

# Journal of the Dutch Burgher Union of Ceylon.

"Eendracht Maakt Macht"

## CONTENTS

|  | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| 1. EDITOR'S NOTE .. ..   | 01          |
| 2. MUDALIYARDOM AROUND WOLFENDHAL<br>by J.R. Weinman .. ..   | 02          |
| 3. CRUWELL'S ASSAULT ON C.A. LORENZ<br>Examiner 14th October 1865 ..   | 07          |
| 4. GEORGE POULIER'S DESCRIPTION OF<br>CRUWELL'S HUMILIATING 'NEMESIS'<br>Colombo Observer, 2nd November, 1865<br>George E. Poulier .. .. | 10          |
| 5. THE LETTER OF RESIGNATION SENT<br>BY THE UNOFFICIAL MEMBER OF<br>THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL<br>by C. A. Lorenz and others ..             | 12          |
| 6. THE BURGHERS<br>by Percy Colin-Thomé .. ..  | 23          |
| 7. GENEALOGY OF THE FAMILY OF<br>VAN EYCK OF CEYLON<br>Compiled by Cherise Pereira ..  | 31          |
| 8. Dutch Burgher Union of Ceylon,<br>General Committee 1993-1994 ..  | 40          |

# Journal of the Dutch Burgher Union of Ceylon

---

Vol. LXVIII

JANUARY - DECEMBER, 1994

Nos. 1-4

---

## EDITOR'S NOTE

This year happened a most significant event. The ICOMOS (International Council On Monuments and Sites) of the Netherlands held a conference in Colombo in October 1993. This conference was a high powered one which included Dutch delegates led by Mr. J.M. Hingevel. No doubt the conference yielded valuable information about Dutch monuments and sites in Sri Lanka erected in Dutch times.

In the course of the conference, the President of the DBU, Mr. Harold Speldewinde, invited the Dutch delegates to a sumptuous dinner at the DBU hall in June 1993. This dinner was attended by about 50 Dutch delegates. It was also attended by a large number of DBU members. It was a highly successful evening spent by all.

The Dutch Embassy in Sri Lanka made it a point of publishing for a second time "the Furniture of the Dutch Period in Ceylon". This fluent work was originally published by Dr. R.L. Brohier and edited by Mr. P.H.D.H. de Silva, Director of the National Museum of Ceylon.

In January this year 1994 the DBU received a sum of Rs. 77,000/- from the Kandy Courts as a legacy from Dr. Lucien de Zilwa. We are ever grateful to him for his generosity.

## MUDALIYARDOM AROUND WOLFENDHAL \*

J. R. Weinman

Mudaliyardom flourished in and about Wolfendhal. Mudaliyardom worshipped in the Wolfendhal Church, but drifted away from Dutch Presbyterianism shortly after the British occupation. They, however, with the permission of the Consistory continued to worship there under the ministrations of the Rev. J.H. de Saram, an Anglican Clergyman. De Saram, was educated in England where he married an English lady. He was the ancestor of the present day Sarams. After some time the Anglican Bishop claimed the Church as the property of that community, but following a fierce controversy the claim was disallowed by the Secretary of State and no Anglican service was thereafter held there. The vaults of many leading Sinhalese families are in the small Church yard attached to the Church. James de Alwis, M.L.C. was buried there in his family vault. De Alwis lived at The Castle, Silver Smith Street. He was a most hospitable man and entertained lavishly. His wife, a sister of Sir Harry Dias, was a magnificent woman, handsome, dignified and stately, a veritable "grand dame". One saw gathered there men of distinction of all communities. Sir W.H. Gregory, Sir A.N. Birch, the Colonial Secretary, Sir John Douglas, the Auditor General used to dine there. Sir Edward Creasy, the great Chief Justice was a frequent caller. I have seen there the great Journalists, A.M. Ferguson of the "Observer", John Capper of the "Times" and "Lep" Ludovici of the "Examiner". The magnificent Udugaha Mudaliyar, father of Sir Solomon, his son-in-law to be, Mr. J.P. Obeyesekera, the finest

specimens of Ceylonese culture and learning, whose premature death was a distinct loss to the Island, William Alwis and his brother Tom, both men of great learning, but totally **Different in Temperament**, Sam Grenier toiling upwards to grasp the highest office in store for a Ceylonese lawyer, many others and the observed of all observers, C.A. Lorenz, one who was regarded by all with feelings akin to affection. On certain occasions, notably at the New Year, there was a long table laden with refreshments of all kinds for the visitors. Lower down the street was the Walauwa of the great Udugaha and opposite Abesinghe Walauwa, now owned by Sir Thomas de Sampayo. Up to the corner of Barber Street and Kurewe Street was the home of the Kurewe Mudaliyar, famous for its productive and profitable massang trees. Along Barber Street were other Walauwas and in Messenger Street stood the Walauwa of the courtly, Mr. Perera, Maha Mudaliyar. Green Street was the home of Edward Dias Bandaranaike, the glories of which are continued by his son. Opposite, "Peter" Maha Mudaliyar built a fine mansion and it was here that W.E. Davidson of the Civil Service, subsequently a Governor in Australia, in congratulating the lady of the house on her son's wedding, made in the vernacular what he thought was a happy remark "Sun and rain and the Fox's wedding" which so roused the old dame that she let herself go with such vigour that Davidson wished for the moment that she had not been born. It is not generally known that there was a detachment of the Ceylon Rifles stationed at Kotahena under the command of Major Stewart, the father of the Ceylon Stewarts. He and his son after him, the famous Stewart, lived and died in a home in Hill Street which later was owned by E.A. Van Der Straaten. New Chetty Street was the home of the Colombo Chetties whose rotund figures topped with tall horned hats and adorned with large ear-rings and **Picturesque Short Jackets** with gold buttons we seldom now see. Gone are those picturesque costumes. The high Gladstonian collars

\* One part of the series "What I Remember" which J. R. Weinman contributed to the *Ceylon Morning Leader*, this being from that of the 11th June 1927. The parts etched in bold print made up the sub-headings of this news item.

