

Made in Germany?
Theology at the Cape of Good Hope in the early 18th centuryⁱ

Victor E d'Assonvilleⁱⁱ

Department of Ecclesiology, Faculty of Theology,
University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa
Forschugstelle – Internationale Reformationstheologie,
Akademie für Reformatorische theologie, Hannover, Germany

Abstract

Paul Roux (1665-1723), a French Refugee, arrived at the Cape of Good Hope in 1688 as one of a larger group of French Huguenots who came via the Netherlands. Together with the famous Reverend Pierre Simond, he was known as a significant champion of the French language in the Cape. The manuscript of a small catechism booklet, a *Belijdenis*, dated 1743, twenty years after his death, was – according to the title page – written by this same Paul Roux. Up until the present, the genesis of this document, one of the few indigenous theological texts from this time, has remained a mystery. References in secondary literature with regard to its origins are speculative at most, and no comprehensive theological analysis of the document has as yet been carried out. This article proves, for the first time, the relationship between this *Belijdenis* and both a Dutch catechism of the 17th and 18th centuries, the well-known *Korte Schets* by Johannes d'Outrein (1662–1722), and the German catechism *Erste Wahrheitsmilch für Säuglinge am Alter und Verstand* of Friedrich Adolf Lampe (1683–1729). The article demonstrates how d'Outrein's catechism was used, often *verbatim*, as a source for the *Belijdenis* by Paul Roux. However, theological differences between these works, in particular regarding the sequence of divisions and arrangement of questions, are revealed in this provisional theological analysis of Roux's *Belijdenis*. A number of the questions posed in earlier studies, for instance regarding the original language of the document, are answered. Evidence of the influence exerted by the Dutch Nadere Reformatie in the Cape during the first half of the 18th century is now substantiated. For Huguenot research in South Africa this means that the line from Calvin via France to the Cape of Good Hope is not as clear cut or as straight as has been stated in some publications.

Introduction

As not many indigenous theological documents which derive from the first century after the initial European settlement at the Cape of Good Hope in 1652 remain,ⁱⁱⁱ a text such as the “Confession of Paul Roux”^{iv} has the capacity to shed some light on the way in which the first and second generation of French Refugees in 1688 and afterwards understood and reflected upon their faith. It is, however, important to note that although this catechism is a document, a theological text, written by an individual and probably used as a catechism in the religious education of children, it had no official status as such, as far as we know.

Paul Roux (1660?/1665?–1723), identified on the title page of the manuscript as the author of this text,^v was among some of the first groups of French Refugees to arrive at the Cape in 1688.^{vi} Roux was originally from Orange in southern France, and would become the South African ancestor of the Roux/le Roux family. On November 8, 1688, he was appointed as “French-speaking reader and teacher” (“voorleser en schoolmeester in de Frans[che] taal” (cf. Franken 1978:21).^{vii} His person and historical work at the Cape in the early years of the French Refugee settlement is fairly well known. He is regarded, together with the Reverend Pierre Simond, as arguably the most significant champion of the French language at the Cape (Coertzen 1976:214). Following Simond's departure from the Cape in 1702, Roux was the only French Refugee who continued to play a significant role in promoting the French language and culture at the Cape, to the extent that Hugo (1977:743) states that Roux's death also signalled, figuratively, the demise of the French language in South Africa (cf. d'Assonville 2003:26, 27).

Although the introductory part of this catechism has already been the subject of examination (at a previous International Huguenot Conference in 2002), its origins have remained unknown. This catechism is fairly well known in recent South African church historical studies.^{viii} However, with the exception of the paper mentioned above,^{ix} and in a certain sense apart from the study by Britz (1990:354 et seq), in which some systematic-theological conclusions were drawn, as well as some remarks of a secondary nature in the other studies – most of them marginal – no exhaustive theological

analysis of either a part of or the entire text has yet been conducted. This lack of systematic enquiry naturally gives rise to postulations about the character and nature of faith, the experience of faith and even of theology at the Cape of Good Hope at the end of the 17th and during the first half of the 18th century. These, then, are used as a foundation for unsupported assertions or speculation regarding the real theological, philosophical and cultural impact of the settlement of the French Refugees at the Cape of Good Hope, and their contribution to the development of South African society.^x

Hence, an analysis of the *Belijdenis* of Paul Roux will enable us to reconstruct its theological history. It may also provide insight into theological reflection at the Cape during this formative stage of its history, as this catechism was compiled by a leading and influential person among the first- and second-generation French Refugee community at the Cape. It provides us with useful opportunities to analyse a document from an important time in the history of the French Refugees, within the context of Huguenot history.

Paul Roux, his catechism and catechisms in general

Background

Some remarks regarding the background to the catechism of Paul Roux made at the Third International Huguenot Conference are included in the footnotes to this article, together with some notes on catechisms in general. In the sections that follow, new light will be shed on the theological roots of this catechism.

Catechisms and catechetical education in general

In addition to what has been said earlier about catechisms and catechism research (cf. d'Assonville 2003),^{xi} it is worth noting that the subject of catechisms, especially Reformation and post-Reformation catechisms, but also pre-Reformation catechisms (cf. Joseph Müller 1970 [1887] on the German catechisms of the Bohemian Brothers), is an extensive and ever-growing field of theological interest.^{xii} One has only to consider the five well-known volumes of Ferdinand Cohrs (1900–1907; reprinted in 1978)^{xiii} on protestant catechisms before Luther's *Enchiridion*, the comprehensive and impressive nine-volume edition (approximately 6500 pages in total) of Johann Michael Reu (1904–1935; reprinted in its entirety in 1976)^{xiv} on German protestant catechisms between 1530 and 1600, or the standard work of Willem Heijting (1989) on the catechisms and confessions of faith in the Dutch Reformation to 1585^{xv} – to mention but a few of the publications in this field – to become aware of the immense variety of protestant catechisms during the sixteenth century and thereafter. Today we are witnessing a new impetus in the field of reformed catechism research – an impetus being stimulated by, for example, the series of β-Verlag: *Beiträge zur Katechismusgeschichte*. All these volumes evince the breadth of the spectrum of catechisms in the history of Reformation and afterwards – a diversity and multiplicity of catechisms as well as types of catechisms. Rather than dwindling in number with the passing of the ages, the range and variety of catechisms has grown down the centuries since the Reformation, and their importance can therefore not be overlooked.

