

essed great natural talents, but that he also knew how to use them. His long captivity may have unfitted him somewhat for the society of his friends in England. He may have been a hard master and a moody companion. We do not know enough to judge exactly what manner of man he was. But we do know enough to be convinced that in spite of all his faults his record during those rough, adventurous times was one not at all unworthy of the English name.

THE LORENZ FAMILY OF CEYLON.

[BY F. H. DE VOS.]

It is stated that the father of Johann Friederich Wilhelm Lorenz was Johann Andree Lorenz, a Captain of the Cuirassiers, who died in 1777. This is probably true, but needs verification in view of the fact that the eldest son of J. F. Lorenz is not called after the child's paternal grandfather—a practice quite general in those days. But as both writers, Mr. Leopold Ludovici (?) and Mr. Francis Beven, have independently arrived at the same conclusion, there is perhaps not much room for serious doubt on this question.

Johann Friederich Wilhelm Lorenz lies buried in the Dutch cemetery of Galle. The following is the epitaph on his tombstone:—

SACRED TO THE MEMORY

OF

JOHANN FRIEDRICH WILHELM LORENZ,

LATE SITTING MAGISTRATE OF MATARA.

BORN AT TEMPELBERG IN PRUSSIAN POMERANIA

25 JUNE 1772.

DIED AT GALLE 3 MAY 1845.

Below the inscription there is engraved a circle with the motto "Labor omnia vincit", within the circle a dexter arm

1. Ceylon Quarterly Magazine, September, 1871 p. 91.; Journal of the Ceylon University Association, Vol. I., No. 4, p. 294.

holding a scimitar.² Whether this has any heraldic significance I am not aware; but it is a curious circumstance that this is a charge which is found in the arms of both the Roosmale Cocq and Leembruggen families; and the first wife of Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Lorenz was Susanna Wilhelmina Roosmale Cocq, the daughter of Petrus Jacobus Roosmale Cocq and Susanna Henrietta Leembruggen. However, this is a matter I leave to others better versed in heraldry than myself to explain. I would however venture to suggest a comparison of the seal used by Mr. Lorenz with the engraving on the stone as a possible solution. Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Lorenz was thrice married: (1) on the 12 July 1801 at Galle to Susanna Wilhelmina Roosmale Cocq of Galle; (2) on the 29 March 1805 at Galle to Maria Elisabeth Andreae of Cochin; and (3) on the 21 September 1813 at Matara to Anna Petronella Smith. His first wife was born at Galle in 1784 and died on the 7 May 1803. She was the daughter of Petrus Jacobus Roosmale Cocq of Doocum in Friesland and Susanna Henrietta Leembruggen.³ Petrus Jacobus Roosmale Cocq died as Sitting Magistrate of Amblangodde 15 August 1813. He was the son of Capt. Pieter Ambrosius Roosmale Cocq, also of Doocum. The name, as the quarterings on his arms indicate, was due to an alliance between a Mr. Cocq and a Miss Roosmale. As regards Susanna Henrietta Leembruggen, she was born at Nagapatnam 31 July 1766, being the daughter of Henricus Leembruggen of Leyden, the Chief of the Cinnamon Department, by his third wife Dorothea Maria Dies, born at Colombo 1742, the daughter of Johann Heinrich Dies of Hildesheim and Maria Wilhelmina Blom of Colombo. Her half sister Petronella Jacoba Leembruggen was the wife of Nicolaas Tadema, Chief of Pulicat.⁴ The latter, as the arms indicate, was of the same family as the great painter Alma Tadema. Maria Elisabeth Andreae, born at Cochin 10 January 1788, died at Galle 22 April 1809, was the daughter of Capt. Johann Friedrich Andreae of Golding (born 5 March 1752,

2. The design here referred to, which we remember seeing when it was quite distinct on the stone, was a crest—a dexter arm in armour embowed, couped at the shoulder, the hand grasping a battle axe, with the motto in a garter. We do not believe this has any connection with either the Leembruggen or Roosmale Cocq crests.—*Editor*.

3. Aanzienlijke Nederlandsche Familien.—*Voorsterman van Oyen*.

4. Monumental Remains of the Dutch East India Company (Madras Presidency) page 35.—Alexander Rea, Inscriptions on Tombs (Madras.) J.J. Cotton, page 195.

died at Galle 4 July 1790, and buried in the Dutch Reformed Church, Galle) by his wife Josina Magdalena van Haren of Cochin, who married secondly at Galle 27 February 1791 Dirk Haating. She was no doubt the daughter of Reynier van Haren^s of Campen, Hoof Administrateur of Cochin (born 12 December 1734, and died there 16 March 1789). The arms on his tombstone are:—Argent, a fesse chequy gules and sable.