and the ample folds of linen round the neck worn by former Maha Mudaliyars, have given way to the exquisite cut of the Bond Street tailor! The old customs are going and even Kandyan Chiefs no longer eat with their fingers to the great grief of Sir Hugh Clifford. Brassfounder Street and nearby harboured shroffdom. There lived Namaswamy Mudliar, the father of N. Ratnasabapathy. His three daughters married Sir P. Arunachalam, P. Coomaraswamy his brother and M. Sathasewam who succeeded his father, Mylepulle, shroff of the Mercantile Bank. P. Muttucumar, a Proctor sharp as one of Gillette's razor blades, Catheravalu the famous shroff of the famous O.B.C., the generous shroff of the Madras Bank a victim of circumstances. It was his suggestion which Governor Gordon accepted that the Government should guarantee the O.B.C. notes when that bank closed its shutters. Ponnambalam and "Namy" and many others lived primitive lives there and amassed wealth. Their descendants have long left this locality and live in the most fashionable part of the Cinnamon Gardens. The European community lived along Union Place, Colpetty and Mutwal. George Wall at "The Cliff". The Armitages at Modera House, the Duncans at Uplands (the home of a famous tortoise said to have been born in Dutch times and subsequently removed to Victoria Park where it pined away.) David Wilson whose daughter Sir Richard Cayley married, M.L.C., who asked more questions than all the Northern members of the present day and unlike those members, was never satisfied with the answers, at Clive Lodge, John Prinz and after him Sam Grenier at Rock House where at one time lived Sir Hardinge Giffard, Lorenz at Elie House, Richard Morgan at Whist Bungalow. Every building except one has been demolished. The old streets have disappeared and a new Mutwal with batteries and docks and search lights has sprung up. **The Military Element Then Predominated** and considered themselves above every one else. The officers were not as sober as those of the present

day. There was a Beresford amongst them and he maintained the Waterford reputation for mischief. The climax was reached when they dragged a few carriages from the Pettah where they were kept for hire and ran them into the Fort Canal.

There was only one hotel in the Fort, the Royal Hotel. Galle Face boarding house as it was termed was a modern building which the late F.C. Loos a man who could always see far ahead purchased. Mount Lavana Hotel built by Sir Edward Barnes was described by Sir Emerson Tennant as half palace, half patch work. It was a white elephant in the hands of some of its proprietors before it began to pay. Colombo was in the track of the globe trotters. One of them returning from Kandy to Colombo in the early morning made the flesh of the English public creep with the startling news that he saw dead and dying men stretched out in the verandahs of Kayman's Gate. There were no slums or tenements in Colombo then and the boatmen and coolies used to have their slumbers alongside each other in the verandahs. The dying men were evidently awakening from their slumbers. The globe trotter recorded that he travelled with an intelligent and observant planter which explains everything.

Our amusements and recreations were few. Cricket was in the flapper stage. Football, golf, tennis were of course unknown. Boys indulged in a game called Gundoo Thattu and the only outing for the girls was Church and Sunday School. It was said when a young man did some courting the mother or maiden aunt sat at the other end of the verandah. It some time happened that the young man eventually married the mother, if a widow of course, or the maiden aunt. A circus was almost as rare a visitant as Halley's Comet. Men always spoke of a great circus of the past. Romanani's. He was an Italian who came here with two charming daughters over whom all Colombo

went mad. One of them **Was Carried Off by Gun Fraser** the Postmaster of Galle. Romamani saddled his best stallion and gave chase. At Kalutara or it may be Panadura he came up to a wedding house where a band from Colombo was entertaining the guests. The horse began immediately to caracole and circle to the music and the bandmen thinking this was a part of the entertainment blew a loud and yet a louder blast. The avenger's whip which Romamani carried was applied to its flanks in vain and when at last he reached his destination the marriage service had just concluded. This is the story told by the ancients of my day and it may be true. It is the fact, however, that Gun Fraser married one of the girls Teresa and left a family in the Island. The sister Louisa married one Tanner and their daughter is Mrs. Patrick Campbell who married Cornwallis West after he was divorced by his wife best known as Lady Randolph Churchill.

**J.R.W.**

## **CRUWELL'S ASSAULT ON C. A. LORENZ, AND HIS SUBSEQUENT HUMILIATION,**

**27 October, 1865**

### **1. Background**

In its issue of the 14 October 1865, the **Examiner** reported on the proceedings of a public meeting at the Kandy Library "to consider the recent appointment of the Unofficial Members of the Legislative Council." There were "upwards of 500 persons" present. Of the 112 names listed in the newspaper, our speculative estimates place 51 as British or European, 22 as Moor, 12 as Burgher, 14 as Sinhalese, while 13 could have been either Burgher or European.

Besides devoting 6 and one half columns to this report, the **Examiner** had a lengthy editorial on the subject. In the course of this editorial, the **Examiner** had this to say:

Departing from **the** object for which that meeting had been convened - a few rebellious gentlemen, with Mr. Cruwell for their leader, seem to have selected the occasion for the display of their violent political antipathies to the Ceylon League, and for exhausting their bottled-up indignation against the success which it is achieving. Mr. Cruwell, who came there with the merciless intention of inflicting on the assembly a rapid speech of some hours' duration, and which intention he almost succeeded in carrying out, .....

The editor proceeded to upbraid Cruwell (a planter, either A.S. Cruwell or Yaclessa or G.W. Cruwell of the Knuckles) further for attempting to destroy the seriousness of the occasion by singing "we won't go home till morning" in the course of his speech.

## 2. Mr. Cruwell<sup>1</sup>

This individual has once more distinguished himself, but this time at greater personal cost to himself. He entered Elie House yesterday, in the morning, accompanied by another, and, after a bullying but unsuccessful attempt to procure an apology from Mr. Lorenz, rose and struck him a blow with the butt end of a whip while seated. He and his friend then retreated to their bandy outside. Mr. Lorenz immediately summoned his servants, and succeeded in intercepting the bandy, while Mr. Cruwell was in the act of hurrying on the horsekeeper. He and his friend were at once drawn out of the bandy, and received a very sound beating from nearly a score of servants and horsekeepers – Mr. Cruwell getting much the larger share at the hands of the Superintendent, who, having succeeded in securing the whip out of his hands, belaboured him at a rate which soon put the two men to flight. They took to their heels, and were last seen running out at the southern gate towards the Cathedral, in a very tattered condition.

Mr. Lorenz shortly after procured a warrant, but the Police were unsuccessful in identifying the second delinquent. Mr. Cruwell was however brought up and admitted the main facts charged against him in the affidavit, including the thrashing he received. He was bound over in £ 800 and two sureties, to keep the peace. Mr. Lorenz, on being asked whether he would press his charge of assault, stated that he considered the two men had been more than amply punished already, and withdrew the charge.

We have since ascertained that the second man was an **Officer** of the name of **Stubbs**.

<sup>1</sup> *The Examiner and Ceylon Journal of Commerce and Agriculture*, Saturday, 28 October 1865: an editorial.

So far these two valiant bullies have received their reward. What explanation Mr. Stubbs, an Englishman and a gallant officer in the British Army, can give of the part he took in C.A. Lorenz, as editor, returned to the charge in the issue of the **Examiner**, 21 October 1865, under an editorial entitled “Mr. Cruwell on Superintendents.” It began with an excerpt from Cruwell’s written speech and proceeded to pull this statement to bits. It was argued:

It cannot.... be denied that Mr. Cruwell attended the Kandy meeting with the sole object of ridiculing the League, for the gratification of the “Great Firm” to whom he is notoriously under the most pressing obligations; and it is equally clear that no man better succeeded in similar circumstances in acting the buffoon, than did the musical German on this occasion.

He then picked on Cruwell’s description of his lobby as being different from planter superintendents with large deposits in the bank, so that he and his friends were “men of straw, who cannot afford to wait” (Cruwell’s words).