It is against this background that Paul Roux's catechism booklet has to be positioned, within the larger context of protestant catechism material in particular and of systematic-theological reflection in general.

The question always has been precisely *where*, in the theological sense of the word, this catechism belongs. What are its theological roots? Along which theological-catechetical line can it be mapped? If one considers how many catechisms were written, not only in the 16th but also in the 17th century, the question of the placement of this catechism has not yet been adequately answered. One has to take account of the fact that in the Netherlands during the time of the Nadere Reformatie a fair number of catechisms were in circulation. Allusions were even made in the Cape in the 1740s (in 1746 by Le Seuer, cf. Britz 1990) to little hand-written books, i.e. catechisms, which were in use in the relatively small population of the Cape of Good Hope at that stage.

Limitations and scope of the examination

As stated in 2003 (cf. d'Assonville, 2003:28), the prehistory and origin of this catechism book, “Paulus Roux [,] Anno Christi 1743 den 18 Majj [:] Belijdenis des Geloofs”, copied by H.C. von Wieding in 1743 (cf. Roux, 1743:35), is still surrounded by historical uncertainty. “Various questions around the

history of its origin have not been answered satisfactorily, or addressed sufficiently in literature. Thus it is uncertain when the original manuscript was written” (d’Assonville 2003:28).

While my previous study attended to an analysis of the *introductory question*, i.e. the First Part (“Eerste Hooftdeel”) of this catechism book (cf. D’Assonville 2003), the focus of this examination is theological-historical, i.e. to investigate the roots or *dependence* of Roux’s catechism on other catechisms of his time. Where can it be charted on the entire map of protestant catechisms extending from 16th to the 18th century?

Before analysing the theological genesis of the catechism, however, it is important to consider the arrangement and structure of the catechism. Therefore, and for the purpose of comparison, the main content of Roux (1743:3–35) can be characterised as follows (cf. d’Assonville 2003:30, 31):

- 1 An anthropological point of departure – p. 3-5: “Het eerste Hooftdeel” (Part 1).
- 2 Theological enquiry – on the one hand of an epistemological nature, and on the other hand concentrating on the divine attributes – with a soteriological focus (cf. p. 5, first question) – p. 5-10: “Het tweede Hooftdeel” (Part 2).
- 3 Theology – the Trinity; Christology; Pneumatology – p. 10-14: “Het derde Hooftdeel” (Part 3).
- 4 Predestination (*decretum aeternum*) – p. 14-16: “Het vierde Hooftdeel” (Part 4).
- 5 Works of God: Creation with an anthropological part; law of love of God and your neighbour; God’s demand for obedience; death as punishment for man’s disobedience – p. 16-18: “Het vyfde Hooftdeel” (Part 5).
- 6 Sin (including original sin); (again) death as punishment for sin; the need for a mediator; Christ as our Redeemer – p. 19-22: “Het sesde Hooftdeel” (Part 6).
- 7 Christology (Christ as the Incarnated; the natures of Christ; the offices of Christ; the descension and the ascension of Christ) – p. 22-29: “Het sevende Hooftdeel” (Part 7).
- 8 Faith; doctrine of Scripture; justification (“rechtveerdigmakinge” – 29, 30); *meritum Christi*; sanctification (“heyligmakinge” – 29; cf. 31); eternal life (“heerlijkmakinge” – 29; cf. 31); sacraments (Baptism and Lord’s Supper) – p. 29-35: “Het achtste Hooft[deel]” (Part 8).

Theological-historical analysis^{xvi}

Theological-historical dependence

In contrast to all previous studies of the catechism of Paul Roux, of which most have been of a general, sometimes even of a speculative nature, the present study is able to report some progress in the theological-historical positioning of the catechism. This is clear from the brief comparison below, which will then be discussed with regard to the respective (German and Dutch) historical lines:

Lampe (1717) ^{xvii}	Roux (1743:3 et seqq.): “Het eerste Hooftdeel”	D’Outrein (1736 [1687]:11 et seqq.) ^{xviii} “II. HOOFDSTUK: <i>Van de Kennisse van ons selfs.</i> ”
		1 Q What is there next to God which we should know? (“Wat is ’er na God aan welks kennisse ons veel gelegen is?”) A Knowledge of ourselves. (“Aan de kennis van ons selfs.”)
1 Q <i>What are you?</i> (“Was bist du?”) A <i>A man [human].</i> (“Ein Mensch.”)	1 Q <i>What are you?</i> (“Wat zyt ghy?”) A <i>A man [human].</i> (“Een mensch.”)	2 Q <i>What are you?</i> (“Wat zyt ghy?”) A <i>A man [human].</i> (“Een mensch.”)
2 Q <i>What does a man [human] consist of?</i> (“Woraus besteht ein Mensch?”) A <i>Of body and soul.</i> (“Aus Leib und	2 Q <i>What is a man?</i> A <i>A rational creature, consisting of soul and body.</i> (“Een redelyk schepsel, bestaende uit ziel en	3 Q <i>What is a man?</i> A <i>A creature, consisting of soul and body.</i> (“Een schepsel, bestaende uit ziele en lighaam.”)

Seele.”)	lighaam.”)	
		4 Q What difference is there between a human and an animal? A An animal is nothing other than a body without a rational soul.
		5 Q Do not animals then have souls? A They have only an animal (<i>dierlyke</i>) soul, consisting of living [organs] (<i>levensgeesten</i>) and the blood.
		6 Q Don't they [i.e. the animals] thus have any reasonable or rational soul? A No.
		7 Q What do you conclude from this? A That I have been created for a higher purpose than the unreasonable animal.
		8 Q To what purpose? A To know God, to love God, to praise Him and to glorify Him.
3 Q What is the soul? (“Was ist die Seele?”) A A spirit. (“Ein Geist.”)	3 Q What is a rational soul? A <i>A thinking being</i> (“Een denket wesen”) functioning by (“werkende door”) <i>mind</i> (“verstand”), <i>judgment</i> (“oordeel”) and <i>will</i> (“wille”).	9 Q But tell me: what is your rational soul? A A thinking being, functioning by (“werksaam in”) <i>mind</i> (“verstand”), <i>judgment</i> (“oordeel”) and <i>will</i> (“wille”).
4 Q What is a spirit? (“Was ist ein Geist?”) A A <i>thinking being</i> , consisting of <i>mind</i> and <i>will</i> . (“Ein denkendes Wesen, bestehend aus Verstand und Willen.”)		
	4 Q What does your mind do? A The mind knows and understands the things and truths that present themselves to me (“mij voorkomen”).	10 Q What do you do with your mind? A With it I understand God and everything except God that can be known by me.
	5 Q What does your judgment do? A With my judgment I agree which [part of] my thoughts (“dunkt”) is true and I deny that [part of] my pretence that is false.	11 Q What do you do with your judgment? A With it I agree with or I deny what I think is true or false.
	6 Q What does your will do? A The will is inclined (“neigt zig”) to	12 Q What does your will do? A The will is inclined (“neigt zig vrywil-

