

THE FOUNDING OF NEW AMSTERDAM  
IN 1626

BY VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS

## INTRODUCTION

THE stepping-stones of history are often rough-hewn, tripping the unwary in the ascent to truth. The history of the primitive period of European contact with the Atlantic coast of North America in the environs of New York has suffered from an insufficiency of critical judgment applied to a sparsity of evidence by nineteenth-century writers. It seems fitting in this introduction to sum up the results of later study derived from a reëxamination of the sources available to these writers and from the interesting evidences that have since come to light.

It is now generally established as a result of nineteenth-century controversy, followed by the discovery of better evidence in the twentieth century, that in 1524 Giovanni da Verrazzano, the Italian who sailed in the interest of France, entered the present harbor of New York in the ship *Dauphine*. But he did not reach Manhattan Island; he never came back, and his visit was fruitless.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Texts or translations of the older corrupt texts of Verrazzano's letter to Francis I., of France, dated July 8, 1524, announcing his discoveries in North America, have been often printed, first in Ramusio's *Navigazioni*, vol. III (1556), in Hakluyt's *Divers Voyages* (1582), in *Collections of N. Y. Hist. Soc.*, 2d ser., vol. I (1841), p. 37, and reprinted in Asher's *Henry Hudson* (1860), and elsewhere. These left much to be desired. But the discovery of a codex in the possession of Count Giulio Macchi di Cellere of Rome and its first publication in 1909 by Alessandro Bacchiani in *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*, fasc. XI, pp. 1274-1323, established beyond peradventure the genuineness of the letter and the certainty of the discovery. This original codex, since purchased by J. Pierpont Morgan, is in the Morgan Library. It is reproduced in facsimile in Stokes's *Iconography of Manhattan Island*, vol. II. The text with an English translation is given by Edward Hagaman Hall in *Fifteenth Annual Report* (1910), of the Amer. Scenic and Hist. Preservation Society.

Estevam Gomez, a Portuguese pilot engaged in the service of Spain, in 1525 sailed along the North Atlantic coast and noted the inlets. It is not at all probable that he entered the Upper Bay of New York, though his explorations as a whole along the coast from Newfoundland to Cape May had a great effect upon the map-makers of his century. The period from Gomez to Hudson, that is from 1525 to 1609, is a void of myth and mystery, so far as the environs of Manhattan Island are concerned.

The significant date in the discovery of Manhattan Island is the afternoon of September 12, 1609, when Henry Hudson in the ship *de Halve Maen* (the Half Moon) anchored off Manhattan Island. We do not know whether Hudson or any member of his crew then set foot on Manhattan Island. But we know that no settlements anywhere resulted then from this voyage<sup>2</sup>.

Joannes de Laet, a Director of the Dutch West India Company, who in 1630 became interested in patroonships in New Netherland, published at Leyden in 1625 a work entitled *Nieuwe Wereldt ofte Beschrijvinghe van West-Indien* (New World or Description of the West Indies), of which a second revised Dutch edition was issued in 1630, and of which amplified versions appeared in Latin and French, respectively, in 1633 and 1640.<sup>3</sup> De Laet admits that the coastal

---

<sup>2</sup>The earliest printed account of this third voyage of Hudson is in Emanuel van Meteren's *Commentarien ofte Memorien van den Nederlandtsen Staet*, preface dated February, 1610, the only known copy of which, formerly owned by the late John Boyd Thacher, of Albany, N. Y., is now in the Library of Congress. A pirated edition appeared in 1611, and another in 1614. Robert Juet's account in Purchas *His Pilgrimes*, vol. III. (London, 1625), pp. 581-595, and reprint edition, vol. XIII (London, 1906, pp. 333-374, has been often reprinted in whole or in part, and is easily accessible in Jameson's *Narratives of New Netherland*, pp. 16-28. The account of Hudson's discovery in book III, chap. 7 of Joannes de Laet's *Nieuwe Wereldt* (1625) is perhaps based on a lost journal or other papers of Hudson. Hudson's contract and instructions, Dutch with English translation, taken from an unpublished manuscript history of the East India Company by Van Dam, are in Henry C. Murphy's *Henry Hudson in Holland*, edition by Wouter Nijhoff (The Hague, 1909), and the page of Van Dam showing the contract is facsimiled in *Eleventh Annual Report of American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society* (1906).