What care **they** for a Legislative Council, .... for the interests of other classes of the community? They are **in haste** to be rich: “**they cannot afford to wait**” (Cruwell’s words) – let all other interests therefore give way! The sooner the members of this self-interested class leave the Island, the better for themselves, the better for their creditors, the better for their estates, the better for the Colony!

the miserable proceeding, and of the hasty manner in which he left the premises, we care not to enquire. We are however quite sure that he will think twice before he ventures on a similar expedition. We are requested to add that the remains of his whip, and portions of Mr. Cruwell’s personal equipments, having been left behind in the Superintendent’s hands, may be obtained by any one who chooses to call for them.

## GEORGE POULIER'S DESCRIPTION OF CRUWELL'S HUMILIATING 'NEMESIS'

To the Editor of the Colombo Observer,

Elie House, October 31, 1865

Sir,

Allow me to make a few comments on Mr. Cruwell's letter in last night's "Observer"..... I did not, as he says, snatch up his whip out of the carriage; but I plucked it out of his hands immediately after it had been handed to him by Mr. Stubbs, and with it (in addition to what he confesses to have received from the servants) I whipped him and his friend from the office entrance to near the Porter's Lodge, whence, seeing a large body of my coolies running towards them with their pick-axes, he and his friend **ran away**. The best of the fun was that I did not know why I was beating the two men, but did so, because I was ordered to do so. Had I known that he had struck my Uncle, Mr. Cruwell would have been in bed by this time.

I was not repeatedly struck down. I did not receive a single blow from either of the two men. Those received by Mr. Cruwell were well mapped out on his neck and hands, when he appeared in the Police Court.

Mr. Cruwell must have lost all recollection of the circumstances, owing to his bewilderment. It was not (as he says) raining at the time the row occurred ..... nor could Mr. Cruwell by any possibility have **walked up the hill** on his return; Elie House is situated on a hill - and he

could not leave it in any direction, without going **down hill**, and this ..... he did at the top of his speed, his big friend of course keeping pace with him.

Lastly, Mr. Cruwell did not leave his carriage voluntarily, but when I came up to it, I found him being dragged out by the Tailor, who afterwards told me that he did it **"by the beards"** - I may here mention that this Tailor was the only one of the servants who was struck by Mr. Cruwell, and that was before he entered his carriage, and before I came up.

Yours very truly,

**George E. Poulier**

---

\* Colombo Observer, 2 November 1865. We could not find the page containing Cruwell's letter in the Observer.

**THE LETTER OF RESIGNATION  
SENT BY THE UNOFFICIAL MEMBERS  
OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL\***

Colombo, 15 November 1864

To the President of the Legislative Council of Ceylon.

Sir, -- We, the unofficial members of Your Honourable Council, deeming it incompatible with our sense of honour and duty to take part in the measure referring to Military Expenditure, which your honour had been directed by the Secretary of State to introduce to the Council, feel compelled to resign our seats.

We believe the demand made by the bill upon the resources of the Colony is unjust, and, if exacted, would prove highly injurious and oppressive, but if we had no other objections than these, we should have felt it our duty to discuss and oppose the measure in our places, and to have rested content to suffer the inevitable defeat which the Govt., with its overwhelming majority of official votes, can always ensure.

It is because the peculiar character of Bill, and the circumstances of its introduction, seem to us hurtful to the

---

\* Derived from the reprinted version in *The Ceylonese Christmas Number 1015*, pp. 44-45. The original can be located in the despatch from Major General O'Brien to

For background information, see J. R. Weinman, *Our Legislature*, Colombo: Associated Newspapers, 1947, pp. 34-42; *History of Ceylon volume 3*. Colombo Apothecaries Co., 1973, pp. 233 - 39, espe. 239; W. J. F. Labrooy "Development of the Legislative Councils of Ceylon" *Ceylon Economist*, 1956, vol. III, pp. 245 - 61; and Nirmala Labrooy *The Movement towards Constitutional Reform in Ceylon 1889-1910*, Oxford University; D. Phil. dissertation in History, 1973.

dignity and honour of the Council and contrary to its rightful privileges, that we decline taking part in it. We should deeply regret if our retirement caused inconvenience to your Honour's Government, but we feel assured that the knowledge you possess of the willing services we have ever rendered in the Legislative Council, will save us from any possible imputation of factious or unworthy motives.

In explaining the reasons which compel us to take the course we now adopt, we shall have occasion to refer to the memo and despatch of 26th Sept. **First**, as to the privileges of the Council, -- we do not think it necessary to enlarge on the elaborate distinction the Secretary of State draws between the **principle laid down** and the **pledge supposed** to have been given by Earl Grey in 1848. The material facts are undisputed -- viz, that Earl Grey, as Secretary of State, did lay down a principle, that he confirmed it subsequently, and that it is still more emphatically laid down in memo of 26th September, as "a cardinal point and first condition of any sound and regular system of finance."

The principle thus authoritatively and conclusively established is, "that appropriation of revenue in every case should without exception, rest on a legal enactment, and in no case on a simple instruction of the Secretary of State."

There is no question therefore as to the **principle** that it is the constitutional and proper function of the Legislative Council to control the whole expenditure of the colony, military as well as civil.

Her Majesty's Government having laid down this principle, it would seem superfluous to question whether or not the council had the **right** to exercise its own proper **function!** The fact is that it is a **function** and duty makes it a right. The laying down of the principle established the right, and Earl Grey distinctly states it as a right, though he afterwards admitted it had not been the **practice**.



The only reason why the Legislative Council has not **exercised** its right, is because Earl Grey and his successors in office have ever since, in direct violation of the principle they themselves laid down, persisted in keeping up the practice, described as so highly objectionable and irregular, of making the appropriation of our revenue for military expenditure on their own simple order. We have thus been deprived of our rights by the interposition of those very authorities who established them.

The right has in fact been ours, at least since 1818, but Her Majesty's ministers have superseded it, doing by their own simple order what they declare to be the function of the Legislative Council.

At length, however, after numerous appeals from the colony, it has been decided to give effect to the "Just and sound principle," and Her Majesty's pleasure on the subject has been made known to us in the despatch and memo of 26th September.

Seeing how long we have been deprived of a constitutional right admitted and established 16 years ago, we might reasonably have expected it would at length have been graciously and unreservedly conceded, whereas it is offered only on **conditions**. We are in fact to purchase it, and the price demanded for its enjoyment in **name**, is no less than its renunciation in **fact**.

The Council is first to pledge itself to the full amount of the demand of the Secretary of State as the **condition** of afterwards enjoying the liberty of inquiring what that sum ought to have been. We may at length exercise our constitutional functions and settle this financial matter for ourselves, but not until we have adopted the settlement unconstitutionally made for us by the Secretary of State -- which seems to us like offering a man a trial on condition of his first signing his sentence.