	desire or to reject that which comes to my mind (“het geen aan mijn verstand voorkomen”).	lig”) to desire or to reject that which comes to my mind (“die aan mijn verstand voorkomen”).
		[Questions 13–15 are further explanations of the relation between mind, judgment and will.]
	7 Q What is your other part? A My body.	16 Q Then, except for your soul, which is your other part? A My body.
	8 Q What does it consist of? A Of flesh, bones, veins, as well as liquids, living [organs] (“Levens-Geesten”) and blood.	18 Q What does the human body consist of? A Of flesh, bones, nerves, veins, muscles, intestines (“ingewanden”), guts (“mitsgaders”), liquids, living [organs] (“levens-geesten”) and blood.
5 Q What is the most noble, the soul or the body? (“Welches ist das Edelste, die Seele oder der Leib?”) A The soul. (“Die Seele.”)	9 Q Which of the two, your soul or your body, is your best part? (“Welke van beyde, uw ziel ofte uw lighaam, is u beste deel?”) A My soul. (“Mijn ziel.”)	[Questions 19–35 deal with the relation between and unity of soul, spirit and body, as well as the question of mortality.]
6 Q Why? (“Warum?”) A Because it is immortal. (“Weil sie unsterblich ist.”)	10 Q Why? (“Waarom?”) A For two reasons: firstly because it functions rationally and is mindful (“met bewustheid”) of itself; secondly because it is immortal. (“om datse onsterfelijk is.”)	36 Q Is the soul the immortal? A Yes.

A German connection?

A first interesting discovery in the search for the theological roots of this catechism is the similarity between the first questions in Part I of Roux’s catechism and those in a renowned German catechism of the 18th century, namely Lampe’s *Erste Wahrheitsmilch für Säuglinge am Alter und Verstand*.^{xix} This catechism, however, should not be confused with other catechetical publications of 1742 and subsequent publications by the same author, such as his commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, *Milch der Wahrheit nach Anleitung des Heidelberghischen Catechismi*.^{xx}

One should keep in mind that Friedrich Adolf Lampe (1683–1729)^{xxi} was considered by some as the most influential theologian of the German reformed church of the 18th century – a fact that is probably not public knowledge outside of Germany. According to E.F.K. Müller, Lampe was the “most influential theologian of the German-reformed church” (cf. Matthias Freudenberg 2005:XV), even considered alongside Schleiermacher to be the most important theologian of the reformed church of Germany after the Reformation (*ibid.*). Lampe, who had studied in West-Friesian Franeker in the Netherlands in 1702, was later called to Utrecht as professor (from 1720 to 1727), where his influence would be extraordinarily far-reaching for the next almost hundred years.

When one compares the first questions that Lampe asks in his catechism of 1717, *Erste Wahrheitsmilch*, with those of Roux’s *Belijdenis*, the similarities are striking at first sight.

Whereas the resemblances are clear, in the second question and answer there is, however, a substantial difference between the catechisms of Lampe and Roux. While Lampe says that “man” consists of “body and soul”, Roux, on the other hand, adds that man is “a *rational* creature, consisting

of body and soul". Body and soul are thus theologically embedded within an anthropological view, according to which man is seen primarily as a rationalistic being.

In elaborating on the concept of soul, Lampe differentiates between "soul" ("Seele") and "spirit" ("Geist"), whereas Roux does not; Roux uses the concept of soul ("ziel") alone. Significantly, "spirit" for Lampe is a "thinking being", similar to "soul" for Roux, but, where for Lampe the spirit of man consists only of "mind and will" (Lampe 2005:33), Roux adds "judgment" to "mind and will" (Roux, 4, third question).

Here the anthropological similarities between the catechisms of Lampe and Roux end, except for the fact that both, in seeing the soul as the most important part of man (more important than the body), explain their conviction through reference to the immortality of the soul (Lampe 33; Roux 5). Another difference becomes evident here, however: for Lampe, the immortality of the soul is the only reason for its superiority to the body, but for Roux the immortality of the soul is only the second reason for its superiority, the first reason being the rationality and the consciousness of the soul (Roux 5, tenth question).

The Dutch connection: The wheel turns full circle

The search for the theological-historical roots of Roux's catechism, however, reveals a more evident link, namely to the Dutch theologian, Johannes d'Outrein (1662–1722).^{xxii} The link with d'Outrein's catechism, *Korte Schets*,^{xxiii} is particularly significant. This link also serves to consolidate the German connection, as d'Outrein himself became known in the German-speaking world *inter alia* because of the same Lampe, who later published notes on the German translation (by H.G. Tegeler) of d'Outrein's commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism.^{xxiv} Lampe's (German) notes on the German translation of d'Outrein's Heidelberg Catechism commentary would afterwards again be translated into Dutch.^{xxv}

Actually, when one takes a close look at the first part of Roux and compares it with the work of Friedrich Adolf Lampe (1717) as well as with the *Korte Schets* by Johannes d'Outrein, it is quite obvious that the similarities between the first chapter of Roux and d'Outrein's second chapter are even more evident than the similarities with the work of Lampe. One only has to compare the following:

Roux (First Part), question 1 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 2;
Roux (First Part), question 2 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 3;
Roux (First Part), question 3 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 9;
Roux (First Part), question 4 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 10;
Roux (First Part), question 5 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 11;
Roux (First Part), question 6 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 12;
Roux (First Part), question 7 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 16;
Roux (First Part), question 8 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 18;
Roux (First Part), question 10 – D'Outrein (Second Chapter), question 36.

