eilco Tamminga (circa 1655-circa 1720) was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1705. His mother was Eilke Clant, the daughter of Eylco Clant and Wilhelmina Hinckaert. Eilke's sister, Anna Clant (1597-?) was the mother of Egbert Horenken (1631-1679) who was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1670. Egbert's son, Geert (1663-1712), was also a bewindhebber from 1705.

Eilco Tamminga was married to Alegunda Eeck (1655-?). Her brother, father, uncle and grandfather together formed an uninterrupted line of bewindhebbers, much like the line of Tamminga's described above. Her brother was Johan Eeck III (1660-?), who became bewindhebber in 1683. He was also mayor of Groningen several times between 1693 and 1713. His father was Sicco Eeck (1626-1679), bewindhebber from 1667. Sicco's brother, Johan Eeck II (1637-1713) was bewindhebber from 1683. Their father, Johan Eeck I (1600-1663), was bewindhebber from 1649, and one of the main participants in the chamber Stad en Lande in 1643, with a stake of f4023.50

The eldest daughter of Johan Eeck I, Margaretha Eeck (circa 1639-?) married Wicher Wichers (circa 1632-?). Their eldest son, Johan Wichers (1662-1739) was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande. Their daughter Alegonda (1664-1693) married Albert Hendrik van Swinderen (1657-1699). Their son Wicher van Swinderen (1688-1764) was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1761.

Evert Lewe van Asinga (1590-1641) was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1634 of 1635. Evert Lewe was married to Anna Coenders (1599-1629), the sister of Berend Coenders van Helpen (1601-1678).51 Berend was lord of borg Fraam in Huizinge, and bewindhebber for the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1649. Evert Lewe's son, Abel Coenders Lewe (?-1664), was mayor of Groningen in 1622 and 1623, and as such involved with the foundation of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande.52 He bought a significant share in the WIC in 1641, and expressed that he thought that more from the Ommelanden should do so, to increase their influence in the company.53 At that time the company was dominated by the urban elite. The fact that Abel Coenders Lewe assumed both his mother's and his father's name indicates the prominence of both families at the time. Evert and Anna's other son, Joost (1626-1676), married Petronella Coenders (circa 1628-1678), the daughter of Albert Coenders van Aduard (circa 1590-1644), who
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was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1629.54

Berend Coenders' sister, Bauwina (1608-1667), was married to Edzard Jacob Clant (1584-1648), another prominent bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande at the time. More importantly, he was one of the co-founders of the WIC in general and served as its director in Amsterdam for twenty years. He held a share of ƒ7000 in the WIC chamber of Stad en Lande. The marriage to Bauwina Coenders in 1616 was Edzard Jacob's second; his first wife was Suzanna van Ewsum (¿-before 1629), whom he married in 1616. It seems that no children were born (or survived) from this marriage. Edzard Jacob was the son of Egbert Clant (1540-1590), lord of borg Nittersum in Stedum, and Gratia Rengers (circa 1527-1593). This makes fellow bewindhebbers Rembt Rengers, Egbert Rengers van Farmsum and Lammert Schotto Rengers van Farmsum his first cousins, once, three times and four times removed (down) respectively.

The first, Rembt Rengers van Ten Post (¿-circa 1633) was one of the founding bewindhebbers of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1622.55 Egbert and Lammert Schotto are discussed at greater length in the next chapter. Edzard Jacob and Bauwina, however, had four children, all of whom married within the network of the rural nobility – and within the network of slavery. The first child, Gratia Susanna (1630-1690), married Allard Tjarda van Starkenborgh (1620-circa 1673), who was the grandson of Allard Gaykinga, one of the largest investors in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande, and who was also one of the main participants in the WIC in Amsterdam.56

The second child, Amelia Clant (1633-1695), married Roelof Sickinghe (1643-1688), who was a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1679. He stepped down in 1683.57 Roelof managed to acquire several high offices and positions: he was a delegate at the Admiralty of Harlingen, and a member of the States General. He and Amelia did not have any children. During his life he became very wealthy, owning not only the Warffumborg and much of the surrounding lands, but also the island of Rottumeroog. Towards the end of his life he had lost much of his wealth; he was forced to sell much of his possessions to pay off his debts.58 He sold his borg, with over 27 hectares of land and the associated rights,59 to Louis Trip (1654-1698), son of Adriaan Trip (1620-1654) and Adriana de Geer (1627-1685). Louis was the Grandfather of mayor Lucas Trip, whom we shall discuss in the next chapters. Roelof was the grandson of bewindhebber Johan
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Sickinghe (1576-1652), who was one of the main participants in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1643 with a stake of ƒ20000 – one of the largest personal stakes – and he was one of the founding bewindhebbers of that chamber.

The third child of Edzard Jacob and Bouwina was Egbert Clant (1634-1709). He was a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1659. He, at some point, stepped down and was again installed in 1682. In 1668, he married Anna Lewe (1650-1702), who was the daughter of Joost Lewe (1626-1677) and Petronella Coenders van Helpen (1628-1678). While the exact relation between Petronella, and Bouwina and Berend, who are discussed above, is unclear, it is certain that they are related. Joost Lewe is the son of Evert Lewe and Anna Coenders discussed above, so Bauwina and Berend were his aunt and uncle. In other words: Egbert married his first cousin, once removed (down).

Bouwina and Edzard Jacob's fourth, and last child was Derk Jacob Clant (1638-1700). In 1660 he married Margaretha Josina Ripperda (circa 1640-1670). Her sister, Josine Maria Ripperda (1640-1719) married Gijsbert Harman Ripperda (1645-1719), who was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1682. Although they have the same last name, and are probably related, I was not able to establish the familial relation between the sisters and Gijsbert Harman. The sisters also stem from the Clant family on their mother's side, but this branch, who resided at the Menkemaborg at the time, was not closely related to the Clant's involved with slavery.

THE URBAN ELITE

Hidde Feenstra notes that between 1645 and 1675, most positions of influence within the city of Groningen were filled by members of the families Gruijs, Aldringa, Horenken, and Coenders. These families were also part of the rural nobility. They were all regarded Jonkers, and all owned a borg (or sometimes even multiple). Several members of each of these families had ties with the WIC, and some of them also were involved with slavery otherwise. They were also closely connected to each other through kinship. Though these families were still influential in the city in the seventeenth century, they were slowly replaced by newcomers. In all this, several families in the urban elite remained a steady factor. This section shows the kinship ties within the urban elite, with both families of the city-oriented rural nobility, but increasingly with newcomers as well.

Wolther Wolthers (1630-1714) was mayor of Groningen four times between 1699 and 1712, and also held several other high offices in local and regional governments. He was a bewindhebber
of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1691 until his death. His son, Harmen Wolthers (1657-1733) was one of the main participants in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1717. Harmen is discussed further in relation to the Van Iddekinge family below.

Adriaan Joseph Trip was close friend to William Butler and married to Anna Elisabeth Wolthers (1690-1712), the daughter of bewindhebber Harmen Wolthers (1657-1733). Harmen's brother Warmold was married to Aleida Sybille ten Winckel. Their daughter Rolina (1700-?) married Cornelis Hendrik Tjaden. Through this line the Wolthers family is related to the Tjaden, Van Buttingha, Gerlacius and Emmen families.

Harmen Wolthers was married to Anna Emmius (1661-1716), daughter of bewindhebber Samuel Emmius (1624-1684) and Anna Sighers (1627-1700). Samuel became a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1675. He was also a member of the city council from 1660, and mayor of Groningen several times from 1676. Anna and Samuel had five children, four daughters and a son, who all married prominent members of the urban and regional elite, connecting many different family lines to each other. Eldest child, daughter Arentjen Emmius (1652-1707) married Lucas Nijsingh (1645-1720), whose father was briefly involved with the establishment of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande. Arentjen and Lucas are further discussed with relation to their grandson bewindhebber Lucas Nijsingh, below. The second child, son Wesselius Emmius (1655-?) married Christina Anna Isebrants (1670-?), daughter of bewindhebber Johan Isebrants (1621-1679). The third child, daughter Tateke Elisabeth Emmius (1657-1684) Married Tjaert Berchuijs (1655-1721). Their descendants include granddaughter Wibbina van Berchuijs, who married Cebes van Sijsen, son of bewindhebber and mayor of Groningen Hendrik van Sijsen (1670-1738) and Alagonda Maria Werumeus (1678-1755); and granddaughter Maria Beerta van Berchuijs, who married Rudolph de Drews (1727-1806), grandson of bewindhebber Johan de Drews (1666-1758). The aforementioned Anna was the fourth child, and the fifth child, daughter Margaretha Tiacomina Emmius (1667-1738) married Theodorus van Brunsveldt (1672-1734). Their daughter Anna Margaretha (1701-before 1785) married Gerhard Jacob Keiser, who invested heavily in the WIC in the late eighteenth century and is discussed in the next chapter.

The Emmius family is best known for producing the “founder of the University of Groningen”, Ubbo Emmius. Ubbo, who was originally from Greetsiel in Ostfriesland, became a prominent figure in the city of Groningen after its reduction in 1594. He became the rector of the Latin school in 1594, a position he fulfilled until the University was founded some twenty years later, in 1614. A certain Cornelis Emmius got appointed assistant at the Dutch Gold Coast in 1718, but
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his relation to the other members of the Emmius family discussed here could not be established.\textsuperscript{66} Several other members, whose relation to the family could be established, also had ties to slavery. Samuel's father and Ubbo's son, Wessel Emmius (1589-1654) was one of the main participants in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1643, with a stake of $f4200.\textsuperscript{67} Samuel's sister, Tjakemina (1627-1666), married Samuel Petrejus. Their daughter, Medina (1649-?) was the mother of bewindhebber Johan van Hoorn (1673-?). He was married to Catharina van Sijsen, the daughter of the aforementioned bewindhebber Johan van Sijsen.

Berend Julsingh (1583-1647) was bewindhebber from 1631.\textsuperscript{68} He was mayor of Groningen at the same time as Berent Gruijis, Barthold Wijfferinge, Johan Drews and Abel Coenders, who are all part of the kinship network. Owned a share of $f4200 in the WIC chamber of Stad en Lande in 1643. Johannes, Bernard's grandson, bewindhebber from 1649. He was married to his cousin, Ellida. Their daughter, Anna Lucia (1680-1740), was married to Pompejus de Valcke (1675-1727). Their son, Joost (1707-1768), was married to Anna Frederica Gruijis (1706-1758) Her great-grandfather was bewindhebber Johan Sickinghe and her great-uncle was bewindhebber Roelof Sickinghe.

Willem van Viersen (about 1583-1630), a solicitor by profession, was one of the founding bewindhebbers of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1622. He was married to Kenna Gockinga (1683-1633). Kenna's brother, Scato (1566-1641) was married to the sister of Eppo Clant (1599-1642). Scato's son Eppo Gockinga served was involved in transatlantic slavery in several ways. He worked with a trading company before he moved to Brazil in 1645, where he was appointed commissioner. He returned to Groningen in 1649.\textsuperscript{69} Eppo Clant's father was mayor of Groningen, and he himself had a military career. Van Winter suggests that it was Eppo's relation to Van Viersen that spurred Eppo to join an expedition to Brazil, in service of the WIC.\textsuperscript{70} He eventually died serving the company, during an expedition to capture St. Thomé and the Loanda coast in 1642. Lucas Clant (born circa 1600), Eppo Clant's brother, married Elisabeth Ehrenreiter. Her father, Erhard Ehrenreiter (1570-?), was also a military man, of Swedish descent. He was commander of the city of Emden in Ostfriesland, to which Groningen had close ties at the time. His father held the same position in Groningen. Ehrenreiter was offered a position of supreme commander of the troops in Brazil, to which he agreed, on the condition that he would remain commander of Emden in name and his father was to take his place there while he was gone. While the States-General and the Stadtholder agreed with this, he
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eventually did not go to Brazil. The exact reasons for this remain unknown.  

Willem van Viersen was tasked with attending to the day to day affairs of the company. He died in Amsterdam, on his way back from a company meeting in Zeeland. His body was brought to Groningen, and buried in the Martinikerk. On his gravestone was a notable epitaph, in which the WIC and his position in it took a central role. After his death, his son-in-law Hendrik van Royen (?-1676) took his place after him. Hendrik was removed from his post and thrown in jail for stealing from the company coffers, his son-in-law Cornelis van der Marck succeeded him.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth century, the name Van Viers(en) reappears in the network. These Van Viersens are the descendants of another Willem van Viersen (1564-1641), a contemporary of 'our' Willem. He was a master of coin and a member of the Admiralty in Leeuwarden. His relation to the Van Viersens in early seventeenth century Groningen is uncertain.

Gerard Swarte (?-1665) was bewindhebber from 1657. His daughter was Wyttske Swarte. Jan Lohman, the son of Meinard Lohman and Wyttske Swarte, bought veenborg “Welgelegen” in 1698. He was born in 1664 in his parents' house at the Grote Markt. He sold it in 1730 to Albertus Boelens. Boelens, in turn, sold it in 1736 to Carl Friedrich von Wartensleben and his wife Wendelina Cornera Alberda. She was the daughter of Unico Allard Alberda, lord of the Menkemaborg in Uithuizen, and Everdina Cornera of Berum. Von Wartensleben was a good friend of his brother-in-law, Gerhard Alberda, lord of Dijksterhuis. After Everdina dies in 1746, the house is sold to Wilhelms Lichtenvoort and his wife Reynouw Gesina Star. Her father was Cornelis Star, a member of the city council of Groningen. The Star family is discussed at greater length in the next chapter. This shows that real estate was also often exchanged, bought and sold within the network.

Wolter Schonenborgh (also written as Schonenburch of Schoonenburch) was the son of the mayor of Groningen and bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande Hendrik Schonenborgh. From 1629 until 1636 Wolter was Drost (governor) of the Oldambt, in the east of the province, which ment he de facto held the highest governmental authority in the area on behalf
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of the city of Groningen. In 1636 he became a member of parliament, and in 1637 he himself was appointed mayor of Groningen. In 1644 he left for Brazil, where he first became mayor of Mauritsstad, and from 1645 became president of the Secret High Council for Brazil, a position held by Prince Maurits before he left Brazil. Although the colony was already in decline, it saw its final demise under Schonenborgh's command in 1654.