Such a proposal we deem unworthy and humiliating, and, if imposed upon the Colony, it must be on the sole responsibility of the servants of Her Majesty's Government, and not of the Council. Had Her Majesty been pleased to confer on the Council that control which her own ministers declare to be the "first condition of any just and sound system of finance" we should have been ready to discharge our duty with all loyalty, faithfulness and liberality, but, as independent members, we are not prepared to accede to the humiliating conditions imposed.

Apart from the **right** which flows from the **principle laid** down, viz., that the finances of the Colony should be dealt by the Legislative Council, Earl Grey's despatch of 1848 is explicit as to the way in which both the civil and military establishments were to be provided for, namely, by an inquiry of the Legislative Council to define the requirements of those services; and, whilst directing that the Governor of that period should at once institute an enquiry as regarded the "whole of the fixed establishment in all their detail." His Lordship stated that the military establishment in particular would call for his "special attention." In pursuance of this order, the civil establishments were liberally provided for by the Legislative Council, and we firmly believe that the military expenditure would then, or at any time since, have been provided for by the like means in an equally liberal manner.

Assuming, however, that we could accede to terms imposed by the Secretary of State, it is by no means certain that the Legislative Council would be allowed to enjoy the privileges of inquiry even after agreeing to the unreasonable conditions demanded, for submitting the enquiry to a **commission**, and does not pledge himself to give it certainly to the Legislative **Council** at all.

The position of the Colony in regard to its military expenditure, would therefore be worse after the passing of

the proposed Bill than it is at present. For sixteen years we have waited for the promised despatch on the subject, and if this bill was passed, we know not how long we might have to wait for the promised inquiry.

Further, although the principle to which Her Majesty's Government have now decided to give effect, is "that appropriation of Revenue in **every** case should, without exception, rest upon a Legislative enactment, and in **no** case on simple instruction of the Secretary of State," (vide memo clause 29) yet we find by clause 33 of the same document that Her Majesty's Government nevertheless reserve the right of future demands upon the Colony. In other words they reserve in one clause what they have expressly relinquished in another, and **the very terms they offer us are in direct violation** of the principles they have themselves laid down.

It is upon such uncertain and partial concessions that we are expected to cancel the deliberate vote of the last session.

**Secondly, respecting the liability of the Colony** in regard to its military expenditure we, as members of the Legislative Council, have ever expressed our sincere and earnest desire to meet that question in a fair and liberal spirit, and to contribute cheerfully whatever amount should, on a full and fair enquiry by the Council, be considered due by the Colony.

The action of Her Majesty's Government does not seem to have been prompted by an equally fair spirit, but with a view to the relief of the Imperial Exchequer rather than to the welfare of the Colony, or the demands of justice.

We do not follow, nor attempt to answer, the arguments by which the Secretary of State attempts to show that our present forces could not be materially reduced, that the whole of our Military expenditure should be paid by the

Colony, and that the establishments at Trincomalee are maintained for local not imperial purposes, because we are unwilling to anticipate, by any opinion of our own or by any foregone conclusions, the result of the inquiry for which we have so long prayed. Those and all other questions connected with the military expenditure of the Colony, ought to be fully investigated by the Legislative Council. The opinion expressed on these points in the memorial of September 26th, however, seem altogether at variance with the language of Earl Grey's despatch of July 17th 1864 wherein he alludes to the great importance of Ceylon as the key of "Indian Ocean and the great Insular outpost of the British Empire in the East," and describes the harbour of Trincomalee as "the greatest reserve station of our military and naval forces in that quarter of the Globe."

We should have been glad if the Secretary of State in quoting the opinion of the Select Committee of the House of Commons of 1861 to the effect "that the expense of the Troops in Ceylon should be borne in a greater degree by the Colonial Treasury," had also mentioned the grounds alleged for the opinion. It should be borne in mind that that Committee had not before them a correct statement of the actual proportion the Colony did pay.

We are at a loss to conceive why the Secretary of State should have thought it necessary to quote the **opinion** of Mr. Dundas in 1801, or the intention of Earl Bathurst in 1821, as bearing upon the present and future obligations of the Colony. We fail to see what authority the mere **opinions** and **intentions** of those officers could have in the present state of the question. The former was an opinion offered just after the British had acquired possession of what was believed to be an El Dorado from whose Cinnamon groves / and fabulous riches / golden harvests were expected. The dreams of that period and its policy of extracting wealth from Colonial possessions for Imperial purposes have in our opinion a bearing on the question at issue, far different from

that for which they are quoted. With the policy of that time we associate in memory the loss of the noblest acquisition that was ever attached to the British Crown. It was an unwise and disastrous policy not to be imitated in these times.

**Thirdly.** With regard to our **financial** position the Secretary of State labours under serious misapprehensions. So far from its being the fact that the ascertained surpluses have been realised, "after fully providing for the Civil Establishment and for all other services of a Civil character, and after providing liberally for public works and improvements," the truth is that they have been produced at the expense of the efficiency of nearly all the public departments of the Colony, by a culpable neglect of public works and by a generally parsimonious policy which has been universally stigmatized and has brought the Government to public censure. This policy, necessarily suicidal, has already begun to produce an effect on the revenue, for the Colonial Secretary in his place in Council has repeatedly and emphatically declared during this session that there was already an end of surpluses, and he plainly indicated that probable **increase** of the **export** duties as necessary to meet the already existing pledge of the Government.

Whilst these hoards of revenue were accumulating numerous applications for important public works have been annually declined on the ground that there were "no funds." The Government, unable to dispute the necessity for those works, could put forth no other plea for their non-execution, and has not scrupled repeatedly and continually for years past to declare its inability to carry them out for **want of funds**. Further, when the order to reserve £30,000 as an additional military contribution was received last year several votes for public works of urgent importance were struck out of the estimates to provide for it.

The state of the public roads has for sometime been such as to cause universal complaint and to call for a committee of inquiry.

The public works department has been reduced to such a state of inefficiency that it could not expend the votes of the Council, and a select committee of the Council has been called upon to report upon the system under which the votes for public works were expended. The report sufficiently proves the disorganisation and disorder which have been caused by the parsimony of the last few years. The police establishment is utterly inefficient, and it is questionable whether in its present state it does not rather promote than discourage crime. A committee has been appointed to investigate this department also.

The Colombo Academy and Queen's College have for the same reason declined from a high state of efficiency and usefulness to a condition such as reflects disgrace on the Colony.

The Post Office has also had its committee of inquiry, but as yet there have been no apparent results. We have good reason to believe that in this as in other departments the cause of decay is the parsimony which has characterised the whole of the policy which the Secretary of State seems to consider admirable because it has supplied the fund by which he now proposes to relieve the Imperial Exchequer.

Whatever opinion may be entertained of this "admirable management" by Her Majesty's Government, it is universally condemned by those who are witnesses of its results, and it can be truly stated that there has not been for many years past any public measure so unanimously approved throughout the Colony as the vote of censure on the policy of that period which by an unprecedented chance the Unofficial Members were able to pass in the present session of the Council.