It is clear from this comparison of the works of Roux, Lampe and D'Outrein that Roux is directly dependent on D'Outrein, even in the details of the formulation. On the other hand, some important questions arise in connection with the questions and answers omitted by Roux – questions that have to be addressed at another time.^{xxvi}

This dependence by Roux on D'Outrein rather than on Lampe is supported by chronological arguments: the first edition of D'Outrein's *Korte Schets* (1687)^{xxvii} was published 30 years before Lampe's *Erste Wahrheitsmilch für Säuglinge am Alter und Verstand* (1717). D'Outrein's *Korte Schets* was approved by the Lords XVII in March 1717 for dispatch to the Cape of Good Hope, thus before Lampe's *Erste Wahrheitsmilch* could have reached the Cape, having been published in German in the same year (1717), and translated into Dutch only in 1730.^{xxviii} That D'Outrein's *Korte Schets* was widespread is evident from the fact that it was translated into German, French, English, Malaysian and Portuguese.

A provisional theological analysis

Roux's First Part: general remarks

In the first part of Roux's catechism ("Het eerste Hoofddeel", Roux 1743:3–5), which deals generally with anthropology, there is no mention of God. At the end of this part, however, there is a reference to "truths", when the catechism speaks about the superiority of the soul to the body and when simultaneously the theme of "immortality" (of the soul) is introduced.

Proceeding via man and his ability to recognise these “truths”, the second part of the catechism (“Het Tweede Hoofddeel”) now comes to an analytical explanation, starting with the question about “the truth” with reference to salvation (Roux 1743:5).

- Q* What is the first truth that man has to know in order to have knowledge of his salvation? (“Welk is de eerste waarheid, die men kennen moet om wys gemaakt te wordt tot Zaligheid?”)
- A* That God is. (Hebrews 11:6 ...) (“Dat God is. Hebr 11 v 6. Die tot Godt komt moet geloven dat hy is, ende een belooner is, der gener die hem zoeken.”)

With regard to the proposed theological and textual dependence on D’Outrein, it is interesting to note that precisely this question is asked, almost *verbatim*, by D’Outrein in his catechism (“I. Hoofdstuk”, Question 9, *Korte Schets*, p. 2):

- 9th Q* What is ... the first truth, which one has to know in order to have knowledge of his salvation? (“9. Vrag. Welke is van de eerste waarheid, die men kennen moet, om wijsgemaakt te worden tot zaligheid?”)
- A* That God is. Hebr 11:6 ... (“Antw. Dat God is. Hebr. XI:6. Die tot God komt, moet gelooven dat Hy IS; ende een belooner word der geener die hem zoeken ...”)

It is quite obvious that Roux took this question from D’Outrein as well, including the reference to and quotation of Hebrews 11:6 (although D’Outrein quotes John 17 in addition).

The notable difference at this stage, though, is that Roux begins his first main part with man (*Locus de homine*) and then proceeds to the *Locus de Deo*, while D’Outrein starts with the *Locus de Deo*, although he begins with a brief soteriological introduction (the first eight questions), and only then proceeds to his second part, which deals with man.

Theological analysis of Roux’s Part 2 (“Het Tweede Hoofddeel”)

When one examines Roux’s second question in this second main part of his catechism, one observes that the catechism proceeds with a significant dissection of the understanding or comprehension of God by the pupil, typically first mentioning a number of attributes of God, who is described as: all-perfect (“allervolmaakste”); infinite (“oneyndig”); eternal (“[e]euwig”); incomprehensible (“onbegrypelyk”), the One who possesses all perfections (“volmaakthede”) in Himself in an absolute way and Who is entirely blissful (“gelukzalig”).

This is evidently a *verbatim* repetition of D’Outrein (“I. Hoofdstuk”, question 10), but while D’Outrein proceeds with the *quod* question (“What is God?”), Roux immediately continues with the attributes themselves.

Thus, the second question of Roux’s second main part (“2. Hoofddeel”) is succeeded by the third question, sc. a direct question regarding God’s attributes:

Which perfections (attributes) do you know already in God? (“Wat voor [v]olmaaktheden kent ghy al in God?”)

The list of attributes that follows in the answer to this question is as extensive as it is impressive:

[God] is

- spiritual (“Geestelyk”)
- living (“Levendig”)
- autonomous (“onafhankelyk”)
- eternal (“eeuwig”)
- unchangeable (“onveranderlik”)
- incomprehensible (“onbegrypelyk”)
- omniscient/all-knowing (“alwetend”)
- wise (“Wys”)
- almighty (“Almachtig”)
- omnipresent (“Alomtegenwoordig”)
- holy (“Heylig”)
- righteous (“rechtvaardig”)
- good (“goed”)
- gracious (“Genadig”)

merciful (“barmhertig”)
patient/clement (“lankmoedig”)
magnificent (“Heerlyk”)
beatific (“Gelukzalig”)]

Of the five attributes referred to in the previous question and answer (second question of Roux’s second main part), three (i.e. more than half) are repeated in this answer:

eternal (“Eeuwig”)
incomprehensible (“onbegrypelyk”)
beatific (“Gelukzalig”)

Hereafter the attributes are divided into three types:

first, those associated with God’s *being* (“wesen”),
second, those associated with God’s *mind* (“verstand”)
and, in the third instance, those associated with God’s *will* (“wille”).

The correspondence to Roux’s tripartite conception of man’s soul is striking. Man’s soul, according to Roux’s catechism, is made up of *judgment*, *mind* and *will*, whereas the three types of God’s attributes are divided into the categories of *being*, *mind* and *will*. He then arranges the whole list of attributes according to these three categories.

However, the similarities between the different levels of Roux’s view of God (his theology), on the one hand, and between his theology and his anthropology, on the other, are even more striking.

When he distinguishes between the perfections (attributes) of God as classified in these three categories of *being*, *mind* and *will*, the following emerges (in the footsteps of D’Outrein):

The first attribute of God’s *being* is that he is *spiritual*.

But Roux’s (1743:7) answer to the question “what is a Spirit?” is somewhat surprising:

Q What is a Spirit? (“Wat is een Geest?”)
A [A spirit] is a thinking being, whose nature consists in a continual activity (werksaamheid) of mind and will. (“Een denkend Wezen, welks natuur bestaet in een geduerige Werksaemheyd van Verstand en Wille.”)