Wolter's father, Hendrik was also a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1627 until his death. His mother was Johanna Verrucius, whose sister, Suzanne Verrucius (1597-1643) was married to Rudolf Warners Emmen (1589-1655), who was one of the main participants of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1643, with a stake of ƒ 7000. Their son, of Warner Emmen (1629-1679), was a bewindhebber of that chamber in the year of his death, 1679. His son, Rudolph Emmen (1663-1727), too, was a bewindhebber from 1717 until his death. His son, Lambert Hendrik Emmen (1696-1763), was the last in this line to be bewindhebber, a position he held from 1746 until his death. The Emmen family held a central position within the network from the start of the WIC until the nineteenth century. They were closely related to many prominent families, such as the Tjaden, Werumeus and Quintus families.

NEWCOMERS AND OUTSIDERS

Several families moved to Groningen around the turn of the seventeenth century. Some came for religious freedom, others saw business opportunities. While most families quickly made a name for themselves, married within the kinship network and rose to the higher strata over the regional elite, some families remained unconnected for generations, or never connected at all.

Two branches of the Trip family settled down in Groningen independently of each other. The first, smaller branch, was founded by Hendrik Trip (1677-1731). He was born in Amsterdam to Louis Trip and Anna Nuyts. His paternal grandfather was Hendrick Trip (1607-1666), one of the two original inhabitants of the Trippenhuis. Hendrik lived in the house that is now known as the Feithhuis in Groningen, named after the Feith family discussed in the chapter about the nineteenth century. Hendrik's eldest daughter, Anna Maria Trip (1712-1778) was married to Wicher van Swinderen, who was elected bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1761. Hendrik's youngest daughter, Henriëtte Johanna Trip (1725-1796) was married to Reneke Busch Gockinga (1715-1789), who was the son of Scato Gockinga (1683-1759), bewindhebber of the WIC chamber.
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This way, the Trip name disappeared from this branch soon after it had arrived in Groningen.

The other branch of the Trip family had its beginnings in the peat extraction areas in the East of the province. The first comprehensive overview of the Trip family was written and published by H. J. Trip in 1883. In the introduction to the book he argues that genealogies until that time were dubious, because of the lack of sources cited. Most of it was based on oral tradition and hearsay, according to the author. The author discusses the impact of the Trip family on Dutch history, and its important role in the relations with Sweden in particular. He states that the atlas by Blaauw specifically noted that it was the families Trip and De Geer that contributed to advancements in the processing of metal ores in that country. The ties with Sweden were first established by Elias Trip. His son, Adrianus Joseph (Adriaan) Trip (1620-1684), settled down in Wildervanck, and became the forefather of the branch of the Trip family in Groningen, that, in later generations, became closely connected with the kinship network. The De Geer family also plays a role in the early history of this branch. Both families competed with each other in the trade of guns and steel, which they supplied to, among others, the VOC and the WIC. In Groningen, both families intermarried. Adriaan Trip married Adriana de Geer, daughter of Louis de Geer (1587-1652), who was one of the largest suppliers of guns in Europe at the time. He, too, supplied guns for the WIC and the VOC. The De Geer family were also the driving force behind the Swedish West India Company. Adrianus Joseph and Adriana's son, Louis Trip (1654-1698), married Johanna Margaretha de Geer, daughter of Laurens de Geer and Louis' granddaughter, his first cousin.

Something about the Trips in Wildervanck and Tripscompagnie. Their involvement with the peat extraction in the area. Adriaan Trip and Louis de Geer purchased large swaths of lande to mine peat on. Another merchant from Holland, David Sena, also invests in peat extraction. His family is well represented in lists of names of those who own land suitable for peat extraction throughout the seventeenth century, but they had no ties to either the kinship network, nor slavery.

A prominent man in the peat extraction region at the time was Gerhard Wildervanck. He collaborated with Adriaan Trip in a large peat extraction operation in 1661. Gerhard's son, Everhard (1657-?), acquired the shares the Ommelanden held in the WIC chamber of Amsterdam.
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in 1691. These shares, worth £2150, were given to Everhard to repay a debt.\textsuperscript{91}

The case of Adriaan's eldest son, Louis Trip (1654-1698), is illustrative of the decline of the nobility that had slowly set in in the seventeenth century, and how the new elite benefited from this. He acquired the Warffumborg, a noble house owned by bewindhebber Roelof Sickinghe, who is discussed above in 1683. Roelof, who was forced to sell the house to pay off his debts, received £45000 for the house and the accompanying noble rights.\textsuperscript{92} Louis' son, Jacob Elias Trip (1688-1719) married Anna Tita Nijsingh (1685-1713), daughter of Lucas Nijsingh (1645-1720) and Arentjen Emmius (1652-1707), who is discussed above. Lucas Nijsingh was a member of a noble family in Drenthe, and lived in the Nijsinghuis in Eelde. Soon after Anna Titia died during childbirth, Jacob Elias joined the VOC and moved to the Dutch East Indies.\textsuperscript{93} The child, Lucas Trip (1713-1783), was raised by his grandparents, Lucas and Arentjen, in the Nijsinghuis.

Lucas married Beerta Sibenius (?-1776). Beerta's uncle, Andreas Sibenius, had worked as a commander on the Dutch Gold Coast in the 1660's.\textsuperscript{94} Lucas had a succesful political career: he was, among other things, a council member and alderman of the city, a member of the provincial government and a member of the national parlement.\textsuperscript{95} He was a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1772.\textsuperscript{96}

From the 1640's until the WIC was dissolved in 1792, the company was served by the Blencke family. The first, Gerrit Blencke, became accountant of the of the WIC Chamber Stad en Lande around 1645. He lived in the West India House, at the Munnikeholm, where the Chamber Stad en Lande was based. The street behind the building, now called the Reitemakersrijge, was know as the “Westindische Kade” in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Gerrit's son, Gerrit II (1654-1717) succeeded his father as company accountant in circa 1686.\textsuperscript{97} His other son, Hendrik, was the father of Henric Blencke who had a position as commissioner on the Dutch Gold Coast from 1707 until 1716. Gerrit II's son, Abraham Blencke (1695-?), became company accountant after his father's death. The Blencke family's socioeconomic position gradually in service of the company. Gerrit II had invested some of his earnings in the company, which made him one of the main participants by 1679. His son commissioned the build of veenborg Vosholen in Kleinemeer near Sappemeer, close to the veenborgen discussed in the next chapter. For Abraham, it was not enough.
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He robbed the company for £80000 and fled the city. His son, Hendrik Gerrit van Bulderen, took on his mother's name, and was the last of his family to serve the WIC. He is discussed in the chapter about the nineteenth century. Even though the Blencke family has close professional and personal connections to many within the kinship network (see, for example, the relation between Gerrit II and Evert Joost Leve van Aduard, discussed in the next chapter), the family only connects to the network via Hendrik Gerrit's son, in the nineteenth century.

Berent Jansen (?-1628) was one of the founding bewindhebbers of the chamber of Stad en Lande. He was the first and only merchant to achieve this position. His son-in-law was Johan Celos (1602-1660), who was one of the main participants in the company in 1643 with a stake of £4362. He became the chamber Stad en Lande's accountant in 1647, and bewindhebber from 1657. Various resolutions of the States of Stad en Lande show that he already had a position as an accountant for the chamber Stad en Lande before 1643. His son, Folckert Celos (circa 1640-?), was married to Susanna Emmen. Their daughter, Margaretha Celosse, was married to Gallenus Sichterman (1662-1710), the father of Jan Albert and Gerard Sichterman, who are discussed below.

While most investors and bewindhebbers tied to the chamber Stad en Lande can be connected by kinship, there are notable examples, especially early on: Nicolaus Mulerius (1564-1630), professor at the University of Groningen and bewindhebber. His son, Petrus (1599-1647), also a professor, invested an unknown sum in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande, as well £3000 in the WIC Chamber of Amsterdam in 1637. Neither he, nor his offspring, marry within the kinship network around slavery, and his family name soon disappears from the lists.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter shows the differences between the marriage choices of the urban elite and the rural nobility. The former is quite an open group, with various marriages to both newcomers and established families, while the second group mainly marries within its own ranks. It contains far more complex intracconnections. As a result, the first signs of the decline of the nobility started showing. Due to the many marriages within their own family circle, much of the property was

---
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concentrated with a few individuals, and the overall number of noble families dwindled. The few noble families that were involved with political affairs in the city also suffered the same fate, and were replaced by, or integrated with, families from the existing urban elite, and a new group of emerging elite who recently moved to the region. Children of those involved with the WIC or with slavery otherwise often married each other. As there were no forbidden degrees of kinship within the WIC, the office was passed on from father to son, from father-in-law to son-in-law, and from uncle to nephew.
The Eighteenth Century: Oligarchy and the Fall of the West India Company

In 1674, the first WIC went bankrupt. This was mainly due to the failure of what is often called “the Brazilian Adventure”. Dutch Brazil had cost the company a lot of funds, and when it was surrendered to the Portuguese all investments were lost. Schroor suggests that Holland gave up the WIC because of its interests in the East. It pushed for a peace treaty with Portugal that surrendered Brazil and retained control over the possession of the VOC for the Netherlands. Charles R. Boxer states that Holland wanted to accept the loss of Brazil in exchange for financial compensation and trade privileges. Holland had the support of Friesland, but Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland and Groningen were strongly opposed to this. Boxer argues that Holland eventually forced a treaty without the consent of Zeeland, Gelderland and Groningen in 1661. Under that treaty Brazil definitively became the property of Portugal, and the Dutch received 4 million cruzados in compensation, paid in installments over a 16 year period. The Portuguese also agreed to return all captured Dutch guns. The treaty wasn’t ratified until 1663 due to various difficulties, and even when it finally came into force, both parties still quarreled over various points. The Dutch accused the Portuguese of not paying the compensation on time, and vice versa, the Portuguese demanded that the Dutch East India Company would return forts on the Indian Malabar Coast, which they recently occupied. Holland had more at stake in the East, while the preservation of Brazil for the WIC was perhaps more important for Groningen. There was great enthusiasm for the new colony, evidenced by the number of Groningers who had ties to Brazil.

Henk Boels and Hidde Feenstra state that the conflict between the city and the Ommelanden had started to cool in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. An important reason for this was their struggle against a common enemy, the bishop of Münster. The end of his siege of Groningen in 1672 coincided with a period of severe financial trouble for the WIC. When the first WIC was dissolved, a second WIC was established shortly after. The trade in slaves was still quite lucrative, and there was too much at stake to simply abandon the company.
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While there was great enthusiasm about the WIC when it first started, Boels and Feenstra state that the WIC did not deliver on its promise. They state that the province had participated in the venture to secure a place in the transatlantic trade, and with that, give a boost to local businesses. This boost never happened, they argue. With the failure of the first WIC, participants lost 85% of the value of their original shares, and if they desired to participate in the second WIC, they were required to pay another four percent of the original value of those shares to do so. Boels and Feenstra state that over a million in investments was lost this way with the first WIC.

Boels and Feenstra state that there was little economic gain from the WIC to local businesses, because ships were often stocked in Amsterdam Goods from the West also arrived there and were brought to market from there. All this led to an increasing dependency of the Chamber of Stad en Lande on Amsterdam. The West India warehouse was hardly used after 1650, because company ships rarely anchored in Groningen after then. The WIC chamber of Stad and Lande built its own ships until 1670. They then decided to rent ships, in order to save funds. The WIC Wharf at the Noorderhaven was rented out to private parties. The eighteenth century only saw further decline of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande.

**Network developments: nobility in decline, oligarchs on the rise.**

Various families who were still relatively new to Groningen in the last chapter have settled into the regional elite by the eighteenth century. With the money made through slavery, but also from peat extraction, industry, politics and agriculture, they bought and built luxurious villas to the South and East of the city. Many of these villas were constructed in the peat extraction areas, or *veen*. This is the origin of their name: *veenborgen*. While the original borgen were the domain of the rural nobility, these *veenborgen* were the place to be for the new oligarchs.

In the early eighteenth century, the gold trade rapidly lost importance in the Dutch Gold Coast, and made way for an increase in the importance of slave trade. In 1720, Director-General William Butler, who later moved to Groningen and is discussed below, noted the decline of gold being traded, and six years later the trade in gold had practically disappeared.

110 Ibid., 286.
111 Ibid.
112 Ibid., 287.
113 Ibid.
115 Cornelis Ch Goslinga and M.J.L. van Yperen, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and in the Guianas 1680-1791* (Assen [etc.):
The eighteenth century would also see the end of the WIC. The decline set in more rapidly in Groningen than elsewhere. According to Schneeloch, a little over ten percent of all recorded slave-ship assignments was associated with the WIC chamber *Stad en Lande*. This was the lowest percentage of all chambers, but not by much. The chambers of *Noorderkwartier* and *Maze* accounted for eleven and twelve percent respectively, *Zeeeland* for a quarter, and Amsterdam dominates with nearly forty-three percent.\footnote{N. H Schneeloch, *Die Bewindhebber der Westindischen Compagnie in der Kammer Amsterdam 1674-1700* (’s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1973), App. 9.} The ships sent out by *Stad en Lande* weren't always outfitted in Groningen. This was often outsourced to the chamber of Amsterdam. According to Postma, nearly 13 percent of all documented slave voyages, however, did have Groningen as its home port. In total, nearly seventeen thousand slaves were transported on these ships, with an average of 511 enslaved per voyage.\footnote{Postma, *The Dutch in the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1600-1815*, 131.} After the monopoly of the WIC ended in 1730, so did the role of Groningen as a port for slave trade. Only one slave-ship would set sail from Groningen after 1730.\footnote{Ibid., 132.}

With the decline of the WIC, some have lost their interest in investing in the company. In some families, stock in the company and its various chambers is inherited, but those who inherit them often do nothing with them. One example is Reint Alberda, who was the son of Agnes van Bassen and Derck Alberda.\footnote{Formsma, Luitjens-Dijkveld Stol, and Pathuis, *De Ommelander Borgen en Steenhuisen*, 118.} He inherited shares in the WIC chamber *op de Maze* in Rotterdam. They came from his mother's family.\footnote{RHC GrA 625 Menkemaborg en Dijksterhuis (2), 1526 - 1900 89 Recepis afgegeven door de bewindhebbers van de Westindische compagnie aan Anna van Brienen wegens een door haar in de Westindische compagnie belegd kapitaal van 1100 gulden, 1628, met stukken betreffende het beheer van dit aandeel door erfgenamen van Anna van Brienen, 1674 – 1725} While Reint officially owned these shares, it is questionable whether it can be argued that he actually had a direct connection to slavery. In this case I have chosen not to count him as such.
As the network illustration clearly shows, the rural nobility is concentrated in a few large, but quite closed networks. They have many connections internally, and relatively few outside. Formsma et al. also noted the closed nature of this group, and argued that this was one of the main reasons for the decline of nobility in the eighteenth century. Through various marriages between noble families, the number of total families in the rural nobility declined rapidly. These families each held various borgen. When they could not pay for their upkeep, dozens of them were sold or demolished. At the end of the eighteenth century, only eight noble families remained: Alberda, Inn- en Kniphuisen, Sickinghe, Lewe, Rengers, (Polman) Grujs, Van Starkenborgh and Jarges, all with only a couple of members each. In this section I discuss a few family lines and individuals with ties to slavery. Most of these come from group 2 of the network visualization.