If, however, the state of our revenue were such that the Council could reasonably calculate upon a surplus of revenue recurring year by year, the first claim upon such surplus would be the remission of that extraordinary position of our taxation which having been voluntarily undertaken for a specific purpose cannot in good faith or justice be levied any longer than it is required **for that purpose**. Until that remission has been made the revenue cannot justly be pledged for any new expenditure.

In considering the state of our finances and the amount of our revenues, it should be borne in mind that a very large proportion of the taxation of the Colony is levied on the food of the people, and acts in direct discouragement of the cultivation of our staple product, coffee, on which the Export Duty also presses heavily.

The fact that coffee has for sometime been realizing extreme prices in the markets of the world, is the sole ground of our present prosperous condition. The same cause, however, which enables us for the time to maintain a state of prosperity, is stimulating the extended production of coffee in other countries, and we may therefore confidently expect a reduction in our staple and consequent decrease of our financial resources.

On a fair and reasonable view of the financial condition of the Colony, of its present requirements and of its existing engagements, it would be highly improper to enter into any unnecessary pledges for the future. There is no reason to doubt the ability of the colony to meet all its engagements and to pay all necessary expenditure, Civil and Military, but we cannot see the propriety of voting so vast a sum as

is now demanded before the investigation we have so long prayed for has taken place, more especially as the demand has been made under an evident misapprehension of the true state of the Colony and its finances.

As members of your Hon'ble Council we have ever preferred our requests to H.M.'s Government with loyalty, respect and submission, and have invariably accompanied them with the sincere expression of the willingness of the Colony to pay whatever sums should be found, after a full inquiry by the Council, to be justly due for the Military Expenditure, and we feel disappointed and hurt by the tone and tenor of the Memo and Despatch of 26th September, and by the circumstance that in granting the inquiry the Secretary of State should have required us so to anticipate its results as to nullify its value.

That the Legislative Council is so constituted, and the obligation of its official members is such that it may become on this, as it has been on former occasions, a mere instrument in the hands of H.M.'s Secretary of State, and that it may be made to pass measures which are repugnant to the convictions of the great majority of its members are facts we have often deeply deplored but never before so much as now that a question of such vital importance is to be brought to so unhappy an issue. The Colonial Legislative may and no doubt will lend its voice to pronounce the will of her Majesty's Minister and may thus give an ostensible sanction to the unprecedented claim now made upon our exchequer, but the violation of the right of the Council will not be made less real or conspicuous by the semblance of constitutional form.

In this juncture we believe we shall best serve the interests of the Colony, discharge the duty we owe to the Public and ourselves, and express our deep sense of the humiliation and injustice put upon the Legislative Council by relinquishing our places therein and leaving it to the servants of the crown to assume the whole responsibility of carrying out an unjust and unconstitutional act?

Finally we shall be glad if your Honour will forward a copy of this letter to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies for his information.

We are, Your Honour's Obedient Humble Servants,  
C.A. Lorenz, G. Wall, W. Thompson, J. Capper,  
J. Alwis, J. Eaton.

## THE BURGHERS\*

Percy Colin - Thomé

The presence of Portuguese armadas in the Malabar waters, in the early 16th century, compelled the Moors engaged in the spice trade to create a new route for themselves between Ceylon and the Maldives. On hearing of this, the Viceroy Dom Francisco de Almeida decided to send his son Dom Lourenco to investigate the new route and report on Ceylon and the Maldives, which were of great importance for their cinnamon and coir. Dom Lourenco was carried by currents and arrived in the port of Galle, on the southern coast of Ceylon, in 1505. He sailed away after a brief stay there. This was the first contact with Ceylon by the Portuguese, who would establish a foothold on the island and gradually consolidate and extend their power along the coastal areas.

The drive behind these risky journeys in frail boats, through perilous seas round the Cape of Storms, renamed euphemistically the Cape of Good Hope, was mainly the lure of spices, precious stones and pearls.

The Portuguese brought no women with them in their crowded, flimsy craft. Shipwrecks, wars, piracy and tropical disease discouraged women from venturing with their men to the East. The Portuguese, therefore, followed a policy of assimilation by promoting marriages between the Portuguese and the indigenous women. The descendants of the unions between Portuguese and Sinhalese or Tamils in the coastal areas were known as *Tupases* and *Mestizos*. *Tupases* were those who could claim a Portuguese ancestor, while the *Mestizos* were those directly born from a European

---

\* From Serendib — Vol. 8 No. 5, September - October 1989 pg. 21 - 25.

father and a native mother. The descendants of the *Tupases* and *Mestizos* later came to be called Portuguese Burghers.

The Dutch connection with Ceylon commenced in 1602 when Admiral Joris van Spilbergen arrived with two ships off Batticaloa, a port on the eastern coast of Ceylon. However, it was not until 1638 that the Dutch invasion of Ceylon began in earnest when Admiral Adam Westerwold arrived with a fleet off Batticaloa and captured the Portuguese fort there. By this time the Sinhalese King Raja Sinha II was thoroughly sick of the land grabbing and plunder of local resources by the Portuguese. He desperately sought the friendship of the Dutch as a counterpoise to the Portuguese.

Eventually the Portuguese were expelled from the island in 1658, and the Dutch East Indies Company became the controlling power in the coastal regions. The aim of the Dutch turned out to be the same as that of the Portuguese: the dispossession of the Sinhalese and Tamils of their land and the exploitation of the resources of the country. This objective was pursued by subsequent Dutch governors with partial success. The feelings of the Sinhalese inhabitants subjected to Dutch rule after the expulsion of the Portuguese were epitomized in the Sinhalese proverb concerning a man who makes a bad exchange: "I have given pepper and got ginger."

The attitude of the directors of the Dutch East & West Indies Companies vacillated between assimilation and apartheid on the question of emigration to Ceylon. The risk of ship-board life on treacherous seas was a major deterrent to the emigration of Dutch women. The Dutch governor Jan Maatzuyker favoured mixed marriages between Dutchmen and Asian or Eurasian women. His successor, Jacob van Kittensteijn (1650-53), strongly opposed miscegenation,

but without success. The Dutch married Sinhalese and Tamil women and also Indo-Portuguese women who remained on the island after the Portuguese were expelled.

The word *Burgher* is derived from the Dutch word *burger*, which means a citizen of a burgh, borough or town. The freelance class of Hollander who came out to Ceylon for private business or trade, as distinct from those who received official acts of appointment from the Company, were called *Burghers* or *Free Burghers* (*vrijburgers*). Originally, the term *Burgher* or *Free Burgher* had nothing to do with race. It was a civil status. This category became increasingly diverse in later years of Dutch rule. Certificates of Burghership, which entitled the recipients to reside in towns and enjoy certain civil rights, were also issued to those who were not Dutch. For example, a certificate of Burghership was bestowed in 1759 upon a man named Andries de Waas of "the fisher caste" on his paying a fee of 15 rix dollars.