Thus, according to Roux, who certainly took his formulation from D’Outrein, the first attribute of the first category of attributes, namely the category of God’s *being*, consists of two continuous activities, namely that which was mentioned two questions before as the other two categories: *mind* and *will*.

Although D’Outrein, in his catechism of [1687] 1743 gives almost exactly the same answer (only “gedachten” [thoughts] are complementary to “mind and will”),^{xxix} he (D’Outrein) poses this question immediately after the question about God, whereas Roux begins with the question about God’s attributes.

Following on from this, Roux (1743:7) proceeds directly with a question in which the essential difference between man’s soul and angels (who are also spiritual), and God’s attribute of being spiritual, is specified. Being spirit, in God’s case, means to be uncreated, infinite, perfect and incomprehensible (two of the four concepts, “infinite” and “incomprehensible”, having been used before) – whereas “angels and the spirits of humans are created, finite and imperfect spirits”.^{xxx}

There is, however, a remarkable correspondence between Roux’s catechism and excerpts from D’Outrein’s anthropology. A few pages after D’Outrein’s discussion of the above-mentioned attributes, he proceeds to his anthropology (“Van de Kennisse van ons selfs”, “II. Hoofdstuk”, 9th question – D’Outrein 1736:11):

9th Question: But tell me, what is your rational soul? (“9 Vrag. Maar seg my eens: wat is uwe redelijke ziel?”)
Answer: A thinking being, active in mind, judgment and will. (“Antw. Een denkend wesen, werkzaam in verstand, oordeel en wille.”)

As previously, the almost *verbatim* similarity with Roux’s later formulation is striking (D’Outrein 1736:11). This serves to demonstrate beyond doubt a (qualified) dependence of Roux on D’Outrein.

Conclusions

In light of these few examples from the first and second main part of Roux's catechism and a provisional theological analysis, the following preliminary conclusions can be drawn:

Dependence on D'Outrein

These examples suffice to demonstrate that Roux's catechism relies very strongly on that of D'Outrein. Not only the *verbatim* quotations of D'Outrein by Roux offer adequate proof, but the external circumstances also support this conclusion, namely the geographical relation between the Cape of Good Hope and the Netherlands, as well as the order in 1717 of 100 copies of D'Outrein's *Korte Schets*, approved by the Lords XVII about six years before Roux's death in 1723.^{xxxii}

When one compares Roux with D'Outrein, it is worthwhile to note not only the questions and answers formulated by D'Outrein that are used almost *verbatim* by Roux, but also the parts of D'Outrein which are omitted. Also of importance is the sequence of questions used by Roux, and how it deviates from D'Outrein's sequence of divisions and arrangement of questions.

This can be explained by means of two examples: Roux uses more terminology referring to *rationality*, while D'Outrein provides extensive empirical explanations of various proofs for his convictions from nature, from creation. This means that one finds in D'Outrein's catechism more pointers to a *theologia naturalis* than in Roux.

Although Roux cites, with only a few exceptions, exactly the same attributes of God as does D'Outrein, it is significant that in each instance Roux gives a Scriptural reference – and quote – for every attribute. This phenomenon is not found in D'Outrein to this extent, and not at all in this specific instance.^{xxxiii}

Influence of the Dutch Nadere Reformatie

With regard to the catechetical education of the Drakenstein congregation (the congregation of the Huguenots) at the Cape of Good Hope in the first half of the 18th century, this proves that there are at least indications of an influence of the Nadere Reformatie (a form of reformed orthodoxy in the Netherlands during the 17th century), to formulate it rather cautiously.

One also has to take into consideration the fact that the Voetius and Coccejus traditions are united in D'Outrein. In the case of the latter, the reformed orthodoxy of the 17th century had begun to be infiltrated by the ideas of the Enlightenment (cf. Cornelis Graafland, 1993:80, 81).

Implications for South African historiography

The implication for Huguenot research in South Africa is that the line from Calvin via France to the Cape of Good Hope is not as clear cut or as straight as has been stated in recent publications (cf. Britz 2008 for a survey of South African publications in this regard).

Moreover, when one considers how accurately D'Outrein is quoted – *verbatim* in many instances – a previous question regarding the original language of the catechism, as well as questions regarding the possibility of a translation,^{xxxiii} are in all probability solved. Taking into account the many changes that take place during translation, it is highly probable that Roux wrote his catechism in Dutch, or rather, copied from D'Outrein's Dutch catechism. This furthermore confirms the probability of a late dating of this catechism, at least after 1700 – most likely even later. Of course, this depends on when Roux first had access to D'Outrein.

Finally

This brief theological tour through the second main part of the handwritten catechism of Paul Roux shows us that there will always be new matters to discover and explore. An area that still merits study is the question of the proclamation of God's Word in Africa. Specific attention should be paid to the role played by the French Refugees, as Huguenots and their descendants, in this regard. For the purposes of research on the French Refugees of 1688 this is an issue of importance precisely because it is also the work of Christ by his Spirit and his Word through the centuries.