The first fifty years of the eighteenth century were the last fifty good years for the rural nobility. Political power in the Ommelanden was increasingly held by fewer and fewer families, with only very few checks and balances. In 1730-1733, it became clear that this situation could at times yield dark consequences: in this period a massive persecution of homosexual men took place, led by Jonker Rudolph de Mepsche (1695-1754) of borg Bijma in Faan.

Rudolph was a central figure in the network around slavery at the time. Rudolph's maternal great-gandfather was Jebbe Aldringa (1602-1650), one of the main participants in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1643 with a stake of f4000. Rudolph's father-in-law was Onno Tamminga van Alberda (1669-1743), bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1717. As described in the previous chapter, the Tamminga family had been involved with the WIC since the chamber Stad en Lande was founded. Rudolph represented Onno Tamminga in company dealings in Amsterdam. For example, in 1720 he sold five actions or subscriptions (rights to invest) in the company for f12,500 each to Theodoor Huygens for his company Huygens & Hotham. This sum did not go into the company's coffers, but went directly to the bewindhebber, Onno Tamminga. This demonstrates the financial gains that could be made as a bewindhebber. Rudolph's grandfather, whose name was also Rudolph, was one of the main investors in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1643.

Onno was married to Josina Petronella Clant (1676-1746), whose father, Egbert Clant (1634-1709) was a bewindhebber from 1682. Two of Onno's sons (Rudolph's brothers-in-law) were also
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bewindhebbers: Edzart Reint Alberda van Bloemersma (1708-1775) from 1772, and Mello Alberda van Rensuma en Nijenstein (1701-1764) from 1749. Boels and Feenstra state that there was a distinct rise in investments in the WIC in Groningen around 1720. Most investors lost heavily, except for Mello. Even though the value of his shares diminished, he managed to make a profit by investing directly in high risk trade in the Caribbean.

Edzart Reint and Mello's first cousin, Gerhard Willems Alberda, was also elected as bewindhebber in 1749. He is incidentally also their second cousin once removed (down), their third cousin once removed (down), their third cousin twice removed (down), and their fourth cousin, all through different common ancestors. This shows how tightly connected – one might also say incestuous – the kinship network of the rural elite was.

With the support of Menso Altingh (1688-1744), son of bewindhebber Menso Altingh (1636-1713), Rudolph persecuted dozens of men for sodomy. Of those, twenty-two were executed, and two died while being interrogated. The trials were, in all likelihood, politically motivated, and aimed towards his opponents Clant van Hanckema, Bennema and Unico de Hertoghe, none of whom are closely connected to the network. When popular uprisings broke out throughout the Netherlands in 1747 and 1748, the memory of sodomy trials were a motivation to restrict the powers of the rural nobility.

There were more members of the De Mepsche family involved in the network around transatlantic slavery: in 1713 Jan de Mepsche sent his son Gerhard to Curacao. By request of the Bewindhebbers of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande, he was assigned a position on the island by the chamber of Amsterdam. His father had requested the assignment after he ran into trouble for misbehaving while serving in the Republic's army. Van Winter describes his tenure in the Caribbean, which was marked by scandals and infamy: soon after his arrival on Curacao, complaints about his demeanor arise. At first from the Jewish community, and later from virtually the entire island. He is sent back to the Netherlands, to return with de Nieuwe Post, a ship captained by slave trader Thomas van Seeratt who is discussed below. But the bewindhebbers in the Netherlands intervene and send him to St. Eustatius instead, where he was made second in command. There, too, he soon started misbehaving. When the commander dies in 1717, De Mepsche and the commander's son jointly take his position. The call for De Mepsche's removal gradually became louder. He was accused of dealing with smugglers, skimming the company
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coffers, and being an overall abusive, loud and obnoxious person. He was sent to St. Thomas, one of the Danish Antilles, where he spent the rest of his days. One of his sons, Jonathan de Mepsche, also had ties to transatlantic slavery, be it on the other side of the Atlantic: he died in Accra in 1739.  

Evert Joost Lewe van Aduard (1677-1753) was Bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1749. He was Onno Tamminga van Alberda's first cousin. Their grandfather, Onno Tamminga, is described in the previous chapter. His parents were Elisabeth Tamminga and Evert Lewe, who died before Evert Joost was born. When Elisabeth, too, died around 1694, Egbert Clant (discussed above), Mello Alberda (1642-1699) and Gerrit Blencke II (1654-1717) were appointed as the guardians of Evert Joost Lewe, son of Elisabeth Tamminga, until he became of age in 1699.  

While Egbert and Mello were Evert Joost's family, by marriage of his mother's sister, Gerrit Blancke is a more striking choice. He was not related to Evert Joost at all, and his family would only connect to the kinship network decades later. Their only relation was through the WIC.  

Evert Joost Lewe van Aduard's son, Evert Joost Lewe van Hoogkerk (1706-1768) was Bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1749. He married Wilhelmina Alberda (1735-1786), daughter of the aforementioned bewindhebber Gerhard Willems Alberda. Edzard Jacob Lewe van Middelstum (1720-1753), who was related to Evert Joost I and II in multiple ways via both the Coenders and Lewe families, was also a bewindhebber from 1746. He was married to Alegonda Maria Rengers (1721-1798), whose father, Egbert Rengers van Farmsum (1687-1745) was bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1722. He was also a bewindhebber of the VOC. Her brother Lammert Schotto Rengers van Farmsum (1726-1779) became a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1761.  

A distant relation of these members of the Lewe family was Anna van Ewsum (1640-1714). Her mother, Margaretha Beata von Freytagh zu Gödens (1621-1665), married twice: the first time to Willem van Ewsum (?-1643), Anna's father, who was one of the main participants in the WIC chamber Stad en Lande with a stake of £10000.  

The second time she married Rudolph Wilhelm van Inn- en Kniphuisen (1620-1666). The eldest son from this second marriage, Haro Caspar (?-1694) married Petronella Anna Lewe (1648-1686). Her father, Abel Coenders Lewe, who was one of the founding investors of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande with a stake of £4000.  
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Evert Lewe van Asinga (1590-1641), was the forefather of most of the members of the Lewe family involved with slavery. He is discussed in the previous chapter. Anna van Ewsum, like her mother, married twice; both times, to members of the Van Inn- en Knipbergen family, again as her mother had before her. Various other descendants of Margaretha Beata and Rudolph Wilhelm also marry within the network: their grandson Hendrik Ferdinand van Inn- en Kniphuisen (1666-1717) marries Aurelia Jarges (1665-1702), whose uncle was bewindhebber Mello Alberda. Their son, Haro Caspar van Inn- en Kniphuisen (1698-1741) marries another Petronella Anna Lewe (1702-1771), son of bewindhebber Evert Joost Lewe van Aduard (the elder mentioned above). Their son, Ferdinand Folef van Inn- en Kniphuisen (1735-1795), married Anna Maria Graafand (1743-1803). Her brother, who was a bewindhebber in Amsterdam and a director of the society of Surinam is discussed below. This is the first marriage in generations that is completely outside of the family. Their daughter, Anna Habbina Jacoba van Inn- en Kniphuisen, married Edzard Jacob Lewe van Middelstum (1783-1856), the grandson of the last mentioned Edzard Jacob Lewe van Middelstum. His father was married to Christina Elisabeth Wolthers (1753-1809), granddaughter of bewindhebber Andreas Conring (1696-1754), which tied this noble line to the urban elite.

Anna van Ewsum, her mother Margaretha Beata, and her son Carel Ferdinand van Inn- and Kniphuisen (1669-1716), all had ties to slavery. Anna was a participant in the WIC in both the Chambers Stad en Lande and in Amsterdam. How large her share was is not certain. Van Schie states that she owned stock for the sum of £1240, but he does not state in which chamber, on on what sources he bases this statement.\(^{137}\) There is, of course, the possibility that this stake was inherited from her father, but it is her name on the books nonetheless.\(^{138}\) Anna also had more direct ties to slavery, but the sources for this are mainly anecdotal. One of the buildings on the estate of Borg Nienoord in Leek, where Anna lived, is adorned with small plaster moor's heads. It is said that these are a tribute to the African enslaved man, who was named Adriaan, who rescued the Jonker's daughter from drowning. Whether this is true or not, it is not unlikely that there were (former) enslaved Africans at Nienoord at the time of Anna van Ewsum. On a portrait by Jan de Baen, Anna is accompanied by a small black boy, who holds a plate of flowers. Margaretha Beata held a share of £10000 in the WIC.\(^{139}\) As this is the exact same amount that Willem van Ewsum had invested in the Chamber Stad en Lande, it is not unlikely that this, too, was inherited from him. Carel Ferdinand, Anna's son, became bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1707.
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Oligarchisation

In the seventeenth century, political power in Groningen was firmly in the hands of a small group of people, most of whom related to each other. This section discusses a few families who stood at the center of the kinship clusters of the eighteenth century oligarchy. It also discusses the new dichotomy that had risen between the patriots and the Orangists. The dispute between the two sides permeated all public affairs, and affected the WIC as well.

Perhaps the most influential person from Groningen in the Dutch slave trade was Anthony Adriaan van Iddekinge (1711-1789) came from a family with a longstanding tradition of civil service. His family had held high offices in the Groningen since 1628. His grandfather, Rembt van Iddekinge (1636-1719), was the first member of the family to become bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1684. He is discussed at greater length in the previous chapter. His father became mayor during an uprise in 1748, the “Oranjerevolutie”. This uprise was caused by an increasing discontent with the ruling class. This discontent was not only growing in Groningen. Throughout the republic, Burgers, especially those well off, wanted more influence, and called for an end of the existing oligarchic power structures. They proposed to make the Stadholder of Friesland, Willem Karel Hendrik Friso (Willem IV) hereditary Stadholder. He would then, they proposed, have the power to challenge the Regents and reform government in the Republic. There was an additional reason for the unrest in Groningen: the Ommelanden felt that the city had too much power in the province. In 1748, the birth of his son, Willem V, led to riots in Groningen. The house of mayor Johan Geertsema in the Oosterstraat was ransacked. Geertsema was also bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1746.

The Stadholdership became hereditary on April 26 1748, in the hope to stop the unrest.
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This had little effect in Groningen, as the inhabitants of both the city and the Ommelanden gathered in the city on May 16th that year to demand change from the provincial states, that had convened there. Even though the provincial states agreed to all demands, unrest remained. Things came to a climax in August, when Ommelanderers again came to the city, and forced the president of the Ommelander assembly, Evert Joost Lewe van Aduard (1677-1753) to come to the city and hear their demands. Evert Joost was also a bewindhebber of the WIC Chamber Stad en Lande from 1717.144

Henk Boels and Hidde Feenstra argue that some members of the urban elite chose the side of the Burgers and Ommelander farmers for opportunistic reasons.145 Among them were Pieter Rembt van Iddekinge (1663-1758) and his son Anthony Adriaan. Even though their family had been part of the ruling class for generations, they were members of less influential factions and therefore did not have access to the highest offices. Pieter Rembt became hugely popular during the unrest of 1748, and was practically made mayor by the unruly masses.146 During the height of the unrests in Groningen in 1749 mayor Johan Geerstema was briefly relieved of all his duties, including those for the WIC. He was fully reinstated the following year, once things had died down.

Pieter Rembt van Iddekinge was married to Beerta Johanna Gerlacius (1688-1750). Together they had nine children, many of whom married within the network around slavery or had a direct connection to slavery themselves.147 Take, for example, their eldest daughter, Rembertina Maria van Iddekinge (1713-1779). She married William Falconer (1712-1776), a lord of Scottish descent, who served as a colonel in the Dutch army. Together they had three children: Wibbina Sophia (1740-1803), who married Willem Andreas Baurmeister (1734-1781), grandson of Willem Baurmeister (1644-1720), who was a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1717. Their second child, Alexander (1754-1826), married Margaretha Clementia Keiser (1759-1826), whose grandfather, Gerhard Jacob Keiser (1701-1785) was one of the main participants in the WIC chamber of Stad en Lande in 1760 and 1770.148 Their third child, Anthony Adriaan (1742-1804) married Christina Elisabeth Sichterman (1738-1809), daughter of Jan Albert Sichterman, whom I discuss below.

Pieter Rembt's second daughter Petronella Wibbina Johanna van Iddekinge (1718-?) married of Feijo Sickinghe (1718-1748). Together they had two sons: Onno Sickinghe (?-1771), and
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his older brother Rembt Tobias(?-1779). They boarded a ship for the Dutch Gold Coast in 1769. Onno died after only two years, while Rembt Tobias worked there for ten years, until he died in 1779. Remt Tobias and Onno were a distant relative of the bewindhebbers from the Sickinghe family, as Johan Sickinghe was their third great grandfather.

Pieter Rembt's eldest son, Anthony Adriaan, who was briefly mentioned at the start of this section, had the most successful political career. He served the city (and the province) of Groningen from 1734 until his death in 1789, and he first became mayor of Groningen in 1760. He became a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber of Stad en Lande in 1761, and a director of the Society of Surinam in 1779. That society was the owner of Surinam, and responsible for appointing government officials in the colony. During Van Iddekinge's tenure, Jan Gerhard Wichers (1745-1808) was appointed governor of Surinam. Jan Gerhard was Van Iddekinge's second cousin, once removed (up). Their common ancestors are Beerta Altingh and Tjaert Gerlacius.

Anthony Adriaan was a committed Orangist and was on good standing with Prince William IV. According to the Groninger Rarekiek, a series of political pamphlets distributed in Groningen at the time, Anthony Adriaan's brother, Berent, had patriotic tendencies. His son, Scato Francois, briefly joined the patriots between 1785 and 1787. Van der Meer argues that Scato Francois not afraid to ruffle some feathers, judging by his choice in wife. He married Catharina Graafland (1765-1805), a choice which Van der Meer deems controversial. From the perspective of this research, the choice for Graafland makes perfect sense, however. Her father was Joan Graafland (1737-1799), bewindhebber of the WIC in Amsterdam and director of the Society of Surinam. In this last capacity he was the direct colleague of Scato Francois' uncle, Anthony Adriaan. Perhaps he played the role of matchmaker in this case. Joan's sister, Anna Maria, marries Ferdinand Folke van Inn- en Kniphuisen, who is discussed above.