<sup>3</sup>The New Netherland matter is in Book III, chaps. 7-11. A highly important map was added to the second Dutch edition and repeated in the Latin and French versions. There have been several English translations of the New Netherland parts; but the best of them,

region of New Netherland had been seen by navigators of other nations, but alleges that none had sailed the inner harbor or had explored the great river before the feat was accomplished by Hudson in 1609. And he adds: "From all that they could judge and learn, there had never been any ships or Christians in that quarter before." He states that after Hudson had "returned to Amsterdam with his report, in the year 1610, some merchants again sent a ship thither—that is to say, to the second river discovered, which was called Manhattes from the savage nation that dwells at its mouth." In the Latin and French versions he adds that these merchants were "of Amsterdam." This is all there is about 1610, and nothing more than a statement about a ship sent to the river by the merchants. The place is not localized. The river's name is given as Manhattes, and the explanation of the name is, that it was derived from certain Indians, a "savage nation," that dwelt at the mouth of the river, yet without indicating just whereabouts the mouth of the river. There is not the least hint of a settlement by Europeans.

We come now to the mythical attributions of 1613. Part 2 of Joseph W. Moulton's *History of the State of New York* is known as *Novum Belgium* and was published in 1826. He refers to four houses alleged to have been built on Manhattan Island in 1613 as a trading post, and in a footnote adds: "On the site of the Macomb houses in Broadway, according to tradition as related by the Rev. John N. Abeel, in Mss. of the New-York Historical Society." When Moulton was securing materials for his *History* he had access to the New York Historical Society and several times cites "Abeel MSS." He also cites other manuscripts of this Society, among them the Miller Papers. The

---

embodying the longer additions of the Dutch edition of 1630 and the variants of the Latin and French versions, is in Jameson's *Narratives of New Netherland*, pp. 36-60. De Laet was also the author of a history of the Dutch West India Company, entitled, *Historie ofte Jaerlijck Verhael* (Leyden, 1644), but there is almost nothing in this work pertaining to New Netherland.

story of Moulton has been copied, enlarged upon, and even immortalized in a tablet erected by The Holland Society of New York, so deserves space for criticism. James Grant Wilson, the general editor of the *Memorial History of the City of New York*, himself wrote the fourth chapter of vol. I. He accepts the alleged 1613 occupation of Manhattan Island and the so-called tradition respecting the site of the Macomb houses, but says he could not obtain a view of the Abeel manuscripts at the New York Historical Society. I relate my experience. When more than a dozen years ago I asked to see the Abeel manuscripts, I was told there were no papers of that kind owned by the Society. I was examining great quantities of manuscripts in the possession of the Society. On the day that I asked for the Abeel manuscripts, I was using the papers of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, which were in the main correspondence and memoranda procured by him with the idea of writing a history of New York. Here I discovered the Abeel manuscripts, consisting of translations from Dutch papers at Albany, and other notes and memoranda, among them a garbled quotation from a tract entitled *New Albion*, whose alleged author is Beauchamp Plantagenet, and the origin of the so-called "four houses," which Abeel suggested were located where the Macomb houses then stood. Abeel, a clergyman who had some understanding of the Dutch language, had made his translations and notes for Dr. Miller. But as Dr. Miller's contemplated *History* did not materialize, the Miller Papers eventually came into the possession of the New York Historical Society. Here Moulton found them and the Abeel manuscripts among them. This it was that Moulton had appropriated. The Plantagenet tract is the originator, Abeel is the amplifier, and Moulton and his endless followers are the victims of this superstition.