Works consulted

- Britz, Rudolf M 1989. Beeld en Singewing: 'n Ekklesiologiese verkenning van die literatuur waarin die geskiedskrywing oor die Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk sy oorsprong het. Unpublished DTh dissertation. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Britz, Rudolf M 1990. Hoe gereformeerd was die Franse Hugenote? *NGTT* 31(3), 348–356.
- Britz, Rudolf M 2008. The French Refugees in the 20th century South African historiography, in Flick, Andreas & Schulz, Walter, *Hrsg., Von Schweden bis Südafrika/From Sweden to South Africa. Proceedings of the International Huguenot Conference in Emden 2006*, 9–33. Bad Karlshafen: Verlag der Deutschen Hugenotten-Gesellschaft.
- Brown, Eddie 199_. Nederduits-Gereformeerd Suid-Afrika, Deel II: Nederduits-Gereformeerd Suid-Afrika, toe 'n Nederlandse verversingstasie in 'n kolonie ontwikkel het. *sine loco*. (Unpublished.)
- Coertzen, Pieter 1976. Die Franse Hugenote in Suid-Afrika: 'n Kerkhistoriese studie. Stellenbosch. Unpublished DTh dissertation. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Coertzen, Pieter 1988. *Die Hugenote van Suid-Afrika 1688–1988*. Kaapstad: Tafelberg.
- Cohrs, Ferdinand 1978 [1900–1907]. Die Evangelischen Katechismusversuche vor Luthers Enchiridion. Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und zusammenfassend dargestellt von F. Cohrs. 1. Band: Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche aus den Jahren 1522–1526. 2. Band: Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche aus den Jahren 1527–1528. 3. Band: Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche aus den Jahren 1528–1529. 4. Band: Undatierbare Katechismusversuche und Zusammenfassende Darstellung. 5. Band: Register. In *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag. [Berlin: A. Hofmann & Comp.]
- D'Assonville, Victor E 2003. The angle of incidence of Paul Roux's catechism: a study on the theology of a French refugee at the Cape. *Acta Theologica* 2003(2), 26–42.
- D'Outrein, Johannes 1724. *Het Goude Kleinoot van de Leer der Waarheid die naar de Gosaligheid is, vervattet in den Heidelbergschen Catechismus*. Nader uitgebreid, opgehelder en betogt deur Johannes D'Outrein, in leven Phil. Doct. en predikant te Amsterdam. Door syn Eerw. selfs merkelyk verbeterd en vermeerderd, zynde met desselfs toestemming, in den tweede Druk daar bygevoeg, de uit het Hoogduitsch door J. de Long vertaalde Aanmerkinge en vermeerderingen van die Hoog Eerw. Heere Frederik Adolph Lampe, in leven Doct. en Professor der H. Godgeleertheit te Utrecht. De Sesde Druk, van veel fouten gesuivert. Amsterdam: Nicolas Byl.
- D'Outrein, Johannes 1736 [1687/1717]. *Korte Schets der Godlyke Waarheden soo als die in haare natuurlyke orde te samen geschakelt zyn*. Waar in kortelyk de H. Godgeleertheit doorlopen, de Wegen Gods in syne Kerke nagespeurd en insonderheyd de verscheide Bedeelingen van het Genadenverbond nader opgeheldert worden. Tot oefening van waarheid en deugd dood Johannes D'Outrein, in leven Philos. Doct. en Bedienaar des H. Evangeliums te Amsterdam. De Vyftiende Druk. Weder op nieuws overzien en van drukfouten gesuivert. Amsterdam: Jacobus Borstius.
- Franken, Johan LM 1978. *Die Hugenote aan die Kaap*. Petoria: Staatsdrukker. (Argiefjaarboek vir Suid-Afrikaanse Geskiedenis, Een-en-Veertigste Jaargang.)
- Freudenberg, Matthias 2005. Reformierte Kaechismen aus drei Jahrhunderten. Rödingen: β-Verlag. (Beiträge zur Katechismusgeschichte, Band 10.)
- Graafland, Cornelis 1989. Friedrich Adolph Lampe, in Brienens, T, Exalto, K, Graafland, C, Loonstra, B & Van't Spijker, W, *Theologische aspecten van de Nadere Reformatie*, 243–274. Zoetermeer: Uitgeverij Boekencentrum.
- Graafland, Cornelis 1993. Schriftleer en schriftverstaan in de Nadere Reformatie, in Brienens, T, Exalto, K, Graafland, C, Loonstra, B & Van 't Spijker, W, *Theologische aspecten van de Nadere Reformatie*, 29–97. Zoetermeer: Uitgeverij Boekencentrum.
- Heijting, Willem 1989. *De Catechismen en Confessies in de Nederlandse Reformatie tot 1585*. Deel 1 & 2. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf.
- Lampe, Friedrich Adolf 2000 [1742]. *Milch der Wahrheit*. Herausgegeben von Matthias Freudenberg. Rödingen: β-Verlag. (Beiträge zur Katechismusgeschichte, Bd. 4.)
- Lampe, Friedrich Adolf 2005 [1717]. *Erste Wahrheitsmilch für Säuglinge am Alter und Verstand*. Angefügt an: Einleitung zu dem Geheimniß des Gnadenbunds, der nach der vernünftigen Milch des Worts Gottes begierigen Jugend zum Nutzen und insbesondere denen, die zum Heiligen Abendmahl sollen zugelassen werden, zur bequemen Anleitung entworfen, in Freudenberg, M, *Hrsg., Reformierte Katechismen aus drei Jahrhunderten*. Rödingen: β-Verlag. (Beiträge zur Katechismusgeschichte, Bd. 10.)
- Müller, Joseph 1970 [1887]. *Die deutschen Katechismen der Böhmischen Brüder: Kritische Textausgabe mit kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlichen Untersuchungen und einer Abhandlung*

- über das Schulwesen der Böhmisches Brüder. Berlin. In *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica* VI. Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf [Berlin].
- Reu, Johann Michael 1976 [1904–1935]. *Quellen zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Unterrichts in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands zwischen 1530 und 1600*. 9 Bände. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben und zusammenfassend dargestellt von Johann Michael Reu. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag. [Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann.]
- Roux, Paul 1743[s.a.]. Belijdenis des Geloofs. Afskrif (in Nederlands) deur H.C. von Wieding. (Handwritten unpublished manuscript; copy of the original kept at the archives of the Dutch Reformed Church in Stellenbosch; original manuscript kept by the Roux family.)
- Schulze, Ludi F 1991. Twee kategismusse uit die 16de eeu: 'n Spieël van aksentverskuiwing. *In die Skriflig* 25(1), 3–27.
- Surkau, Hans-Werner 1959. Katechismus: II. Geschichtlich. In Galling, K, Hrsg., RGG. *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, III. Band. (Dritte, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage.) Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). Spalte 1179–1186.
- Van 't Veer, Marinus B 1942. *Catechese en catechetische stof by Calvyn*. Kampen: Kok.
- Van Zijl, Willem J 1992. *Van skeepskis na wakies tot boekrak*. Kaapstad: Lux Verbi.
- Vitringa, Campegius 1724 [1717]. *Korte Schets van de Christelyke Zedenleere ofte van het Geestelyk Leven ende desselfs Eigenschappen*. Uit het Latyn vertaalt door J. D'Outrein. Derde druk. Amsterdam: Antoni Schoonenburg.
- Weber, Otto 1996[1963]. Einleitung. In *Der Heidelberger Katechismus*, hg. von Otto Weber. Gütersloh: GTB.