As leader of the Orangist faction in Groningen, Anthony Adriaan van Iddekinge stood opposite of Wiardus Siccama (1713-1797). Siccama was appointed bewindhebber at the same time as Van Iddekinge. After the Batavian revolution he served three years as a commissioner for colonial trade under the new government. Wiardus was the grandson of Harmen Wolthers (1657-1733), who was a bewindhebber from 1717. While the Orangist faction had many members of the Van Iddekinge family, many patriots were directly related to Wiardus Siccama, mainly from the Wolthers family. Wiardus Siccama was married to Anna Catharina Hora (1718-1738), whose
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mother was a sister of his mother.

Quirina Jacoba Persijn was the daughter of Govert van Persijn and Louise Blankert. She was born in the Hague in 1723. When she was 19 years old, she married Maurits de Savornin, who was the mayor of Tholen, Zeeland at the time. De Savornin was twice her age and a widower with a six year-old daughter, Isabelle. Quirina and Maurits had four children, of whom two survived infancy. In 1747 they fled to the Hague as Zeeland was invaded by the French. Savornin decided to go back alone to fulfill his duties, but he soon fell ill and died. Quirina was 24 and a widow. Maurits' daughter inherited most of his money, which left Quirina in dire financial straits. She met Anthony Adriaan van Iddekinge in 1745 in the Hague, while he represented in the parliament and council of state there. They married in 1749, and lived in the Hague until 1757. Holidays were spent in Groningen.155

After 1757, the family moved to Groningen, where Quirina's stepdaughter, Isabelle de Savornin, had moved several years previous to marry Tjaard van Berchuijs. Tjaard fourteen was years her senior, and almost as old as Van Iddekinge. He was mayor of Groningen together with Anthony Adriaan in 1785, and with is brother Berent van Iddekinge in 1786. He was mayor again in 1789, and died that year.

Together, Anthony Adriaan and Quirina had two children. The eldest, Anna Wilhelmina (1753-1826) married Gerard Regnier Gerlacius (1741-1770). Gerard Regnier's grand uncle was Bernard Gerlacius (1660-1729), bewindhebber of the WIC chamber of Stad en Lande from 1722 until his death.156 The youngest, Tjaert Anthony (1756-1737) married Hendrina van Droogenhorst (1753-1795). Tjaert Anthony followed in his father's footsteps, and became a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber in Amsterdam and a director of the Society of Surinam in 1790, until both institutions were dissolved.

In the last chapter we discussed the Grujs family at borg Wirdum and Lellens. We left off with the son of Berend Grujs and Cecilia Tamminga: Onno Berend Grujs (1675-1744). He married twice: his first wife was Sophia Henriëtte Sickinghe (1680-1720), whom he married in 1702. Her mother was Anna Tjarda van Starkenborgh, the daughter of bewindhebber Allard Tjarda van Starkenborgh and Gratia Susanna Clant, who are both discussed above. Her father was Hendrik Sickinghe, son of bewindhebber Johan Sickinghe, who is also discussed above. Together they had a daughter, Anna Frederica Grujs (1706-1758), who married Joost de Valcke (1707-1768). He became a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1761. Their daughter, Sophia Henriëtte de Valcke (circa 1733-1780) married Willem Livius van Viersen. Here, the name Van Viersen rejoins
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the network, after it had disappeared from it in the previous century. This disappearance was of course not gradual, but ushered in by scandal. The primary reason is of course that bewindhebber Willem van Viersen had no son to pass on his name, but even if his name was passed on, the subsequent malpractices of his son-in-law would probably have ruined his name forever. This Van Viersen is not a descendant of the early bewindhebber, but as discussed in the previous chapter, he traces his lineage to another Willem van Viersen, mint master in Leeuwarden.

After Sophia Henriëtte died, Onno Berend married Gerhardina Lohman (1681-1748) in 1721. Her grandnephew Wytzius Hendrik Lohman later married Anthony Adriaan van Iddekinge's stepdaughter, Anna Adriana de Savornin (1744-1788), which formed the later influential family De Savornin Lohman. One of their descendants, Maurits Adriaan de Savornin Lohman (1832–1899), would later become governor of Surinam after the abolition of slavery.

Jan Albert Sichterman (1692-1764) was often referred to as the “King of Groningen”, because of his extreme wealth and gaudy behavior. I have not found any sources supporting a direct relation between him and transatlantic slavery, but he deserves to be mentioned nonetheless for several reasons. Firstly, he is a central figure in the kinship network. His brother Gerard was one of the main participants of the WIC of his time; each of his five children married within the network.

In 1716 Jan Albert joined the service of the VOC, for which he became a merchant in Bengal. He married Sybilla Volkera Sadelijn (1699-1782) the daughter of Jacob Sadelijn, who would later become Director-General of Bengal. Whether it was because of this marriage or because of the quality is unknown to me, but the fact is that he swiftly rose through the ranks. When director Rogier Boerenaart died in 1733, Sichterman was made director ad interim. This position was made permanent the following year. When he returned to Groningen in 1744, his wealth was exorbitant — and he wanted to flaunt it. He commissioned the construction of the largest house of the city, on the North face of the Ossemarkt. This city palace was adorned with a monumental main entrance, flanked by two sandstone statues of African women supporting the balcony. The house was so large that it was unsaleable after his death, and his widow had to have it split in two parts. The sandstone statues from the original entrance were sold to his son-in-law, Berent van Iddekinge (1717-1801), who placed them on the main entrance of his home, the Hof van Iddekinge near the Schuitendiep in the city. Berent, who is mentioned above, was a brother of Anthony Adriaan Sichterman. Another brother, Rembt Tobias, also married a daughter of Jan Albert

158 The Hof van Iddekinge was demolished in 1913, to make way for the W. A. Scholtenstraat. The sandstone statues were saved from the rubble and kept at the Groninger Museum, where they were exhibited last year. The cover picture was taken at this exhibition.
Sichterman.

Many wild tales were told about Jan Albert Sichterman. These stories balance on the edge between folklore and oral history. One of them is relevant for this research: it is said, that when Jan Albert would go out, he rode in a carriage drawn by six horses and accompanied by six “negro servants”, throwing coins out of the windows to the people in the street.\(^{159}\) Where these “negro servants” came from is not sure. Perhaps they came with Jan Albert from Bengal, or perhaps they were of African descent. While the sandstone statues clearly represent African women to me, the curator of the Groninger Museum Egge Knol argues that they are probably badly depicted Bengali women.\(^ {160} \) Perhaps people in Groningen were unable to distinguish between people of African and Bengali origin, but I find that unlikely.

In the last chapter I discussed the family line from bewindhebber Berent Jansen to Jan Albert’s father, Arend Ludolf. Many of them married within the network. Jan Albert is closely related to the Alberda, Trip, Laman, Conring, Gockinga, Alberti, Isebrants and Iddekinge families.

Although some relations may seem distant, they are not meaningless. Arend Godert de Vos van Steenwijk was married to Hermanna Elisabeth Bakker, who was the second great granddaughter of Jan Albert Sichterman and bewindhebber Cornelius Tjassens. This means she is directly related to many of those involved with slavery. De Vos van Steenwijk himself came from a family with close ties to slavery. Many members of his family, which was originally from Overijssel, with many members living in Drenthe, owned shares in plantations in Surinam, such as ‘t IJland and Peperpot. Arend Godert himself owned a share of 10/45th of Peperpot and ‘t IJland.\(^ {161} \)

**SOCIAL MOBILITY, WEALTH AND KINSHIP**

The WIC enabled many to climb the socio-economic ladder. The rise in wealth and standing does automatically not bring with it access to the kinship network, however. This section discusses several notable examples of people who rose to positions in Groningen that would normally be reserved for the elite, or even only for nobility. They were all outsiders, and only very few of them managed to connect to the main kinship network of the regional elite, and then still only after several generations.

Thomas van Seeratt (about 1676-1736) was a captain who made a fortune sailing enslaved people across the Atlantic. He later settled down in Groningen, where he got a high position in
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\(^ {160} \) Conversation with Egge Knol, spring 2015.

\(^ {161} \) DrA 1.0606. Havixhorst te De Wijk.
provincial water management. He had lot of ties in business, possibly in friendship, but no kinship connection to the main network. He is, however, part of a smaller, but significant, kinship network.

His father, Hans Baltzar von Rappholt, was the son of a Silezian nobleman, who joined the Swedish military. He probably met his wife, Christina von Liewen, who was of Estonian descent, when he was stationed as captain with the Artillery in the city of Arensburg on the island Osel, near Estonia. It is not certain when exactly Thomas started his seafaring career. In his journal he states that he was young when he did so. The first evidence of his career as a captain with the WIC is from 1707. In that year he was appointed by the WIC chamber of Amsterdam as the captain of the Elmina. In 1707 he sailed for the coast of Guinea. He arrived there on may 19th of that year, and returned almost a year later on April 24th. He sailed back to Falmouth in Cornwall as captain of the Eva Maria, from where he could take several ships that would eventually bring him back to the Netherlands. It seems that he did not ship slaves across the Atlantic on this voyage. He did do so on his most well known, and perhaps last voyage, in 1715.

In that year, van Seeratt set sail for the Loanga coast to buy slaves for the slave market on Curacao. On his way there, he captured a smuggling ship, *Vlissingens Welwaren*, which he rechristened *Compagnies Welwaren*. With the two ships fully loaded he set sail for Curacao. Of the 795 people he loaded in Africa, he could only bring 753 to market upon arrival. The rest was either dead or in too poor a condition to sell. On this same voyage, Seeratt abandoned five slaves on the African coast because of mental or physical impairment. As they had no more monetary value, they were left to their fate. Postma argues that this kind of cruel treatment was exceptional. Henk den Heijer argues that slaves must generally have been treated well, since it was in the interest of the slave traders to keep the “precious cargo” “in good condition”. Maltreatment would lead to unrest aboard the ships, and there were strict regulations against physical or sexual abuse. Whether or not Seeratt's actions were exceptionally cruel, they were motivated by economic interests. This shows that Den Heijer's reasoning from rationality does not always lead to the humane treatment of slaves.

After this last slave voyage, Thomas moved to Groningen. He bought the Calmerhuis, one of the oldest and largest buildings in the city, from Onno Tamminga van Alberda, who was bewindhebber from 1717 and is discussed above. In Groningen Seeratt was appointed steward of the provincial possessions. In that function he played an important role in the rescue and repair
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operations after a large flood in 1717. This provided him with the little fame he has in the province. One of the provincial water boards was named after him from 1924 until 1974, and the provincial government still has an inspection ship that bears his name.

Kinship can be established by three means, of which two are most common: by birth or by marriage. The third option is through adoption, of which there is at least one prominent case in this research, namely that of Jurriaan Lindenberg (?-1751) and Arij de Graaff (circa 1729-1788). Lindenberg moved to Groningen around the time of Thomas van Seeratt's death. Van Seeratt was his uncle, which was likely his reason for coming to the city. Like his uncle, he was a captain for the WIC. Lindenberg was born in Stockholm, most likely around the turn of the eighteenth century. Lindenberg made several voyages to Elmina on the Dutch Gold Coast. There he befriended Martinus de Graaff, an employee of the WIC from Rotterdam.

Martinus had a child with a local African woman, named Arij, born circa 1729. In 1733, Lindenberg was tasked with hunting smuggling ships around the Dutch Gold Coast. Around the same time, Martinus de Graaff drowned in the bay of Elmina. Lindenberg decides to adopt Martinus' son Arij. Arij is baptised by the famous Isaacus Ketelanus in Elmina in 1734, and moves with his adoptive father to the Netherlands. While Doortmont argues that he was raised in the Lindenberg home in Groningen, at the Nieuwe Kerkhof.

After his childhood in Groningen, returned to Elmina in 1745. He became master of provisions in 1746, the same position as his father had once held, in service of the WIC chamber of Zeeland. That he kept in contact with the Lindenberg family is apparent from the fact that he authorized his adoptive mother, the widow of Jurriaan Lindenberg, to collect his wages back in the Netherlands. During his tenure in Africa, Arij married a local woman. Doortmont suggests she may have been a slave, as a enslaved woman named Efiba, whom he suspects to be the woman, was given a letter of manumission by Arij's request in 1760. Together they had two children, Martinus (?-1803) and Wilhelmina. Both children joined him when he returned to the Netherlands in 1763. He sailed to the Netherlands via Surinam, where he delivered 23 enslaved “Mulatto's, inteded as house slaves”.

---
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After his arrival in the Netherlands, Arij and his children initially briefly lived in Amsterdam. In 1765, he moved to Groningen and married Gesina Barlinckhoff, the daughter of a prominent local typographer. He purchased the Onstaborg in Wetsinge from Margaretha Bouwina Tjarda van Starkenborgh (1704-1785) and Egbert Rengers van Farmsum (1687-1745) in circa 1765, and moved there shortly after. Such a house would normally be reserved for the rural nobility. The decline of the rural nobility inflated the value of borzen; the Onstaborg was hardly ever used by Margaretha Bouwina and Egbert Rengers, as they owned several others throughout the province, inherited from both sides of the family. De Graaff purchased it with all the rights a borg like this brought with it, which meant that, which in a sense made him nobility as well. Arij styled himself “Lord of Wetsinge and Sauwerd”, and lived as a Jonker in his borg. Clearly, his work on the Dutch Gold Coast had made him quite a wealthy man. Further evidence of this is that, in 1767, Arij received f20000 from Jan Willem Pichot, a former member of the council for civil justice in Surinam, as repayment for a mortgage of f60000 that De Graaff had given Pichot.

Together, Thomas van Seeratt, Jurriaan Lindenberg and Arij de Graaff form a small kinship chain that is not connected to the main kinship network. While there are social, business and professional ties, this cluster does not marry into the regional elite. The cluster does live the life of a member of the regional elite: they live in houses, hold political and professional positions and display wealth, all fit for the elite. They tick all the boxes described by Bernard Altingh, in his Pilaren Ende Peerlen. But still, they remain outsiders, and all the money and prestige they gathered through slavery would not change that. They all have in common, however, that they are part of several other kinship networks around slavery, that are not based in Groningen.