Anna Petronella Smith was the daughter of Johan Gabriel Smith and Helena Catharina Ernst (born 1775), daughter of George Nicolaas Ernst of Neustadt on the Aisch.

The children of the first marriage were:—

1. Henrietta Rudolphina Lorenz, born 1802.
2. Louis Charles Constantyn Lorenz, born at Calpentyn 12 Jan. 1803.

Both these children died young.

The children of the second marriage were:—

1. Johanna Wilhelmina Justina Lorenz, born 4 Jan. 1806.
2. Anna Sophia Carolina Lorenz, born 24 Dec. 1807.

Johanna Wilhelmina Justina Lorenz was married at Matara on the 24 Nov. 1834 to Petrus Jacobus Ludovici, Secretary of the District Court of Galle, born 3 Feb. 1791, died July 1875. He was the son of Jan Hendrick Ludovici of Amsterdam, Garrison Surgeon, Matara, and Gertruida Rudolphina Hoffman, the daughter of Christoffel Wilhelm Hoffman of Berlin and Johanna Margareta Meurling, who was the daughter of Johannes Meurling of Westerwick (Sweden). Jan Hendrick Ludovici was the son of Laurens Ludovici of Markt Elback by his wife Johanna Margareta Elisebeen Westernhoff of Fustenuw. Anna Sophia Carolina Lorenz married at Matara 24 Nov. 1829 Charles Alexander van der Straaten. He was the son of Pieter Engelbert van der Straaten, boekhouder in the Dutch service, and Maria Elizabeth Kriekenbeek, and grandson of Engelbert van der Straaten of Singen and Susanna Thysz.

The children of the third marriage were:—

1. Margareta Frederica Wilhelmina Lorenz, born 25 Aug. 1814, died 16 July 1857. Married on the 6 March 1832 Andreas Everardus Andree.
2. Lucilla Charlotta Henrietta Lorenz, born 22 Aug. 1815, died 21 Nov. 1890. Married 24 July 1837 Adolphus

Wilhelmus Andree, widower of Thomasia Dorothea Adriana Poulrier.

3. Nancy Catharina Louisa Lorenz, born 20 Sept. 1816.
4. Adelaide Amelia Lorenz, born 20 Nov. 1817. Married George Poulrier, born at Matara 1816.
5. Adriana Charlotte Henrietta Lorenz, born 29 June 1819. Married 26 Nov. 1840 John William Ebert.
6. Harriet Agnes Lorenz, born 12 Dec. 1820. Married John Drieberg.
7. Georgiana Elizabeth Lorenz, born 16 Jan. 1824, died 9 July 1825.
8. John Fredrick Lorenz, born 5 Jan. 1827.
9. Charles Ambrose Lionel Lorenz, born at Matara 8 July 1829, died at Colombo 9 August 1871. Married Ellen Nell.

Andreas Everhardus Andree and Adolphus Wilhelmus Andree were the sons of Willem Hendrik Andree and Clara Elizabeth van Hoven, and grandsons of Fredrik Andree of Selles and Anne Maria Douwe of Colombo. George Poulrier and Thomasia Dorothea Adriana Poulrier were children of Gerrit Joan Poulrier, Sitting Magistrate of Belligam, and Anna Catharina de Vos. The great-grandfather of Gerrit Joan Poulrier, Arnout Poulrier of Bergen-op-zoom was the original settler in Ceylon, having come out in 1714 in the ship *Schooneval*.

John Willem Ebert, born 4 May 1811, was the son of Pieter Johannes Ebert and Anna Cornelia Mack and grandson of Rycloff Johannes Ebert, Sitting Magistrate of Kalutara, and Susanna van der Laan. The grandfather of Rycloff Johannes Ebert was the settler in Ceylon. He was George Golfried Ebert of Aarneburg (Brandenburg).

John Drieberg, born 17 May 1809, married at Matara 13 July 1841 Harriet Agnes Lorenz. He was the son of Gerard Johan Willem Drieberg and Amelia Frederica de Wolff, and grandson of Johannes Gerrardus Drieberg and Johannes Catharina Horn.