Endnotes

-
- 1 I would like to express my appreciation to the Johannes a Lasco Library and its staff in Emden, Germany, for their support in allowing me the opportunity to use their excellent facilities in researching this theme during September 2006 and April 2007. The nucleus of this article was delivered as a paper at the Fourth International Huguenot Conference in Emden, Germany, September 14–17, 2006. My thanks is due to Dr. Andreas Flick, the editor of the volume *Von Schweden bis Südafrika/From Sweden to South Africa* (www.hugenotten.de), in which this article was published under the title “Early theology at the Cape of Good Hope – A German–Dutch connection? Some notes on the theology of a French Refugee in the early 18th century”, for giving his permission for a slightly altered version of this article to be published in *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*.
- 2 Dr Victor E d’Assonville, Research Associate, Department of Ecclesiology, University of the Free State, PO Box 339, Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa; Forschungstelle – Internationale Reformationstheologie, Akademie für Reformatorische Theologie, Hannover, Germany. E-mail: assonville@reformatio.de.
- 3 Cf. in this regard the lists published in Rudolf M. Britz (1989) and Willem J. van Zijl (1992).
- 4 “Paulus Roux [,] Anno Christi 1743 den 18 Maij [:] Belijdenis des Geloofs”, copied by H.C. von Wieding in 1743, cf. Paul Roux (1743).
- 5 The many references to Paul Roux in church historical studies of the past two decades can be attributed to the fact that this manuscript (Roux 1743) came to light in the latter part of the 20th century (Coertzen 1976:214). (Cf. D’Assonville 2003:27.)
In all probability – if one accepts the authenticity of this document – this catechism book by “Paulus Roux” is consequently originally from the pen of the same Roux, who had died twenty years earlier, in 1723. According to Pieter Coertzen (1976:214), to date this is the oldest known written index of questions, or catechism book, in the Cape, although another catechism, which also dates back to the first half of the 18th century (that of Le Seuer – cf. Britz 1989; 1990) had been printed in 1746. That Paul Roux’s catechism had indeed been ascribed a certain legitimacy has been deduced from the fact that the book was, years after Roux’s death, [probably] still used by the pioneer parish of Drakenstein (cf. Britz 1990:349). (Cf. d’Assonville 2003:27, 28.)
- 6 The French Refugees had been fleeing France via the Netherlands since 1685 as a result of the abolition of the Edict of Nantes.
- 7 However, it is interesting that from 1688 until his death in 1723 there is no mention of “the teaching of Paul Roux” (“die onderwijs van Paul Roux”) in the official correspondence between the clergy at the Cape and the VOC (cf. Franken 1977:32, 33).

-
- 8 E.g. Pieter Coertzen (1976:214 et seqq.; 1988:129 et seqq.); Rudolf M. Britz (1989:58 et seqq.; 1990:344, 354 et seqq.); Eddie Brown (199_:48 et seqq.); Willem J. van Zijl (1992:156 et seqq.); Victor E. d'Assonville (2003).
- 9 Finally published as V.E. d'Assonville, 2003. The angle of incidence of Paul Roux's catechism – a study on the theology of a French Refugee at the Cape. *Acta Theologica* 2003(2):26–42.
- 10 Cf. Rudolf M. Britz (2008).
- 11 D'Assonville (2003:29, 30):
“The complexity of catechism research should be taken in regard, when one wants to obtain a view on the contemporary theological and religious education at the Cape against the background of the broader European reformed context. This is applicable especially when one is considering perspectives on the influence of the Huguenots regarding the nature of the founding and expansion of the reformed religion at the Cape in the first half-century after their arrival. Catechetical training or education, after all, can be justly called one of the foundation pillars of the reformed religion, and as such there are few measures more suited to a theological analysis than specifically a catechism book. Furthermore, a catechism always intends to be a concise summary of doctrine; as such it can be regarded as a mirror of the doctrine and its development during the period of its origin” (Ludi Schulze, 1991:5).
“During and after the Reformation, *catechetical education* on the one hand and *catechisms* on the other hand acquired a special importance in the practice of Protestant religion, within both the Lutheran sphere of influence and in accordance with Calvin's Genevan initiatives. The impact of Luther's *Großer Katechismus* and his *Kleiner Katechismus* (1529) is universally acknowledged, as is that of Calvin's *Genevan Catechism* of 1542. In fact, the *Small Catechism* (Luther) together with the *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563) and the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* (1647) rank as the most prominent examples of catechisms, which have been widely accepted since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries” (cf. Otto Weber, 1996:5).
- 12 For the significance and historical application of the term “catechism”, cf. Marinus B. van't Veer (1942:6 et seqq.) and Hans-Werner Surkau (1959:1179 et seqq.).
- 13 Ferdinand Cohrs 1978 [1900-1907]. Die Evangelischen Katechismusversuche vor Luthers Enchiridion. Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und zusammenfassend dargestellt von F. Cohrs. 1. Band: Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche aus den Jahren 1522–1526. 2. Band: Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche aus den Jahren 1527–1528. 3. Band: Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche aus den Jahren 1528–1529. 4. Band: Undatierbare Katechismusversuche und Zusammenfassende Darstellung. 5. Band: Register. In *Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag. [Berlin: A. Hofmann & Comp.]
- 14 Johann Michael Reu 1976 [1904–1935]. Quellen zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Unterrichts in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands zwischen 1530 und 1600. 9 Bände. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben und zusammenfassend dargestellt von Johann Michael Reu. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag. [Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann.]
- 15 Willem Heijting 1989. De Catechismen en Confessies in de Nederlandse Reformatie tot 1585, Deel 1 & 2. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf.
- 16 Further reference to the catechism book by Roux (1743) will be made – when applicable – by the page numbers only in brackets, e.g. (3) meaning Roux (1743:3).
- 17 Cf. Matthias Freudenberg (2005:33).
- 18 First impression in 1687. The fifteenth impression, that of 1736, was used for this article (cf. Johannes d'Outrein, 1736).
- 19 Friedrich Adolf Lampe 2005 [1717]. Erste Wahrheitsmilch für Säuglinge am Alter und Verstand. Angefügt an: Einleitung zu dem Geheimniß des Gnadenbunds, der nach der vernünftigen Milch des Worts Gottes begierigen Jugend zum Nutzen und insbesondere denen, die zum Heiligen Abendmahl sollen zugelassen werden, zur bequemen Anleitung entworfen. In Matthias Freudenberg, Hrsg., 2005. Reformierte Katechismen aus drei Jahrhunderten. In *Beiträge zur Katechismusgeschichte*, Bd. 10. Röttingen: β-Verlag.
- 20 Cf. Friedrich Adolf Lampe 2000 [1742]. Milch der Wahrheit. Herausgegeben von Matthias Freudenberg. In *Beiträge zur Katechismusgeschichte*, Bd. 4. Röttingen: β-Verlag.
- 21 Friedrich Adolf Lampe was born on 18 or 19 February 1683 (cf. Matthias Freudenberg, 2000:XV) in Detmold, Lippe. After studying at the Gymnasium Illustre in Bremen and in