For most of the last century, this definition of a Burgher by Chief Justice Sir Richard Ottley (1830) was - however awkwardly put - generally accepted by the community.

"The name Burgher belongs to the descendants of the Dutch and Portuguese and other Europeans born in Ceylon ....[I]f the male ancestor were Dutch, Portuguese, or other Europeans, whoever may have been the female parents, if the parents were married, the offspring would be Burghers."

Accordingly, children of any European who married a Burgher or Sinhalese woman were regarded as Burgher. At the same time, descendants of Portuguese and indigenous women were also regarded as Burgher.

After the British incursion in Ceylon in 1796, the fortunes of the Dutch descendants and Burghers declined. The Burghers realized that their only hope of advancement under the British was by a mastery of English. An English

education was one of the main channels of elite formation used by the Burghers in the last century, and the institution which was the seedbed of this elite formation was the Colombo Academy, established in 1835. The Academy produced a coterie of brilliant pupils who were later to distinguish themselves in the liberal professions. In 1850 about 65 percent of the pupils in the academy were Burgher. The rest were upper-caste Sinhalese, along with a few Colombo Chetties and Tamils.

Until the end of the last century, Burghers dominated the legal, medical and teaching professions. Some eminent Burgher doctors of the last century included James Loos, who was a pioneer of medical education in Ceylon and the first principal of the Medical College established in 1870. He was succeeded by E. L. Koch, who was the leading surgeon at the time. Other eminent doctors at the time were J. L. Van der Straaten and P.D.A. Anthonisz. Burgher women such as Winifred Nell, A. de Boer and Dr. Claribel van Dort were the first Ceylonese women to be doctors in the last century.

Numerous Burgher men and women belonged to the teaching profession in the last century and several private schools were run by them in the principal towns in the country. The clerical service became a major industry of the Burghers.

The Burgher-managed *Young Ceylon* (1850-52) was the leading literary journal in Ceylon at the time. It was the first publication to agitate for social reforms for the people of Ceylon. In 1859, Burgher Charles Ambrose Lorenz and a syndicate purchased the *Examiner*, the first "Ceylonese" newspaper on the island that was completely managed by Ceylonese. It became the policy of this paper to refer to the people of Ceylon as *Ceylonese*, and not as Sinhalese, Tamil, Muslim or Burgher. Until his death in 1871,

Lorenz wielded the powerful influence of his pen in support of social reforms for the Ceylonese and in opposition to injustice.

J.L.K. van Dort (1831-98) was one of the most brilliant artists in the last century. His sketches, which appeared in *Muniandi* (the *Ceylon Punch*) and in the Christmas supplements of the *Examiner*, are not likely to be forgotten. He had the rare gift of capturing vivid movement. He was also a valued contributor to the *London Graphic*. His oil panels presenting Ceylon scenes were exhibited at the Chicago Exhibition, and some of his paintings were shown at the Great Paris Exhibition.

A remarkable Burgher maverick in the last century was J.A.E. Buultjens (1865-1916). He had a brilliant career at St. Thomas' College, Mutwal, the leading Anglican school in the island. He won a scholarship to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he read for the History Tripos. He renounced Christianity while at Cambridge and became a Buddhist in 1888 after his return to Ceylon. The authorities of his old school were so scandalized by his conversion that they removed his name from the school's panel of honour.

Buultjens played a vital role in the cause of Buddhist education. He became principal of the Pettah Buddhist School (later Ananda College). As general manager of Buddhist schools, he helped establish schools for boys and girls throughout the island. He was also a pioneer in the trade union movement in Ceylon.

At the turn of this century, when it became evident that ethnic representation in the Legislative Council would soon become a matter of democratic choice, with officially demarcated communal electorates, a section of the Burgher community petitioned the government to restrict the Burgher electorate to Dutch Burghers only. This was rejected by

the British. The Dutch Burgher Union was formed in 1908, ostensibly "to promote the moral, intellectual and social wellbeing of the Dutch descendants in Ceylon." Others interpreted its establishment as an attempt by a segment of upper-class Dutch Burghers to prevent the Portuguese Burghers and Eurasians (the descendants of unions between Britishers and Sinhalese or Tamil women) from out-voting the Dutch Burghers for the Burgher seat in the Legislative Council. It was met with considerable opposition. Sir Hector van Cuylenburg, proprietor of *The Ceylon Independent*, which was regarded as a Burgher paper (although it was called *The People's Paper*), was lampooned as he was one of the notables promoting the DBU. *The Ceylon Morning Leader*, ably edited by Armand de Souza, published some witty limericks. Although published under the pseudonym "I.C.D. Funnyside," the poem was believed to be the work of de Souza himself:

The chief of the People' paper  
Has recently cut a caper  
Says he I've a touch  
Of blood that is Dutch  
My "native" is turned into vapour.

Edmund de Livera, man of letters and lawyer, composed a satirical poem called "Dutch Burgher". The first verse reads:

All the people you know - all the people you see  
Aren't Burgher, you know - Dutch Burgher, you know -  
The Tamil, Mechanic, Malay, Cingalee  
Aren't Burgher - Dutch Burgher, you know.

But born in this Island are some with a touch  
Or a dram or a teaspoon of blood that is Dutch -  
'Tis a hard thing to tell you - how little, how much,  
They're Burgher, Dutch Burgher, you know.

O the things that they do and the things that they see  
Are Burgher you know - Dutch Burgher, you know,  
But the Tamil, Mechanic, Malay, Cingalee  
Aren't Burgher, Dutch Burgher, you know.

Towards the end of the last century the spread of education and the growth of national aspirations in the communities diminished the influence the small Burgher community had in official circles. Until about 1940, however, the Burghers continued to have a significant place in the judiciary, the Bar, the medical and teaching professions, the public service, the mercantile sector, the Press, the police, customs, railway, excise, the navy and the armed forces.

In art, music and drama, Burghers have made a significant contribution. Lionel Wendt, who was a true *aficionado* of the arts, was a brilliant pianist and a photographer with an international reputation. E.F.C. Ludowyk, who won the prestigious Oldham Shakespeare prize at Cambridge, revolutionized the teaching of English in Sri Lanka. He made an incalculable impact on the theatre in Sri Lanka. He wrote several scholarly books such as *The Footprint of the Buddha*, *Understanding Shakespeare*, *The Story of Ceylon* and *The Modern History of Ceylon*. He also edited six Shakespeare plays for the Cambridge University Press.

Certain trends from the 1940s spread a sense of insecurity in the Burgher community, many of whom decided to emigrate to Australia. The rise of communalism and the growth of attitudes hostile to Christianity and to Western modes of life and thought created conditions which the Burghers felt were inimical to the welfare of their children. The Sinhala Only Act (1956) created a major crisis for all the minorities, especially the Burghers, who had adopted English as their mother tongue for nearly 150 years.



The Burgher community at the turn of the century was about 0.7 percent of the total population of Ceylon. In 1981 the number of Burghers had been reduced to about 30,000 or 0.25 percent of the total population of 15 million.