For William Butler (1686- ), too, the WIC was a means to make money and a name for himself. He was born to Scottish merchants living in Hamburg. Jan J. Clement notes that he may

have had Dutch kinship ties, as letters written by him show he knew the Dutch language well.\textsuperscript{171} This could also have been due to close social or business ties, however. He joined the WIC in 1705 and boarded a ship from Texel to Elmina. There he was appointed assistant to director general Willem de la Palma. He gradually rose through the ranks until he was eventually appointed director general in 1718. Clement describes him as a strict and authoritarian man, who was not well-liked by Dutch slave trade captains who stopped at Elmina. Through a loophole in his contract, Butler found a way to legally profit from the slave trade personally, by charging Portuguese slave traders a commission. While the WIC was teetering on the edge of bankruptcy his tenure, Butler himself benefited greatly financially.

After Butler was caught illegally shipping gold to the Netherlands, the Heren X secretly appointed a successor, Abraham Houtman, in 1722. Upon his arrival in Elmina, he detained Butler and interrogated him. Houtman fell ill shortly after his arrival, and freed Butler in exchange for money and his support. In 1723 Butler was allowed to return to the Netherlands, where he was again detained and questioned by the Heren X upon arrival. He managed to get back some of the gold they had confiscated, but sued to regain the rest and his wages due.

Butler did not have any kinship ties in Groningen. The cause for this is simple: he was married before he came to the region. In Holland he had married Maria Leeser (1702-1766). After Butler's death, she marries Isaac Lohoff, who was from the West of the Netherlands. It is clear, however, that came to Groningen through the network. He bought his house, a veenborg called Overwater in Hoogezaand from Thomas van Seeratt in 1724. He took on the lifestyle of the rural elite. Not far from Overwater stood the main church of Hoogezaand. Together with Adriaan Joseph Trip (1686-1748) and Jan Duursema (who at the time lived in Borg Stadwijk, which was later sold to Jacob Appius) donated an elaborate oak pulpit for the church, engraved with their family emblems. Although I have no proof that Adriaan Joseph was directly involved with slavery, he is closely connected to the main network. His maternal grandfather was Harmen Wolthers (1657-1733). Adriaan Joseph's son, Vincent Bernard (1723-1800) was married twice: his first wife was Hermanna Henriëta Emmen (1731-1795), daughter of Lambert Hendrik Emmen (1696-1763) who became bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1746, as his father Rudolph Emmen (1663-1727) had been before him since 1717, and his grandfather Warner Emmen (1626-1679) before him since 1679. Vincent Bernard's second wife was Christina Louisa Wichers (1752-1820), the first cousin, once removed (down) of liberal politician and abolitionist Berend Wichers, who is discussed in the next chapter. These are only a few of the many connections between Joseph Trip and the network. At this time, there are son many kinship connections between the various clusters within
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the network, that many within the network can be connected to someone involved with slavery in only a few steps, and often even with several people.

Not long after Butler was forced to retire as Director-General and moved to Groningen, a man with a strong connection to Groningen rose through the ranks to become Director-General. Pieter Woortman (1700-1780), born in Soest, Brandenburg, likely first arrived on the Dutch Gold Coast in 1720, when William Butler was still in office. Whether they knew each other is unknown. After nine years in Africa, he moved to Groningen and married Elsebeet Carier in 1730. She was the daughter of Peter Carier, a Grocer whose store was located at the Damsterdiep. Pieter Woortman joined the Grocer's guild and took over his father-in-law's store at the Damsterdiep. His business did not do well, however. In 1735 he was detained due to inability to pay his debts. Some time before 1740, the family left their store at the Damsterdiep and moved to the Boterdiep. Perhaps they were forced to sell the store. Doortmont suggests that Woortman returned to the Dutch Gold Coast in 1740 because of his financial circumstances. He would never return to Groningen, but his ties to the city remained. The story of the Woortman family shows how wealth gathered with slave trade could lead a rise in social standing and increased political power. The family eventually became the provincial elite of Groningen, though they were only loosely connected to the core kinship network around slavery, and only after several generations.

Pieter Woortman swiftly rose in the ranks on the Dutch Gold Coast. He started in the relatively low rank of bottelier, who was responsible for the supply of food and drink. In 1742 he was named captain of the WIC ship Het Goede Succes. His job was to patrol the coast in search of illegal Portuguese traders. In 1744 he was made assistant of Fort Lijdzaamheid in Apam. This was one of the lowest ranks of the non-commissioned civil officials. In 1747 he was promoted to provisional sub-commissioner for trade, one of the lower commissioned ranks. In 1754 he became provisional commissioner for trade, the highest ranking civil official at Apam. There, Woortman marries a local woman namen Aphodewa. He established a network for slave trade through her family. The children from this marriage bore the name Plange, after Woortman's mother.
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Pieter Woortman's stay at the fort in Apam lasts until 1763. The length of this tenure is notable, because when he leaves the fort in 1763, he quickly rises to the highest ranks. Perhaps his long tenure at Apam was of his own choosing? It seems not, as he requested transfer to Accra in 1758. This request was not honoured until 1763. In Accra, he became senior commissioner for trade and the highest ranking civil official. In 1767, he replaced the recently deceased Director General Huydecoper ad interim. Pieter Woortman officially succeeded Jan Huydecoper as Director-General of the Dutch Gold Coast at Elmina castle in 1768.\textsuperscript{177} He was sworn in as “director of the North and South coast of Africa” on September 26, 1769.\textsuperscript{178}

Woortman served as director general for nearly thirteen years. This is the longest tenure in this function, but it was also exceptional because of how long Woortman was able to survive on the Dutch Gold Coast. Johannes Menne Postma states that death rates in on the Dutch Gold Coast were extremely high: during the eighteenth century, nearly a quarter of the WIC personnel in Africa died there, and numbers from 1774 show that many died within the first nine months.\textsuperscript{179} Of the Directors-General, half died while in office, and on average they served a little over two and a half years. Postma points out that this last group certainly had a higher standard of living than the average personnel, and that this makes theirs a best-case scenario.\textsuperscript{180}

Pieter was joined in Africa by his son Jan Woortman (1730-1777), who entered the service of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande in 1741.\textsuperscript{181} He, too, rose in the ranks quickly: in 1748 he was already an assistant to the secretariat. In 1750 he was promoted to assistant on the Dutch Slave Coast in Keta, approximately 330 kilometers east of Elmina. He became lower commissioner for trade in 1762. He commanded leading Fort Amsterdam in Kormantin, 35 kilometers east of Elmina, from 1766 until 1770 and again from 1772. He eventually became commissioner for trade in 1777, and commander of Fort Batenstein in Boutry, 100 kilometers west of Elmina. He died shortly after in 1777.

Jan Woortman was married to Acoua, a local woman. Together they had at least four children, of which two are known: Johanna (circa 1751-?) and Pieter (before 1758-1785). Johanna married Wille Pieter Christiaan Cornelis Huydecoper, son of Director-General Jan Huydecoper. Pieter Woortman entered service of the WIC in 1762, when he was only four years old, as a cadet. This was not unusual, as it allowed the child to live with his father in the fort.\textsuperscript{182} In 1775, Pieter was
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sent to the Netherlands for his education. Pieter returned to Guinea in 1777, where he went to work for the WIC chamber Zeeland. Jan also had several children with his slave Apousie. The first was Maria Catharina (1762-?). She joined her half-brother Pieter in 1775 to the Netherlands. In 1778, she inherited a large sum of money from her uncle Hendrik Woortman. In 1793 she married Boele Hostingh, a lawyer from Onstwedde, Groningen. They married in Wildervank, where her uncle Jacob lived at the time. Another child, Hendrik Woortman, served the Dutch Council of Colonies in Dutch Guinea in 1803.  

Pieter Woortman's second son, Pieter Woortman, Jr. (1734-1815), joined his father in the slave trading business in 1771. Van Winter states that Pieter Jr. worked for his brother Jan when he was in Africa, but that he soon had to return to the Netherlands because he couldn't handle the climate. In 1780, he partnered with Daniel Cornelis Wesselman in the trading firm Wesselman & Woortman in Amsterdam that participated in the slave trade on the African coast. Doortmont suggests that one of the firm's ships, the Juffrouw Elisabeth, which was used for the transportation of slaves, was named after Pieter's sister who is discussed below.

Before Pieter Jr. entered the slave trade he had at that point already made a name for himself in Groningen. He married Eva Takens (1736-1811) in 1760, and together they bought a paint factory at the Zuiderdiep in Groningen. This is also where the family lived until 1765, when they moved to a house in the Steentilstraat. Pieter Jr. gained citizenship of the city in 1768.

Woortman became a Gezworene in Groningen in 1780, and as such got involved with the struggle between the patriots and the orangists. Woortman was an orangist and a client of Anthony Adriaan van Iddekinge. Pieter Jr. is mentioned several times in the Groninger Rarekiek, a patriot series of propaganda pamphlets. In one of these pamphlets, he is portrayed as a simple man who pretends to be aristocracy, and he is urged to “...als borger te leve en teere. Na zijn geboorte, en voormalige Stant”. This points towards the social mobility that wealth, that was accumulated through slave trade, brought with it. While Woortman was allowed to fulfill positions that were normally only for the members of the established oligarchical network, he was not truly considered one of them. Another telltale sign was his rejected as a member of the Groote Societeit in 1783. Such a rejection was rare, according to Van der Meer.

Woortman invested in real estate both in the city and outside. Together with his brother Jacob, who is discussed below, he bought the leasing rights to some land in Wildervank from the heirs of Hindrik Rudolph Trip, one of the descendants of Adriaan Trip, and
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also a relative of bewindhebbers Scato and Scato Ludolph Gockinga, who are discussed in the previous chapter and above. Pieter Jr. and his family moved to Engelbert in 1780. Here they built a veenborg, which bore the name Delmina. This name was still marked on the map by Willem Ulrich Huguenin in 1819.189 The house was located near the Winschoterdiep, close to what is now Waterhuizen. The location of the house is no longer visible in the landscape today, but the that lead past it still bears Woortman's name: Woortmansdijk.

Pieter Woortman's third child and only daughter was Elizabeth Woortman (1736-1822).190 She married Jurriaan Groenhoff (1732-1811), a cobbler from Amsterdam. They lived in Groningen, where Jurriaan later worked as a Grocer, like his father-in-law before him. They had five children, of which one was involved with slavery: their third son, Dirk Groenhoff (1762-1799) sailed to the Dutch Gold Coast in 1783. He worked there as an assistant, later commissioner of trade, in service of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande.191 He was stationed at St. George d'Elmina until 1788, and later in command of several forts: first a year at Fort Dorothea in Akwidaa, 100 kilometers west of Elmina; then Fort de Goede Hoop in Senya Beraku, 120 kilometers east of Elmina and lastly Fort Hollandia (formerly Fort Groß Friedrichsburg) at Pokesu, 120 kilometers west of Elmina. He died at Fort Hollandia in 1799 without leaving a will. His estate included several slaves.192

Jacob Woortman (1738-1812) married Elisabeth Magdalena Kolff (1755-1833) in 1796. They did not have any children. Jacob Woortman did pass on the family name, however. His wife had a nine year old son from her previous marriage with Hendrik Berghuis, a medical doctor from Amersfoort, who had died in 1794. This son, Wijnand Anthony, took on both his father's last name, as well as his stepfather's. There are still descendants of Wijnand Anthony Berghuis van Woortman alive today who carry that name. There is no evidence that Jacob had any direct involvement with slavery. He did have connections within the network around slavery, however: in 1792 he sold a wallpaper factory at the Schuitemakersstraat in Groningen to Hendrik Gerrit van Bulderen and his son Jan Keizer van Bulderen. Hendrik Gerrit was the last secretary of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande and is discussed in the next chapter. Like his brother, Jacob was a gezworene in Groningen in 1789-1790 and 1793-1794.

Pieter Woortman's youngest son was Hendrik Woortman (1740-1779). Hendrik was, like his father and eldest brothers, deeply involved with slavery. He had two daughters with a local woman. In 1777 Hendrik fell ill and requested discharge. He returned to the Netherlands with his two
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daughters and a black servant. After first stopping in Rotterdam, they travelled on to Groningen where Hendrik had bought a large house on the North side of the Vismarkt. Here he died shortly after. There is mention of a remarkable event that took place in the brief period that Hendrik was in Groningen. In 1779, Hendrik was attacked in the Herestraat in Groningen, allegedly because he was in the company of a black servant.  

During his tenure as Director-General, Pieter Woortman also actively participated in slave trade. Though strictly forbidden under severe corporal punishments, it was a highly profitable affair. Despite the risks, all WIC personnel were involved in the private slave trade, according to Clement.  

For example, in 1769 Woortman, together with his son Jan and Willem Sulyard van Leeufdael, rented the WIC ship *De Beschutter* for £20,000 to transport 400 slaves from Elmina to Surinam. In another instance, noted by Doortmont, Woortman supplied 267 slaves to Ary de Pot, captain of the *Maze*. All these slaves were branded with Woortman's initials. His son, Jan, supplied another 133 slaves in Accra, who were branded with Jan's initials. Goslinga notes that, in 1773, Woortman inquired about the price of a 1/16th share of the slave ship *Vrouwe Isabella Maria*. Goslinga argues that this shows his obvious intent to buy the ship outright. He states that it was common for slave owners and senior WIC, Society of Surinam and plantation personnel to invest in slave trade.

The cluster around the Woortman family (group 35) is only loosely connected to the main kinship network. In 1799, Henderika Woortman (1781-1845), the granddaughter of Director-General Pieter Woortman, marries Hajo Albert Spandaw (1777-1855). Their son, Georg Jan (1802-1836), marries Wendelina Cornera Lewe (1806-1889) in 1831. She was the daughter of Edzart Willem Lewe (1781-1820) and Anna Alberda (1782-1854), both members of the rural nobility. Wendelina was the second great granddaughter of bewindhebber Gerhard Willems Alberda (1705-1784). Due to various marriages within the closely knit network of the rural nobility, she was incidentally also his third, fourth and fifth cousin, several times removed, with various shared ancestors in the Clant, Coenders, Tamminga and Rengers families.

**FORMERLY ENSLAVED IN GRONINGEN**

There are various examples of black, or mixed race people who lived in Groningen in the
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seventeenth century. One of them, Arij de Graaff, we discussed earlier. Other examples were mentioned in connection with the Woortman family and Jan Albert Sichterman. There are also a few examples of the (former) enslaved themselves who lived in Groningen.