John Frederick Lorenz married..... La Brooy and died without issue.

Of Charles Ambrose Lionel Lorenz and his public life I have nothing to add to what has already been written about him in the Magazines already referred to. We are at present concerned with genealogical details. The sponsors at his baptism were Robert Charles Roosmale Cocq, Jacobus Ambrosius Roosmale Cocq, Maria Theresia de Leeuw, widow

Elsenhans, and Anna Sophia Carolina Lorenz. His wife Eleanor Nell was the daughter of George Michael Nell and Marie Elizabeth Conderlag, and granddaughter of Frederick August Neil of the Cape of Good Hope. Maria Elizabeth Conderlag, born 1865, was the daughter of Johan Frederick Conderlag and Elizabeth Erfson, and granddaughter of Johannes Conderlag of Hesse Cassel and Susanna Louisa Giller.

THE CAPTURE OF THE BRIEL.

1572.

[BY R. G. ANTHONISZ.]

The capture of the fortress of the Briel by the *Watergeuzen*, or Beggars of the Sea, in 1572, has been referred to by Miss Pieters in the "Sketches of Dutch History" appearing in the pages of this Journal. The event was one of so much importance in the struggle for freedom which formed the basis of the Eighty Years' War, that the story has been told and retold by Dutch writers as a prominent episode in the history of that war. English readers have had it graphically described to them by Motley in his "Rise of the Dutch Republic". Yet, as many of the members of the Dutch Burgher Union have perhaps never had the time or the opportunity for a study of the subject, a concise account of this memorable exploit of the Beggars of the Sea may not be considered out of place here.

The Briel is a town in the Island of Voorn, to the southwest of the Province of Holland, at the mouth of river Maas. The name is said to be derived from two words: *breede*, broad, and *heel*, from Helium, the Roman name for the Rhine, which was broadest at this spot after its junction with the Maas. *Breede-heel*, gradually modified into *Brecheel* and *Brehiel*, at length assumed its present form *Briel*, in the same way as Breda was derived from *Breed-aa*, on the river Aa. A glance at the map will shew the favourable position which the Briel occupied for strategical purposes and its value to either party in time of war.

At the time of its capture by the Beggars of the Sea the Prince of Orange had not a foot of land in the Netherlands. The Duke of Alva had so made himself master of the country

that the Prince, deserted by his mutinous soldiers, had to leave it to its fate. Alva may well have considered himself undisputed ruler of the Netherlands, but one matter gave him cause for much uneasiness. He had promised the King of Spain that he would speedily cause a stream of gold a yard deep to flow into Spain out of the forfeited goods of those who were to be condemned, but none of this could he yet see his way to accomplish. It was true hundreds of persons had been brought to the scaffold and all their possessions poured into the Treasury, but the maintenance of the large army and the needful expenses of the Government demanded more than he could collect. He found that, instead of a surplus from which he hoped to redeem his promise to Philip, he was left sadly in want of funds. He could hardly apply to the States of the Netherlands to make up the deficit, nor did he consider it worthy of the King's representative to take such a course even if he could do so with a good grace. It was in this crisis that he devised the plan of raising the funds by the imposition of the three taxes of which so much has been said—viz., the hundredth, the twentieth, and the tenth penny. The hundredth penny, or one per cent. assessment on all property throughout the land, was to be levied at once and for all. The other two taxes were to be imposed, the one (the twentieth penny) on the sale of all immoveable property, and the other (the tenth penny) on the sale of all moveables. The hardship, especially of the two latter taxes, was so great that not a member of the States would approve of them. They all rightly judged that these impositions would be the ruin of all trade. Even those of the Dutch nobles who had otherwise supported every action of Alva's turned against him in this matter. But he was inexorable: the taxes must be levied at all costs. After much argument he was persuaded to defer the imposition of the twentieth and tenth penny for two years, the States paying him as commutation for this period a sum of two million guilders. But on the expiry of the two years he resumed his arbitrary demand and insisted that the taxes should be levied. He appears, however, not to have calculated on the opposition he would receive from the traders themselves. These worthy citizens, judging it impossible to carry on their several trades under the imposition of such oppressive taxes, suspended their business. As a consequence the inhabitants of the land were put to great straits. Bakers, brewers, and butchers closed their shops, and the people could hardly obtain the necessaries of life. Misery and