The problems confronting the Burghers after Independence in 1948 have been partly caused by their own mistakes, which made them vulnerable after the British left. They were too close to the British rulers and vested interests. They were out of sympathy with Buddhism and the Sinhala language and culture. And they also held more jobs in the public sector than other communities in proportion to their size. This caused a great deal of antipathy towards them.

Despite their small numbers, the Burghers can still make a useful contribution to the destiny of Sri Lanka by working together with other communities. They bring to the task a rich cultural heritage. And by standing both apart from and together with mainstream Sri Lankan society, they bring both objectivity and genuine concern to the great issues which face the country today.

## GENEALOGY OF THE FAMILY OF VAN EYCK OF CEYLON

Compiled by Cherise Pereira

**Leenders Van Eyck** of Holland came to Ceylon in 1769

His son **Arei Van Eyck**, born in 1771 at Galle, Assistant in the Government Secretariat, Colombo, married:

- (a) Anna Magdalena Peiris:
- (b) Sophia Louisa Abrahamsz at the Dutch Reformed Church Wolvendaal on 9th May 1789

*Of the first marriage he had:*

- (1) Sarah Dorothea Van Eyck, baptised 31 August 1788

*Of the second marriage he had:*

- (1) Arnold Wilhelm Hendrik Van Eyck, baptised 15th May 1791
- (2) Catherina Louisa Van Eyck, baptised 9th February 1794, married Jan Christoffel Melkers. She had by him:

*Janette Charlotte Melkers born 8th August 1813,  
married on 15th March 1830, William Morgan,  
son of Richard Owen Morgan and Behrana Lucretia  
Lourensz*

- (3) **Ferdinand Carel Van Eyck who follows under II**

- (4) Angenita Sophia Van Eyck, baptised 30th December 1798, married 30th July 1835, Frederick Lionel Lemphers, (born 16.9.1809, died 28.8.1866), son of Samuel Pieter Eregod Lempfert, Draughtsman, Survey Department, Colombo (born 4.7.1784,

married 24.10.1806, died 26.3.1822) and Maria Johanna Perera, (died 21.4.1837); (DBU Journal Vol. XXXIV Jan. 1945 No. 3. page 84)

- (5) Maria Christina Van Eyck, baptised 8th February 1801
- (6) Arnoldina Margereta Van Eyck, baptised 5th August 1804 married on 19 January, 1837, Henry Meyer
- (7) Dorothea Cornelia Van Eyck, baptised 12th October 1806

## II

**Ferdinand Carel Van Eyck**, baptised **8th January 1797** married:

- (a) Margerita Elizabeth Paulusz, born 1804, married in the Dutch Reformed Church, Wolfendaal, on 15th July 1819, died 2nd April 1829. Daughter of Johannes Jacobus Paulusz and Wilhelmina Baarthouwer. (DBU Journal Vol. XLI Oct. 1951 No.4 page 169)
- (b) Susannah Cornelia Lemphers, born 1810, daughter of Samuel Pieter Eregod Lempfert and Maria Johanna Perera, referred to in (4) above

*Of the first marriage he had:*

- (1) Eliza Sophia Van Eyck, born 31st May 1820, married George Martin Schubert
- (2) Anna Amelia Van Eyck, born 22nd May 1822
- (3) **John Henry Van Eyck who follows under III**

*Of the second marriage he had:*

- (1) **Charles Frederick Van Eyck who follows under IV**

- (2) Francis Gerard Van Eyck, born 9th October 1833
- (3) Seraphina Henrietta Van Eyck, born 22nd August 1835, married in 1855, John Henry Eardé. She had by him:
  1. Sarah Magdalena Eardé, born 29.10.1856
  2. Anne Lydia Eardé, born 12.4.1858, married John Augustus Sparkes Marshall
  3. Oscar John Henry Eardé, born 13.10.1861, married Laura Leticia
  4. Kate Millicent Eardé, born 22.1.1877, married Cyril Godolphin Van Eyck who follows under VIII
- (4) Louisa Petronella Van Eyck, born 23rd May 1837
- (5) Carolina Charlotta Van Eyck, born 24th March 1839, married Thomas Baldesing
- (6) **John William Van Eyck who follows under V**
- (7) Henrietta Margerita Van Eyck, and Susanna Jacomina Van Eyck (twins), born on 27th February 1845
- (8) **William Theodore Van Eyck who follows under VI**
- (9) Thelesia Frederica Van Eyck, born 28th January 1849
- (10) Sophia Louisa Van Eyck, born 18th December 1851, died 20th March 1875, married 25th July 1874 in the Dutch Reformed Church, Wolfendaal, Samuel Oliver Kelaart (born 1.9.1848 died 1912) Son of John William Kelaart and Henrietta Argina Schubert. (DBU Journal XLII April 1952 No.2 page 69)

## III

**John Henry Van Eyck, born 1st August 1826**, married Janette Henrietta Sypst on 9th January 1850

## IV

**Charles Frederick Van Eyck, born 31st October 1830** married Dorothea Cornelia Zieglaar on 13th October 1853, and had by her:

- (1) **Vincent Arnold Van Eyck who follows under VII**

## V

**John William Van Eyck, born 14th June 1842**, married:

- (a) Margaret Caroline Nicolle on 29th June 1866, died 1st January 1873  
 (b) Carolina Wilhelmina Paulusz on 27th December 1875, daughter of Johannes Gerhardus Paulusz\* and Helen Catherine Jones

*Of the first marriage he had:*

- (1) Henry Oliver Van Eyck, born 3rd July 1868

## VI

**William Theodore Van Eyck, born 14th March 1847**, married Emily Sarah Fonseca on 4th November 1869, and had by her:

- (1) Evangeline Rosella Van Eyck, born 28th January 1871, died 15th November 1896, married in the Dutch Reformed Church, Wolvendaal 20th July

\* Son of Johannes Jacobus Paulusz referred to in II (a) above.