Jacob Appius (1730-1789) was a lawyer from well-to-do family. His grandfather, Jacobus Appius, (1667-1712) was mayor of the City, and his grandmother was Anna Haijakens, daughter of an officer of the city artillery. Her sister Enna Haijcken was Johan Geertsema's (1693-1758) mother, which makes Johan Jacob's first cousin, once removed (up). Johan was mayor of Groningen and bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande, and is discussed above. Jacob Appius' aunt, Elisabeth Appius (1695-before 1724) was married to Hindrik Veldman (1687-1753). Hindrik held various political offices in Groningen: he was mayor several times between 1733 and 1753, a member of the city council, a supervisor of the Latin school, governor of the orphanage, and he represented the city at the State Council. He was a bewindhebber of the WIC chamber Stad en Lande from 1746. Although Appius' family was not heavily involved with slavery, it was closely tied to families at the center of the oligarchy, with strong ties to slavery.

In 1763, Appius moved to Surinam, where he initially intended to practice law. After his arrival he soon got a position in service of the Society of Surinam. When the Society decided to change Appius' conditions of employment, Appius did not agree. He resigned and sued for a large sum of money as compensation. The matter was eventually settled for the sum of ƒ5000.

Back in Groningen, he bought veenborg Stadtwijk in Sappemeer, where he lived with his sister until his death. This was not a true borg, but a “veenborg”, a country house in the peat extraction area to the east of Groningen, mostly built in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. These houses did not have any special rights attached to them, as true borgen did. He also brought his house slave Jan Christiaan with him from Surinam. When Jacob Appius died, he left a yearly stipend to Jan Christiaan, mentioned as his “black servant” in Jacob's will.

Jan Christiaan was not the only black person in the area at the time. At another veenborg, just a short walk to the south, lived Cornelis Star Lichtenvoort (1743-1833), who had also brought back his house slaves from the West. Cornelis, born in Leeuwarden, moved to Curacao to practice law there, just like Appius had. He met his wife, Maria Kock (1741-1815) on the island.
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born there in 1741 as the daughter of William Webb Kock and Catharina Dekker.\textsuperscript{204} William Webb Kock was master of provisions (equipagemeester) for the WIC on Curacao.\textsuperscript{205} Maria had been married to Lieutenant Arnold Padbrugge, who had died sometime before 1763. He married Maria on the island in 1764.\textsuperscript{206} This marriage also brought Rozetak plantation into the Lichtenvoort family via Maria Kock. It was bought by her first husband, Padbrugge, in 1758.\textsuperscript{207}

Lichtenvoort sold Rozetak to A. van Uytrecht-Raphoen, in 1768, and returned to the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{208} When they moved to Groningen, they brought two “blacks” with them from their plantation, as servants in their new home.\textsuperscript{209} They moved into veenborg borg Welgelegen in Kleinemeer, which had been in his father's family. One of the black servants they brought with them was named Louis Alons. He was born on Curacao around 1755.\textsuperscript{210} The first evidence of his existence is found in the records of baptism and marriage of Sappemeer. In 1779, he married Hindrikje Luitjens, and on the same day their daughter (who was obviously conceived out of wedlock) is baptised. There are two notes on the wedding papers. The first concerns the child's illegitimate birth. The second is more important: “He [is] from Curacao”.\textsuperscript{211} In 1805 he marries a second time. We find another marriage in the records in 1813.\textsuperscript{212} This time Louis is mentioned as the father of the groom. The document also notes that he is at that time a carriage driver.

F. Alons, the author of a genealogy of the Alons family, assumes that Sappemeer was a closed community, due to limitations in transportation and the low number of inhabitants.\textsuperscript{213} Schutter also states that “these negroes […] must have caused quite some commotion” as the local population was not used to such “exotic types”.\textsuperscript{214} There is an argument to be made against this assumption. There are several arguments to be made against this. The society of Groningen at the time had many connections with the colonies, through the WIC and otherwise. Many of these connections have already ben discussed. The area around Hoogezaand and Sappemeer had relatively more connections with the West, still. Various high profile members of the network lived in the area, most in veenboren: William Butler, Thomas van Seeratt, Jacob Appius, Cornelis Star Lichtenvoort, but also Jan ter Pelkwijk, a postmaster whose son Gerard Justus moved to Surinam shortly before
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Appius. Ter Pelkwijk owned veenborg *Veenlust* near Veendam.\textsuperscript{215} Mayor and bewindhebber Gerhard ten Berge (1621-1682) owned veenborg *Vredenburg* near Hoogezand. That all these people chose precisely this area to settle down after their career in the West is no coincidence. The area was newly developed, and had large plots of land on which expensive veenborgen could be built. There was also a good connection to the city and beyond via the Winschoterdiep, which was dug in the first half of the seventeenth century. Many prominent families had also moved to the region in the previous century because there was good money to be made with the peat extraction in the area.\textsuperscript{216} The area was thus not as isolated (and backward) as Alons suggests. Jan Albert Sichterman, Hendrik Woortman, and Trip, Gockinga, Emmen, Werumeus, and Wichers families also owned veenborgen in the area.\textsuperscript{217} Perhaps Schutter and Alons based their arguments on their views of the area today, as it is now a small town like many others in Groningen, peripheral and rural. But in the eighteenth century, it was one of the most desirable areas of the province.

Louis names two of his children Cornelia and Maria, after Star Lichtenvoort and his wife.\textsuperscript{218} This does suggest that the relation between Louis and his (former) enslavers was familiar. Of course, it seems obvious that they would not bring a slave with whom they had a bad relation, but rather one that they could get along with. Whether Louis Alons and Jan Christiaan should still be considered slaves when they lived in Groningen is uncertain. We do not know how they experienced their position: whether felt free to go, or if they felt like they were still possession or not.

Cornelis' second great grandfather was Enno Doedens Star (1631-1707), vice-admiral of the Dutch fleet, who took part in punitive expeditions against the English in both the Caribbean and on the African coast, under the command of Michiel de Ruyter in 1661-1663.\textsuperscript{219} His grandson was Cornelis Star Numan (1807-1857), a professor of Law in Groningen, who had abolitionist sympathies. Is is discussed in the next chapter.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The eighteenth century was the heyday of the oligarchy in Groningen. Various families, which had gained wealth and power. The rural nobility, dwindling in numbers, had lost much of its power as a result of the unrests in the 1740's. They were finally stripped of their privileges in 1795.

For Thomas van Seeratt, Arij de Graaff, Jurriaan Lindenberg and William Butler, Groningen was a place to retire to after their career in slavery. For Pieter Woortman, it was the place he had left
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to make his career in slavery. Both Butler and Woortman directly profited from slave trade as directors-general. For every slave bought by the WIC in Africa, they received a commission. Furthermore, they also received 2.5% of all the company's profits in Africa.\textsuperscript{220} It is clear, therefore, that both returned to Groningen wealthy men. Newcomers to the city like Thomas van Seeratt and Arij de Graaff, who had made a fortune from the slave trade, lived in Groningen as though they were members of the regional elite. They had prestigious houses and functions, but as they did not get access to the elite kinship network, they remained outsiders.

In the area around Hoogezand, Jan Christiaan and Louis Alons found their new home. Whether those brought to the veenborgen of Appius and Lichtenvoort felt like slaves is unknown. Hall et al. describe similar practices in the United Kingdom as bringing enslaved over “as live furniture”.\textsuperscript{221} This is not an unreasonable statement, as the slaves likely had little choice in the matter.
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The Nineteenth Century: End of Slave Trade and Abolition

In the discussion about the abolition of slavery in the Netherlands, an important role was played by a man from Groningen. Marten Douwes Teenstra (1795-1864) published several works on the Dutch colonies in the West and slavery. Teenstra was the son of a wealthy farmer and a mennonite. An agricultural crisis in 1819 and resulting economic downturn in the years after forced him to sell his farm Arion in the Noordpolder in 1826. He decided to move, first to the Dutch East Indies, and later to the West, and try his luck there. He started writing about what he saw in the colonies. In 1835 a volume on agriculture in Surinam, followed in 1836 and 1837 by two volumes on the Dutch Antilles and finally in 1842 by his most important work: De Negerslaven der kolonie Suriname en de uitbreiding van het Christendom onder de heidensche bevolking. In this last work he strongly condemned slavery. He stated that “no pirate captain would treat his subordinates more cruelly than the white man, especially the Jews, treat the negro slaves of Surinam. Many are not even satisfied by the cruelest of punishments, but they have to put pepper in the bleeding wounds, and torture those unfortunates with a smile on their face”. He was not connected to the networks of the urban elite or the rural nobility by kin. He was a freemasoner, however, as were many other members of the regional elite at the time. IJntke Botke states that Marten Douwes, as well as his father and grandfather, were examples of progressive, wealthy farmers who assumed a more prominent role in society during the enlightenment. It should be noted that, while Teenstra was a vocal opponent of slavery, he did not hold free blacks and coloreds in the highest regards. Teenstra called colored Surinamese “arrogant, haughty, conceited, lazy, and insolent”.

Network developments: Transition to Modernity

The Batavian Revolution was the final blow for the rural elite. Their power had gradually
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dwindling numbers and financial hardship, but their special privileges were finally eliminated in 1795. After that, they were still members of the regional elite, but they had no special position over the others. The establishment of the institution of knighthood in 1814 would not change this. Of the few noble families that were still left, many marry outside the regional nobility, slowly integrating the group with the rest of the regional elite.

The network analysis shows that, towards the second half of the nineteenth, clusters become more open and interconnected. As the mobility of the elite grows, many new names show up, of marriage partners from other parts of the country.

GOVERNANCE

After the Westindies Company was dissolved, governance of the colonies fell to the Dutch government. Various people from Groningen played roles in colonial governance in the period between the dissolution of the WIC and the abolition of slavery. Some, like Hendrik Gerrit van Bulderen (1724-1806), were part of both systems. Van Bulderen served both the WIC, and its predecessors during the Batavian Republic and the French occupation of the Netherlands, until his death in 1806. He stems from the Blencke family that had served the WIC in Groningen nearly from its inception. He took his mother's name because of a scandal with his father, Abraham Blencke (1695-?).

He was the last secretary of the WIC, then a member of the Colonial Council, then a member of the Committee for the West Indies during the Batavian Republic until his death. He did not attend many meetings of the Committee due to severe rheumatism, however.

Hendrik Gerrit van Bulderen plays a special role in the history of the connection between transatlantic slavery and Groningen. Not only does he play a significant role in it himself, he also singlehandedly destroyed the most important corpus of historical sources related to it. Van Winter states that it was Van Bulderen who probably burned most, if not all, of the archives of WIC chamber Stad en Lande. In 1801, he wrote to the newly founded Council of American Properties that the archive was of little value, and that most of it could simply be burned. Thus, it is not unlikely that those archives went up the chimney of Van Bulderen's country house Brinkhoven near Paterswolde, on a cold winter's day in 1801, heating the house and Van Bulderen's old, rheumatic hands.
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Jan Gerard Wichers (1745-1808), was the governor of Surinam from 1784 until 1790. Goslinga describes Wichers as a progressive governor. He states that Wichers, in cooperation with the colonial political council, was responsible for new regulations for plantation overseers, which also included protective measures for the enslaved. He also notes that Wichers was the only governor to form a social policy, attempting to halt the exodus caused by the economic crisis of 1773. That crisis had caused the bankruptcy of many plantation holders and in turn caused many white inhabitants to leave Surinam, Wichers feared. He proposed to incentivize “mulatto-breeding”, urging white men to impregnate black (enslaved) women, and consequently declaring their offspring free and compensating the enslaver for ƒ100. Through this policy, Wichers aimed to create a colored middle class that was more likely to stay in Surinam. Furthermore, they could work as colony militia or plantation overseers, as there was dire need for workers that could fulfill these functions, Goslinga argues. Because the feared white exodus never actually happened, and the only visible consequences were an increase in manumissions and more coloreds being appointed to lower government positions. Goslinga also notes that there was a rise in interest for literature in Surinam when Wichers was governor. Wichers also oversaw the significant expansion of Paramaribo northeast of Fort Zeelandia. During his tenure as governor, over 20,000 feet of land was cleared, and a new neighborhood called “Combé” was built here. Overall, Goslinga paints quite a positive picture of Wichers.

After he was forced returned to the Netherlands in 1790 for health reasons, he was appointed a member of the newly founded Colonial Council. The colonial council was replaced by the Committee for the West Indies after the Batavian Republic, of which Jan Gerard was not a member. Jan Gerard's first cousin, abolitionist Berend Wichers is discussed below. His paternal grandmother was Elizabeth Sophia Trip (1687-1753), aunt of mayor and bewindhebber Lucas Trip (1713-1883), who was discussed in the last chapter. As Lucas and Jan Gerhard were first cousins, and lived in the same city at the same time, chances are they knew each other. I have not found any archival sources to support this, however.

Leffert Thelen Hayunga (1749-1837) was a member of the Council of Curacao. He was...
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born in Marienhafe in Ostfriesland. He was married to Engelina Henrica Berghuijs (1761-1817), the daughter of Arnold Hindrik Berghuijs (1731-after 1786) and Cornelia van Iddekinge (1726-1786). Cornelia was Anthony Adriaan van Iddekinge's youngest sister. As his family has no prior ties to Groningen, it seems likely that he was able to connect the kinship network through his ties to the network around slavery.

ABOLITION

Although the first calls for the abolition of slavery came from the patriot faction at the end of the eighteenth century, the Anti-Slavery Movement did not gain momentum until the mid-nineteenth century. During the long nineteenth century a sense of progress and modernity developed in the West. It was a time of revolutions, stronger governments and social reform. Under influence of similar movements in the Anglo-Saxon World, several “humanitarian reform movements” arose in the Netherlands. These movements felt the need to address wrongdoings that, they argued, had no place in the civilized modern world. The motives were this were not entirely altruistic: it was also their goal to restore the reputation of those responsible. Among these the movements for temperance and the abolition of slavery were the earliest, and most prominent. The Dutch Anti-Slavery Movement arose in the early 1840’s, with the formation of local societies for the abolition of slavery. Roughly two factions existed within the movement: the orthodox Christians, those who would later found the Antirevolutionary Party, and the Liberals, who traced their ideological lineage to the Enlightenment and the Patriots.

The Anti-Slavery Movement in the Netherlands was heavily influenced by British Abolitionists, and by the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, founded in 1839, in particular. The call for the end of slavery was seen as politically highly controversial at the time in the Netherlands. The king had absolute power over colonial affairs, and any call for alterations in colonial policy could therefore be seen as a call for revolution. This prevented the formation of a national anti-slavery movement initially, which in turn made the local initiatives more important. The United Kingdom had abolished slavery in 1833, which had reignited the discussion of abolition in other countries. British abolitionists published the Anti-Slavery Reporter, a publication which was circulated in the Netherlands as well.