-
- Franeker, he was reformed minister in Weeze (Kleve), in Duisburg and in Bremen, before being called in 1720 to be professor at the University of Utrecht. He taught there until 1727, when he returned to Bremen to occupy the office of *Primarius* at the St. Ansgarii and professor at the Gymnasium Illustre, where, on 8 December 1729, he died.
- 22 Johannes d'Outrein was born in Middelburg (Netherlands) on 17 October 1662 and was minister of religion in Franeker for 3 years, Arnhem for 12 years, Dordrecht for 6 years and Amsterdam for 13 years. He died in Amsterdam on 24 February 1722.
- 23 D'Outrein's *Korte Schets* (cf. Johannes D'Outrein 1736) should not be confused with either the other "Korte Schets", the book of Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722), best-known student of Johannes Coccejus and professor in Franeker from 1681, which was translated by the same D'Outrein from the Latin into Dutch, with the Dutch title: *Korte Schets van de Christelyke Zedenleere ofte van het Geestelyk Leven ende desselfs Eigenschappen* (cf. Campegius Vitringa 1724), or with D'Outrein's own commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, which he announced in his preface to the 1718 edition of his *Korte Schets* (cf. Johannes D'Outrein, 1736:48). Of the latter a second impression had already appeared in 1724 (Johannes D'Outrein, 1736:48).
- 24 Johannes D'Outrein 1721. *Gülden Kleinod der Lehre der Wahrheit nach der Gottseligkeit verfasst in dem Heidelbergischen Catechismo, weiter ausgeführt, erläutert und befestigt von Johannes D'Outrein, Phil.D. und berühmten Prediger zu Amsterdam; nunmehr wegen seiner Fürtrefflichkeit ins Hochdeutsche übersetzt durch Henr. Günth. Tegeler, N.C.P. und Organisten der S. Stephanskirche in Bremen; ferner mit Fleiß übersehen und mit verschiedenen Anmerkungen und Zugaben vermehret von Friderich Adolph Lampe, vormahls Dienern des Göttlichen Worts zu Bremen, anjetzo Doct. und Professore Theolo. zu Utrecht in Holland. Bremen: Philipp Gottfried Saurmanns.*
- 25 Johannes d'Outrein 1724. *Het Gouden Kleinoot van de Leere der Waarheid, die naar de Godsaligheid is; Vervattet in den Heidelbergischen Catechismus. Nader uitgebreidt, opgeheldert en betoogt door Johannes D'Outrein, in leven Phil. Doct. en predikant te Amsterdam. Door syn Eerw. selfs merkelyk verbeterd en vermeerderd, zynde met desselfs toestemminge, in desen tweeden Druk daar bygevoegt, de uit het Hoogduitsch door J. le Long vertaalde aanmerkingen en vermeerderingen van den Hoog. Eerw. Heere Frederik Adolf Lampe, Doct. en Professor in de H. Godgeleertheid te Utrecht. Amsterdam: Jan Boom. (Cf. the sixth impression [1738] and the seventh impression [1752], with the addition: "De Sevende Druk, van veel fouten gesuivert. Amsterdam: Nicolaas Byl.")*
- 26 Of course the influence of D'Outrein's *Korte Schets* on Lampe's *Erste Wahrheitsmilch* still has to be examined thoroughly. The relation between Lampe and D'Outrein is well known (cf. Matthias Freudenberg 2005:XIV). Lampe's notes on D'Outrein's Heidelberg Catechismus Commentary were also published with the latter's book in 1724 (cf. Johannes D'Outrein 1724).
- 27 The 15th impression of D'Outrein's catechism, that of 1736, was at my disposal in the John a Lasco Library, Emden, Germany, where the research for this paper was conducted.
- 28 Friedrich Adolf Lampe 1730. *Eerste Waarheyds-Melk voor Zuigelingen*. Amsterdam: Schoonenburg. (Cf. Matthias Freudenberg, 2005:XIX.)
- 29 Johannes D'Outrein 1736 (*Korte Schets*, hfst 1, q 12 answer): "[A spirit] is a thinking being, that is a being whose nature consists in a continual activity of thoughts, mind and will."
- 30 "Vraag: Wat voor onderscheyd stelt gy tusschen Godt die een Geest is, en onse Zielen en een Engel die ook Geesten zyn?"
"Ant: God is een Ongeschaapen, oneyndige, volmaakte en onbegrypelyke Geest. Maar de Engelen ende de Geest des menschen, zyn geschapene, eyndige en Onvolmaakte Geesten."
- 31 In 1717 the order for 100 copies of D'Outrein's "Korte Schets" was approved for dispatch to the Cape, together with 100 copies of the Heidelberg Catechism (Coertzen 1988:130).
- 32 A general observation is that, in direct contrast with other catechisms since the Early Church, but especially with catechisms of the 16th century and later on, Roux's catechism does not give any explanation of the Decalogue (Ten Commandments), the Apostolic Confession or even the Lord's Prayer. He does, however, explain the sacraments.
- 33 Cf. Victor d'Assonville (2003:28), where it was stated that in light of Roux's ardour for the French language, and the fact that he was a first-generation French settler, it can be argued that the original manuscript was in French and not in Dutch – in contrast to this single remaining copy of which we are aware. However, this is at present "still largely a supposition that has not yet been verified by studies [...]. If the language of the original manuscript could be ascertained, it would give rise to further questions, such as whether this existent text is a translation and/or

version, and whether it is a true version/copy of the original or not ...” It also gives rise to questions about who was “responsible” for this “translation/version” (d’Assonville 2003:28).