1892, Dennis Augustus Kelaart (born 18.1.1866, died 12.8.1927) son of Henry Gerard Kelaart and Maria Sophia le Dulx. She had by him:

1. *Shirley Augustus van Eyck Kelaart, born 18.06.1894 married Ismay Claire Andriesz born (1.09.1903), died 17.11.1944.*
  2. *Alice Evangeline Edwina van Eyck Kelaart, born 15.11.1896*
- (2) Orissa Amelia Van Eyck, born 21st June 1872, died 28 November 1928, married Charles Henry Pate, (born 19.9.1844, died 25.12.1943), son of Ananias Pate and Mary Poppleton. She had by him:
1. *Orissa Christine van Eyck Pate, born 24.6.1896, died a spinster*
  2. *Marjorie Iris van Eyck Pate, born 1.8.1897, married Percival Vernon Kronenberg*
  3. *Pearline Beryl van Eyck Pate, born 17.9.1898, died in childhood*
  4. *Ouida May van Eyck Pate, born 21.9.1901, died in childhood*
  5. *Charles Henry van Eyck Pate, born 25.2.1904, died a bachelor*
  6. *Vivian Ruby van Eyck Pate, born 17.6.1906, died 5.5.1985, married Edward Joseph Candappa, born 13.10.1903 died 23.6.1968.*
  7. *Phyllis Brenda van Eyck Pate, born 4.11.1907, died in childhood*
  8. *Elmore Bruce van Eyck Pate, born 8.12.1909, married Norah Gertrude Perera, born 23.10.1908, died 5.4.1980.*

9. *Doreen Merle van Eyck Pate*, born 10.5.1912, died in infancy

**(3) Cyril Godolphin Van Eyck who follows under VIII**

- (4) Mildred Arabella Van Eyck, born 21st April 1876, married on 5th July 1898, Wilfred Henry Auwardt. She had by him:

1. *Vilma Ruby Iris van Eyck Auwardt*, born 31.10.1899, died 23.6.1985, married *Christopher St. George Prout*.
2. *Albert Henry William van Eyck Auwardt*, born 28.5.1901

3. *Esme van Eyck Auwardt*, born 16.3.1903

- (5) Mabel Laura Van Eyck, born 31st December 1878; died unmarried, on 18th December 1959

- (6) Muriel Enid Van Eyck, born 21st June 1883, married Owen Duncan Cecil de Vos. She had by him:

1. *Claire Muriel van Eyck de Vos*, married: a. *Albert William Victor Alagaratnam*, widower of *Millicent Isaaks*, and b. *George Vethacan*

2. *Bertha van Eyck de Vos*, married *Vernon Mack*

3. *Boniface van Eyck de Vos*, married *Leticia Fernando*

4. *Miriam Constance van Eyck de Vos*, married *Samuel Andrew William Mottau*, widower of *Thelma Phyllis Foenander*

5. *Gladys Dagmar van Eyck de Vos*, married *Kingsley Matthis*

6. *Edward van Eyck de Vos*, married *Doris Reimers*

7. *George Paul van Eyck de Vos*, married *Avrille Joseph*

8. *Noeline van Eyck de Vos*, married *Shelley Anderson*

9. *Pansy van Eyck de Vos*, married *Clancy Abeykoon*

## VII

**Vincent Arnold Van Eyck**, born 28th September 1854 married:

- (a) *Alice Emily Ebert*, on 20th December 1877, born 5th January 1858, died 19.6.1889, daughter of *Adrianus Johanne Ebert* and *Emily Jane Eardé*,\* born 3rd April, 1840

- (b) *Agatha Bona Emma Rodé* on 10th December 1891 in the Dutch Reformed Church *Wolvendaal*, daughter of *John Rodé* and *Ellen Alice Bennet*

*Of the first marriage he had:*

- (1) *Percival Arnold Van Eyck*, born 19th November 1878

- (2) (Dr.) *Evan Clarence Ellis Van Eyck*, born 16th January 1881, died September 1946

- (3) *Alice Louis Estelle Van Eyck*, born 13th March 1882

*Of the second marriage he had:*

- (4) *Doris Augusta Van Eyck*, born 17th February 1902

- (5) Roy Arnold Van Eyck who follows under IX**

---

\* Daughter of *George Earde*, and *Johanna Engeline Van Geyzel*, born 13.11.1817.

## VIII

**Cyril Godolphin Van Eyck**, born 7th May 1874, died February 1908, married Kate Millicent Earde, born 22.1.1877, died 5th May 1920, daughter of John Henry Earde and Seraphina Henrietta Van Eyck, (referred to in II(3) above. He had by her:

- (1) Norma Kathleen Van Eyck, born 3rd December 1901, died 1953, married on 9th April, 1927, Betram H. Blacker of the Ways & Works, CGR
- (2) Earle Van Eyck, born 7th July 1906, died 13th July 1906
- (3) **Percival Carl who follows under X**

## IX

**Roy Arnold Van Eyck**, born 13th June 1903

## X

**Percival Carl Van Eyck**, born 11th May 1908, died 4th November 1964, married on 26th December 1939 at the Dutch Reformed Church, Regent Street, Neliya Edith Blanche Alagaratnam, (born 11.4.1917) daughter of Victor Alagaratnam and Millicent Isaaks, referred to in VI(6) above. He had by her:

- (1) Norman Earl Van Eyck, born 30th March 1941, married on 27th December 1972, Aloma Agnes Pereira, daughter of Peter Lynwood Oswald Pereira and Agnes May De Lay
- (2) Carlene Anita Van Eyck, born 31st January 1943, married on 18th April 1968, Darian Egerton de Meuron Joseph, born 6.2.1944, son of Ronald Edwin De Meuron Joseph and Louisa Orelia de Silva. She had by him:
  1. *Ian Michael Joseph, born 6th November 1971*

2. *Alan David Joseph, born 2nd October, 1974*

- (3) Caryl Rowena Van Eyck, born 1st August 1944, married on 23rd October 1980, Ralph Peter Clifford de Zilwa, born 16.10.1941, son of Hindley Peter de Zilwa and Therese Ziska Mortier
- (4) **Neville Carlson Evan who follows under XI**
- (5) Cherise Kathleen Rosemarie Van Eyck, born 13th April 1948, married on 27th December 1971, Kingsley Oswald Joachim Pereira, born 26.7.1946, died 3.7.1991, son of Peter Lynwood Oswald Pereira and Agnes May De Lay
- (6) **Percival David Neal who follows under XII**

## XI

**Neville Carlson Evan Van Eyck**, born 28th November 1946, died 8th October 1981, married on 15th June 1969, Sherine Patricia Joseph, born 3.1.1948, daughter of Ronald Edwin De Meuron Joseph and Louisa Orelia de Silva. He had by her:

- (1) **Shane Neville Van Eyck**, born 28th February 1971
- (2) **Johanne Neal Van Eyck**, born 13th February 1978

## XII

**Percival David Neal Van Eyck**, born 9th November 1956, married on 2nd August 1980, Melanie Mary Manickam, born 6.8.1959, daughter of Felix Manickam and Mavis Neydorff. He had by her:

- (1) Amanda Janice Van Eyck, born 4th August 1983
- (2) Samantha Carol Van Eyck, born 8th October 1984

**DUTCH BURGHER UNION OF CEYLON****General Committee 1993-1994**

MR. HAROLD SPELDEWINDE      – *President*  
MR. V. A. MULLER                – *Hony. Secretary*  
MR. E. H. A. MELDER            – *Hony. Treasurer*

Mrs. B. Speldewinde

Mrs. A. Muller

Mrs. M. Colin-Thomé

Mrs. Y. Poulier

Mrs. C. Gomez

Mr. G. de Vos

Mr. G. Poulier

Mr. M. Kerkoven

Mr. P. Colin-Thomé

Mr. A. I. E. de Kretser

Mr. G. de Kretser

Mr. P. L. Prins