Cornelis Star Numan (1807-1857) was the grandson of slave owner Cornelis Star
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Lichtenvoort, whom I discussed in the previous chapter. Star Numan became a professor of Law at the University of Groningen in 1830, and he was elected Rector Magnificus of that university in 1834.\textsuperscript{241} Star Numan's personal archive at the Groninger Archieven provides insight into his abolitionist views.\textsuperscript{242} It contains several abolitionist pamphlets and publications, such as *The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter*.\textsuperscript{243} The editions found in his archive date from 1841-1842, when Cornelis was in his mid-thirties. In undated notes for a speech, he states that, even though people no longer say that slavery is “God's well-deserved punishment of the blacks, whose wrath may forever rest upon them”, they are still not prepared to “exterminate these ailments”.\textsuperscript{244} This shows that he was at least passively opposed to slavery, but it does not with certainty us whether he actively campaigned against it. It goes, therefore, perhaps a bit too far to call Cornelis Star Numan an abolitionist. On the other hand it is worth remarking that within two generations both the ownership of slaves, even in Groningen itself, and abolitionist views existed.

Cornelis married Octavia Cornelia Susanna van Swinderen (1806-1896), the sister of Gerard Regnier Gerlacius van Swinderen (1804-1879). As a member of the Senate, Van Swinderen voted for the abolition of slavery.\textsuperscript{245} Van Swinderen is the second and third great grandnephew of Bernard Gerlacius. Their common ancestors are Beerta Altingh and Tjaert Gerlacius, Gerard Regnier's parents. Bernard's brother Antonius is the third great grandfather of Gerard Regnier.

Soon after the calls for abolition rose around 1840, they died down again. The government argued that these calls would lead to a slave revolt and called on the abolitionists to do the responsible thing and halt their campaign. A few abolitionists continued to spread their beliefs in a different way. In Utrecht, a few of them, including university professor Jan Ackersdijk, decided to start a publishing house for anti-slavery propaganda.\textsuperscript{246} Their pamphlet was entitled the *Bijdragen tot kennis der Nederlandsche en Vreemde Koloniën, bijzonder betrekkelijk de Vrijlating der Slaven*.\textsuperscript{247} Prominent abolitionists from all over the Netherlands would join them as co-publishers to lend the publication credibility. Amongst hem was at least one from Groningen: Berend Wichers (1790-1876), a liberal politician. He was born in 1790 to Johanna Catharina Elisabeth van Iddekinge and Cornelis Wichers. His cousin by marriage was Willem Jan Quintus, son of Mayor of Groningen Justus Datho Quintus and Catharina Johanna Alberda van Ekestein. Governor of Surinam Jan Gehradt Wichers was his first cousin. Their common ancestors were Johan Wichers and Elisabeth Sophia Trip,
grandparents. Elisabeth Sophia was the daughter of Louis Trip, lord of the Warffumborg, who is discussed in the previous chapter. Both Berend and Jan Gerhard were also related to Gerard Regnier Gerlacius van Swinderen (1804-1879), as Beerta Altingh and Tjaert Gerlacius were their common ancestors. As a member of parlement, Gerard Regnier voted for the abolition of slavery. Berend was closely related to the most prominent families of Groningen at the time, from both the circles of the urban elite and the rural nobility. He practiced law until he became a member of parliament in 1844. In 1847 he is one of 143 co-publishers of Bijdragen. He voted for the abolition of slavery.

**OWNERSHIP AND COMPENSATION**

In the previous chapter I discussed the case of Reint Alberda, who inherits stock in the WIC chamber in Rotterdam from his mother's family. I argued that he should not be on the list of those directly connected to slavery, because he did not actively engage with slavery, slave trade, abolition, or anything related to these subjects. When slavery was abolished in 1863, owners of slaves were compensated for their “loss of capital”. Even though many of those compensated did not pursue their share in plantations, and many came by them the same way Reint Alberda did, I have chosen to discuss these people, as they directly profited from the (abolition of) slavery.

Six members of the Feith family can be found on the list of compensated slave owners, and two others who are directly connected to the Feith family. All six own shares in plantation 't IJland in Surinam. Three were descendants of Hendrik Octavius Feith (1778-1849), the head archivist in Groningen: daughter Hillegonda Adriana Feith (1802-1873) and son Hendrik Octavius Feith II (1813-1895). Hendrik Octavius II succeeded his father as head archivist. His son, Johan Adriaan Feith (1822-1897), followed in his footsteps as well, and became the most famous archivist of the archives in Groningen to date. These three all owned a share of 2/1764. The three others were children of Hendrik Octavius' brother, Berend Hendrik (1790-1825): Octavia Feith (1815-?), son Rhijnvis Feith (1822-1897) and daughter Elisabeth Machtilda Catharina Feith (1824-?) t IJland. The first two each held a share of 2/3528, while the third held a much larger share of 2/1764, the same as her cousins. How they got these shares is unclear. It is possible that they themselves invested in the plantation, but it is likely that they each inherited parts of what once was a larger share. One clue towards this comes from Ockje van Sandick (1810-1868), the daughter of Hendrik Octavius and Berend Hendrik's sister, Henriëtte Engelina Feith (1777-1851) and Onno Zwier van Sandick (1760-1822). She owned shares in three plantations: Rozenburgh (7/72); 't IJland (2/1764) and Mon Byou
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Her share in 't IJland (2/1764) is the same as her cousin's, which suggests that she also received part of the inheritance from which this share came. Onno Zwier van Sandick (1760-1822). Onno Zwier van Sandick Jr. (1805-1883). Onno Zwier van Sandick III (1837-1911). Another cousin, Ockje Meder (1808-1883), daughter of Octavia Bellina Feith (1774-1820) also holds a share of 2/1764 in 't IJland. All this suggests that the shares came from their common ancestors, Rhijnvis Feith (1753-1824) and Ockje Groeneveld (1748-1813). Even though they did, in all likelihood, not invest in the plantations, they did in fact own slaves, who were considered part of the inventory of the plantation, for which they were compensated financially when slavery was abolished in 1863.

CONCLUSIONS

When the WIC was dissolved in 1792, slavery did not end. Nor did Groningen's involvement with it. Governance of the colonies was taken over by various governmental institutions during the Batavian revolution, the French occupation and finally the newly founded Kingdom of the Netherlands. Many of those who held offices in these institutions were from, or related to families which had previously been involved with the WIC.

Although the calls for the abolition of slavery first started in the eighteenth century, it was not until the 1840's that a serious abolitionist movement gained momentum in the Netherlands. Involved in this movement were several Groningers, such as Cornelis Star Lichtenvoort, who came from a family that was actively involved in slavery. Slave owners and abolitionists not seldom came from the same families, like in the case of Gerard Regnier Gerlacius van Swinderen and Berend Wichers both were related to bewindhebbers, investors in plantations and facilitators of slavery.
Conclusion

We have gone from the cold abstraction of network statistics to the concrete examples of the lives of those within the network. While most were only discussed briefly, some of these lives were illustrated in greater detail. These detailed give a glimpse of the attitudes these people held towards slavery, and their own involvement with it. These attitudes differed greatly. Take, for example, governor of Surinam Jan Gerhard Wichers: even though he was part of the institution that facilitated slavery, it can be argued that the enslaved benefited from his actions. On the other hand, people like Thomas van Seeratt considered the enslaved no more than merchandise.

The quantitative analysis and interactive visualization of the network presented in the first part of this research help gain insight into the historical sources. They enabled the discovery of connections that would otherwise be impossible to find. Furthermore, they help to better understand the empirical material itself. In other words: by showing the people and structures on screen, and by being able to browse through them using the mouse and keyboard, additional information can be extracted from the associated historical sources. Because of the newly gained insight into the vast and complex kinship network around slavery, historical facts that would otherwise seem trivial can become meaningful. For example, the fact that someone owns a tiny share in a plantation may not seem like too big a deal, but the fact that they are connected to the kinship network around slavery makes this fact all the more significant. Another example is that of the abolitionist pamphlets in the archive of Cornelis Star Numan. The pamphlet by itself would be of little significance, if we did not know that among his forefathers were a slave owner and a sea captain who facilitated slavery.

These connections show that there was a closely knit kinship network around most of those connected to transatlantic slavery in Groningen. This network arose through two distinct but analogous developments: on the one hand are several groups, already connected through kinship, of which several members become connected to slavery. On the other hand there are those connected to slavery, who become connected to the kinship network. In both cases affiliation with one network leads to affiliation with the other.

This research has shown that there is both continuity and change within the kinship network around slavery. Continuity with regard to the structure of the network, which changed very little throughout the period, and if it did, it was always quite gradually. Kinship played an important role in the network around transatlantic slavery in Groningen. The primary reason for this is that
Groningen was a very oligarchised society, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As Altingh argues in his *Pilaren ende Peerlen*, the elite in Groningen wanted to gather prestige through the attaining first wealth, then luxury, then political power. All these things could in some form be achieved through involvement with slavery. Unsurprisingly, the network was always dominated by the regional elite.

The network around slavery and the kinship network were mutually constructive: kinship ties were formed with others in the network around slavery, and the involvement with slavery spread through the kinship network. Some newcomers don't manage, or choose to marry into the network. This usually leads to the connection to slavery being lost over generations.

It is common to see various modes and levels of involvement with slavery within one family. For example, one generation could facilitate slavery through military service in the colonies. The next generation could be involved with governance through institutions such as the WIC. The next generations could directly own slaves at plantations or even in Groningen. And finally, the next generation could be involved with abolitionism. This example is inspired by the Star/Star Lichtenvoort/Star Numan family, but there was a similar situation in the Wichers family.

Contrasting the stability of the structures within the kinship networks is the instability of the institutions discussed. The most notable change is that of the role of the nobility: while fundamental at the start of the WIC, the families of the old rural nobility had nearly died out in the nineteenth century, and played a much more modest role resultantly. This made way for a more prominent role of the urban elite. The network became more open and accessible, but at the same time less interconnected and unified, as time passed. Only a few of those involved with slavery in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century were not connected to the network by kinship, while this becomes more common later on. People met each other through both the networks of kinship, and those around transatlantic slavery, which caused them to interconnect. As the ties to slavery lost their strength after the end of the second WIC, so did the ties of the kinship network.

I found it startling how the little known history of Groningen's involvement with slavery, time and again collides and overlaps with the general political history of the region. While many works about individuals in the above elite networks have been published over the years, very few mention ties to slavery. It is clear now, that in certain parts of the regional elite of Groningen, involvement with slavery was commonplace.

The database that was constructed for this research has not been analyzed to its full potential yet, as that is beyond the scope this research. Only a select few lines, as illustrative cases, were described, while there are many more to explore. The database could also yield new insights when combined with other relevant data. For example, when combined with geographical data, it could
give insight into which specific areas of the province and city of Groningen were more involved with slavery than others. If this analysis is done diachronically, it could also show that certain areas are more involved in certain periods, and others in other periods. For example, the rural nobility was more involved with slavery in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century than it was later on. This group was often based in Borgen in the northern and northwest areas of the province. Later on, these groups also mix with the urban elite, and the focus shifts more and more towards the city. Further analysis would give a more detailed image of this.

The focus of this research was solely on kinship connections, while there are many other connections that could be added to the database to give a more complete image of the social networks around slavery in Groningen. I have discussed several business and social connections that were not accompanied by social connections, such as between Thomas van Seeratt and Onno Tamminga van Alberda, or between William Butler and the Trip family. There are also several professional and political connections within the network. Further analysis of such connections, compared to kinship connections would give further insight into the unique role kinship played in this social network.

This research focused on the structures of the network itself: whether or not people were connected through kinship, and what kind of kinship relations coincided with relations through the network around transatlantic slavery. Further research should be done into more qualitative aspects of the network. Analysis into the exact nature of relations would greatly improve the insight into the dynamics of the kinship network.

Ideally, the network should be made even more complete. Based on family names and existing connections, many connections can still be made between those in the network. This requires further archival research. Finally, improvements should be made to the interactive visualizations of the network. I already discussed those improvements should be in the first section of this research. Enhanced visualizations enable the discovery of new structures and anomalies within the network.

As stated before, this research provides a starting point. It identifies structures of and within kinship networks around transatlantic slavery; it provides insight into how one gets involved with slavery, who can get involved and who cannot. Most importantly, it shows that involvement with transatlantic slavery was widespread in both the city and province of Groningen.
Appendix one: Glossary

Jonker: (Male) member of the rural provincial nobility of Groningen. Often owns a "Borg", from which, rather than his noble descent, he derives his rights.

Borg: a country house that has certain noble rights associated with it. Usually owned by a “Jonker”.

Veenborg: a country house for the elite, usually built in the seventeenth or eighteenth century. Not a true “borg” as it did not have any noble rights associated with it.

Gezworene meente: the early modern version of today's “gemeenteraad” or city council. Members were called “gezwoerenen”.

Burgemeester: Mayor, in the case of this research usually of the city of Groningen. Until 1824, Groningen had four mayors, with the exception of 1795-1803, when the city was governed by a revolutionary committee; 1808-1811 and 1815, when the city had two mayors; and 1811-1814, when it had only one.

Raadsheer: the early modern equivalent to today's “wethouder”. The approximate English equivalent is an alderman. 14 raadsmannen and 4 burgemeesters were jointly responsible for governing the city of Groningen.

Rekenmeester: city accountant.

Bewindhebber: directors of the chambers of the WIC (and VOC).

Hoofdman: the president of the city civic guard, the schutterij. This was a prestigious and influential function in the city.

Taalman: lawyer, counselor or sollicitor.

Stad: The city of Groningen is de facto the only city in the province of Groningen. Strictly speaking Appingedam also has (Fryian) city rights, but Groningen has always functioned as the urban center of the province. This has lead to the city colloquially being called “Stad”, or “city” in most of the province, and even parts of Drenthe and Friesland.

Stad en Lande: The name of the WIC chamber in Groningen. Also a name for the province of Groningen, meaning “City and (surrounding) lands”. Variation: Stad en Ommeland. Also see Ommelanden.

Ommelanden: this term refers to the areas of Westerkwartier (1), Hunsingo (2) and Fivelingo (3) to North-West of the city of Groningen. See map below.
Illustration 4: Map of the province of Groningen. (1) Westerkwartier; (2) Hunsinga; (3) Fivelingo; (4) Oldamt; (5) Westerwolde; (6) Stad Groningen and Gorecht.
Appendix two: list of those connected to slavery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I0562</td>
<td>Alberda van Bloemersma, Edzard Reint</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0965</td>
<td>Alberda, Gerhard Willems</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0514</td>
<td>Alberda, Mello</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0027</td>
<td>Alberda, Mello</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1037</td>
<td>Alberti, Daniël</td>
<td>about 1620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0706</td>
<td>Aldringa, Jebbe</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>after 1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0565</td>
<td>Aldringa, Wibbe</td>
<td>about 1600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0893</td>
<td>Altingh, Joachim</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0896</td>
<td>Altingh, Menso</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0996</td>
<td>Altingh, Menso</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0003</td>
<td>Appius, Jacob</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0934</td>
<td>Baurmeister, Willem</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0577</td>
<td>Berchuïjs, Pieter Lamberts</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1256</td>
<td>Blencke, Abraham</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1264</td>
<td>Blencke, Gerrit</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1262</td>
<td>Blencke, Gerrit</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1271</td>
<td>Blencke, Henrick</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0640</td>
<td>Bothenius, Louis</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0170</td>
<td>Busch, Reneke</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Butler, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1179</td>
<td>Celos, Johan</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0277</td>
<td>Clant, Edzard Jacob</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0281</td>
<td>Clant, Egbert</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0621</td>
<td>Clant, Eppo</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>about 1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0036</td>
<td>Coenders Lewe, Abel</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1185</td>
<td>Coenders van Helpen, Berend</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1234</td>
<td>Coenders, Albert</td>
<td>about 1590</td>
<td>1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0114</td>
<td>Conring, Andreas</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0785</td>
<td>de Drews, Johan</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0781</td>
<td>de Drews, Johan</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0787</td>
<td>de Drews, Johan</td>
<td>about 1599</td>
<td>about 1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0001</td>
<td>de Graaff, Arij</td>
<td>about 1729</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0023</td>
<td>de Graaff, Arij Martinus</td>
<td>about 1729</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0022</td>
<td>de Graaff, Martinus</td>
<td>about 1729</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0174</td>
<td>de Marees, Reneke Busch</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1329</td>
<td>de Mepsche, Gerhard</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0712</td>
<td>de Mepsche, Rudolph</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1333</td>
<td>de Mepsche, Rudolph</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0881</td>
<td>de Savornin Lohman, Maurits Adriaan</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0571</td>
<td>de Sighers, Albert</td>
<td>about 1609</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0567</td>
<td>de Sighers, Sigher</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0321</td>
<td>de Valcke, Joost</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1112</td>
<td>de Vos van Steenwijk, Arend Godert</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0979</td>
<td>Eeck, Johan</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1055</td>
<td>Eeck, Johan</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0971</td>
<td>Eeck, Johan</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0969</td>
<td>Eeck, Sicco</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0639</td>
<td>Ehrenreiter, Erhard</td>
<td>about 1570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0358</td>
<td>Emmen, Lambert Hendrik</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0551</td>
<td>Emmen, Rudolph</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1060</td>
<td>Emmen, Warner</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0335</td>
<td>Emmius, Samuel</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0333</td>
<td>Emmius, Wessel</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1162</td>
<td>Entens, Hillebrandt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1204</td>
<td>Eyben, Hieronymus</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0234</td>
<td>Feith, Elisabeth Machtilda Catharina</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0218</td>
<td>Feith, Hendrik Octavius</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0214</td>
<td>Feith, Hillegonda Adriana</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0225</td>
<td>Feith, Johan Adriaan</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0233</td>
<td>Feith, Octavia</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0235</td>
<td>Feith, Rhijnvis</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1217</td>
<td>Folckers, Folckert</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0766</td>
<td>Folckers, Jan Willem</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0299</td>
<td>Gaykinga, Allert</td>
<td></td>
<td>about 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0812</td>
<td>Geertsema, Johan</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0914</td>
<td>Gerlaciutis, Bernard</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0607</td>
<td>Gockinga, Scato</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0685</td>
<td>Gockinga, Scato Ludolph</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0831</td>
<td>Graafland, Joan</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1357</td>
<td>Groenhoff, Dirk</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0724</td>
<td>Gruis van Lellens, Hilbrandt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1242</td>
<td>Gruis van Wirdum, Hillebrandt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0738</td>
<td>Gruis, Berend</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0741</td>
<td>Gruis, Elteke</td>
<td></td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1077</td>
<td>Gruis, Geert</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0735</td>
<td>Gruis, Hilbrandt</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0559</td>
<td>Hayunga, Leffert Thelem</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0902</td>
<td>Hoeth, Albert Willem</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0925</td>
<td>Hooffman, Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td>before 1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0959</td>
<td>Horekken, Egbert</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0958</td>
<td>Horekken, Geert</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0961</td>
<td>Horekken, Johan</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1064</td>
<td>Isebrants, Johan</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1066</td>
<td>Isebrants, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1181</td>
<td>Jansen, Berent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0311</td>
<td>Julsingh, Bernard</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>1647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0942</td>
<td>Junius, Franciscus</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0865</td>
<td>Keiser, Gerhard Jacob</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0714</td>
<td>L'argentier du Chesnoy, Daniel Henri</td>
<td></td>
<td>1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0843</td>
<td>Laman, Paulus</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0716</td>
<td>Lewe van Aduard, Evert Joost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0037</td>
<td>Lewe van Asinga, Evert</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0718</td>
<td>Lewe van Hoogkerk, Evert Joost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0775</td>
<td>Lewe van Middelstum, Edzard Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0438</td>
<td>Lewe van Middelstum, Reint Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0002</td>
<td>Lindenberg, Jurriaan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0919</td>
<td>Ludolph, Ludolph</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0238</td>
<td>Meder, Ockje</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1272</td>
<td>Mulder, Gijsbertus Hermannus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0836</td>
<td>Mulerius, Nicolaus</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0838</td>
<td>Mulerius, Petrus</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0754</td>
<td>Muntinghe, Harmannus</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0755</td>
<td>Muntinghe, Hendrik</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1001</td>
<td>Pott, Petrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0140</td>
<td>Pringle, Maria Anna</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0442</td>
<td>Rengers van Farmsum, Egbert</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0769</td>
<td>Rengers van Farmsum, Lammert Schotto</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1225</td>
<td>Rengers, Johan Rempt</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0930</td>
<td>Rengers, Osebrand Johan</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1056</td>
<td>Ripperda, Gijsbert Harman</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1202</td>
<td>Rufelaert, Johan</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0241</td>
<td>Sandick, Ockje van</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0240</td>
<td>Sandick, Onno Zwier van</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0987</td>
<td>Schaij, Cornelis</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1246</td>
<td>Scharff, Diderick</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1238</td>
<td>Schonenborgh, Hendrik</td>
<td></td>
<td>about 1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1239</td>
<td>Schonenborgh, Wolter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0274</td>
<td>Sibenius, Andreas</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0663</td>
<td>Siccama, Wiardus</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0665</td>
<td>Siccama, Wiardus</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0007</td>
<td>Sichterman, Arend Ludolf</td>
<td></td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0111</td>
<td>Sichterman, Gerard</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0110</td>
<td>Sichterman, Jan Albert</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0469</td>
<td>Sickinghe, Johan</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0758</td>
<td>Sickinghe, Rembt Tobias</td>
<td></td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0473</td>
<td>Sickinghe, Roelof</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0057</td>
<td>Star Lichtenvoort</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0053</td>
<td>Star Numan, Cornelis</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0747</td>
<td>Star, Enno Doedens</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>1707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1177</td>
<td>Swarte, Gerard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0005</td>
<td>Tamminga van Alberda, Onno</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0966</td>
<td>Tamminga, Eilco</td>
<td>about 1655</td>
<td>about 1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0448</td>
<td>Tamminga, Onno</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0029</td>
<td>Tamminga, Onno</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0453</td>
<td>Tamminga, Onno</td>
<td>about 1577</td>
<td>about 1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0449</td>
<td>Tamminga, Schotto</td>
<td>about 1620</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1160</td>
<td>ten Berge, Gerhard</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1078</td>
<td>ten Berge, Gerhard Hindrik</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0750</td>
<td>ter Borgh, Ajolt Jan</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1172</td>
<td>Tjarda van Starkenborgh, Lambert</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0502</td>
<td>Tjassens, Cornelius</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0797</td>
<td>Trip, Hendrik</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0995</td>
<td>Trip, Lucas</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0916</td>
<td>van Borek, Willem</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0878</td>
<td>van Bulderen, Hendrik Gerrit</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1240</td>
<td>van Cleve, Joost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0049</td>
<td>van Ewsum, Anna</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0730</td>
<td>van Ewsum, Christoffer</td>
<td>about 1600</td>
<td>1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0725</td>
<td>van Ewsum, Ulrich</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>1706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1199</td>
<td>van Heeck, Hindrick</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0955</td>
<td>van Heeck, Johan Viglius</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0806</td>
<td>van Hoorn, Johan</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0183</td>
<td>van Iddekinge, Anthony Adriaan</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Death Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10187</td>
<td>van Iddekinge, Pieter Rembt</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10759</td>
<td>van Iddekinge, Pieter Rembt Antonic</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10692</td>
<td>van Iddekinge, Rembt</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10186</td>
<td>van Iddekinge, Tjaart Anthony</td>
<td>about 1756</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10688</td>
<td>van Iddekinge, Tobias</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10052</td>
<td>van Inn- en Kniphuisen, Caral Ferdinand</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10783</td>
<td>van Julsinga, Johan</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11120</td>
<td>van Nijveen, Arnold</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11122</td>
<td>van Nijveen, Hugo</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10458</td>
<td>van Royen, Cornelijs</td>
<td>about 1626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10457</td>
<td>van Royen, Hendrik</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>van Secratt, Thomas</td>
<td>about 1676</td>
<td>1736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10793</td>
<td>van Sijsen, Hendrik</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10800</td>
<td>van Sijsen, Hendrik</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11174</td>
<td>van Starkenborgh, Allard</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10820</td>
<td>van Swinderen, Gerard Regnier Gerlacus</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10795</td>
<td>van Swinderen, Wicher</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10245</td>
<td>van Viersen, Willem</td>
<td>about 1583</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10595</td>
<td>Veldtman, Hendrik</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10596</td>
<td>Veldtman, Hindrik</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10697</td>
<td>Verrucius, Gerlacus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10695</td>
<td>Verrucius, Julius</td>
<td>about 1620</td>
<td>1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10047</td>
<td>von Freitagh, Margaretha Beata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10348</td>
<td>Werumeus, Cebes</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10350</td>
<td>Werumeus, Hendricus</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11244</td>
<td>Wicheringe, Bartolt</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10390</td>
<td>Wichers, Berend</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10492</td>
<td>Wichers, Hendrik Ludolf</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10160</td>
<td>Wichers, Jan Gerhard</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10539</td>
<td>Wichers, Johan</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11159</td>
<td>Wijchgel, Rengenier Lodewijk</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11241</td>
<td>Wijfferinghe, Albert</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10526</td>
<td>Wildervanck, Everhard</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10144</td>
<td>Wolthers, Harmen</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10990</td>
<td>Wolthers, Wolter</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11348</td>
<td>Woortman, Hendrik</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10412</td>
<td>Woortman, Jan</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>before 1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10410</td>
<td>Woortman, Pieter</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10413</td>
<td>Woortman, Pieter</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-printed sources

The following family and house archives were consulted:

RHC GrA 521 Familie Gruijs 1423 – 1834

RHC GrA 552 Familie Van Swinderen en De Marees van Swinderen, 1370 – 1982

RHC GrA 590 Familie Verrucius-Emmen 1458 – 1806

RHC GrA 598 Familie Wolthers, 1470 – 1917

RHC GrA 619 Borg Farmsum, 1246 – 1912

RHC GrA 622 Borg Lulema, 1400 – 1900

RHC GrA 623 Menkemaborg en Dijkstra'shuis (1), 1465 – 1901

RHC GrA 983 Leden van de familie Dronrijp en Radijs, 1661 – 1876

RHC GrA 1029 Familie Quintus Lewe, 1596 – 1779

RHC GrA 2097 Familie Numan

Also consulted at the RHC GrA:

Aangifteboek overledenen met minderjarige kinderen 1768-1808 Kerkelijke gemeente - Groningen Collectie DTB (toegang 1462) Inventarisnummer 13

Algemene doopboeken 1640-1778 Kerkelijke gemeente - Groningen Collectie DTB (toegang 124) Inventarisnummers 146-151

Breukdodenboek 1729-1794 Kerkelijke gemeente - Groningen Collectie DTB (toegang 124) Inventarisnummer 194

Doop- en trouwboeken of various municipalities including Groningen, Noordlaren, Adorp and Harssens, Wirdum, Veendam and Loppersum.

Groningen - Register van huwelijkscontracten Groningen Collectie huwelijkscontracten (toegang 1534)

Ondertrouwboeken 1611-1769 Kerkelijke gemeente - Groningen Collectie DTB (toegang 124) Inventarisnummers 159-182

RHC GrA 755 Historische verzameling (RAG)

2241 Losse stukken Register Feith, meest charters, 1246 – 1864

Consulted genealogies (non-printed)

RHC GrA 598 Familie Wolthers, 1470 – 1917

1. Tabellen en aanteekeningen van genealogischen aard betreffende de geslachten Wolthers, Broxes, Celos(se), Conring, Emminus, Sijgers, Trip, Van Wingene; Crans, Warmoldt, Altingh,
Suur, Frix, Straakholt, Van Buttingha, Sichterman, Van Swinderen, 18de en 19de eeuw
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Printed and online sources; literature

Alting, Bernhard. De pilaren, ende peerlen van Groningen: tractaat, bethone ende waer op de welvaert van die stad is staende, ende waer door syn meest is geciert. Tot Groningen: Gedrukt by Samuel Pieman ..., 1648.


Janse, Maartje J. “De afschaffers: publieke opinie, organisatie en politiek in Nederland 1840-1880.” _Wereldbibliotheek], 2007_.


Meer, J.K.H. van der. “‘Ten voorbeeld van het nageslacht’, of het wedervaren van het Groningse
“Ten voorbeeld van het nageslacht’, of het wedervaren van het Groningse burgemeestersgezin Van Iddekinge, voornamelijk in de tweede helft van de 18e eeuw.”


Resolutien van Holland, 1654.


*Zaaken van Staat en Oorlog, betreff. de Vereenigde Nederlanden, zedert het begin van het jaar 1780 (tot nov. 1786),* 1792.