Now, the little quarto, no larger than a Shakespeare quarto play, is called: *A description of the province of New Albion*, by Beauchamp Plantagenet, printed at

London, 1648, also reprinted. The original edition is very rare and a rich man's hobby, but should not be a historian's pony. Among the extraordinary statements in this singular tract is one which says that "Sir Thomas Dale and Sir Thomas Argall" on a return voyage from the French settlements in Acadia, in 1613, made a visit "at Manhatas Isle in Hudson's River where they found four houses built and a pretended Dutch governour under the West India Company of Amsterdam." So far as there is a shadow of truth in this tract, it can be traced to the printed works of Purchas, Captain John Smith, and other contemporary authors, as well as to the diplomatic history of the times, from which the fabricator had drawn his cues for the distortion of truth and the concoction of statements that are contrary to all contemporary history. This tract, as already shown, was accepted by uncritical compilers of history as gospel truth. In a broad way, its use in the history of New York has come about by its accessibility in the *Collections* of the New York Historical Society, 2d series, vol. I (1841), pp. 333-342, in a contribution by George Folsom, who accepted the work as of "undoubted" authority. But his article shows no critical acumen and he reached conclusions without supporting them by authority. Moreover, it is indeed singular that Folsom did not know that only a year before, in 1840, there had appeared an excellent critical examination and analysis of the tract by John Penington, in the *Memoirs* of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, vol. IV, pt. 1. Penington exposed with lucidity many of the falsehoods of the tract and concluded that even the name of the author, Beauchamp Plantagenet, was a fabrication—the *raison d'être* of the tract resting in motives to bolster up unworthy speculative schemes. Brodhead's *History of N. Y.*, vol I (various pages) gives a sane exposition of the subject. Henry C. Murphy showed his disbelief in *Collections* of the New York Historical Society, 2d series, vols. II and III. Berthold Fernow in Win-

sor's *America*, vol. IV, discredits the alleged visit to Manhattan and the authorship of the tract. Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer in her *History of the City of N. Y.*, vol. I, shows how the "belief in the four houses which Argall was said to have seen on Manhattan topples down in the general destruction of the story." Other recent doubters have been Alexander Brown in his *First Republic in America* (1898), and Amandus Johnson, in his *Swedish Settlements*, vol. I.

The story of an alleged visit to Manhattan by Argall or any other Englishman in 1613 rests entirely upon the tract of 1648 and later works of Heylin, Ogilby, and others, who copied from it or copied from one another. Brodhead said of the tract in 1853, that it was then "generally held to be a mass of absurd and inconsistent errors," and he added: "It is extraordinary that no English or Dutch State Papers corroborates the story." The fact is as well true that Father Biard's *Relation* and letters know nothing of the story. Again, Argall had not been knighted in 1613, and Sir Thomas Dale did not go with him on either of the Acadian expeditions. The Dutch West India Company did not exist in 1613—it was chartered in 1621. There was no "Dutch Governour," pretended or otherwise, in 1613, and the allusion to "the next pretended Governour" is a garbled reference to Peter Minuit, in whose time "Maps and printed Cards, calling this part New Netherland," were made and published. Stuyvesant, who is named "Stuy" in the tract, was appointed in 1646 and arrived at New Amsterdam in 1647, so could not be guilty of acts attributed to him about three years before his arrival. So far as the acts mentioned in the tract have even a modicum of truth in them, they are applicable to Willem Kieft. This baseless fabrication may be allowed to rest in the cabinets of collectors; it should no longer intrude itself in the writing of history.

In his seventh chapter, De Laet mentions without elaboration the charter that was granted by the States

General in 1614 to "merchants" who had been interested in the expedition of 1610, giving to them the "exclusive privilege of navigating" the Hudson River "and trading there"; and in the later versions of his work he adds, "our people wintered there." Also in this connection he states that in 1615 "a redoubt or small fort was erected, up the said river, and occupied by a small garrison," and "our countrymen have continued to make voyages thither each year [*i. e.* from the granting of the aforesaid commercial privileges], and continuously some of our people remain there [*i. e.* 'up the said river,' where the small fort was built], for the purpose of trafficking with the natives; and on this account the country has justly received the name of New Netherland."

De Laet in his ninth chapter returns to mention this fort, which now he says "was built in the year 1614 (in his seventh chapter he said 1615), and he now definitely locates it "upon an island on the west side of the river, where a nation of savages dwells called the Mackwaes [Mohawks], the enemies of the Mohicans." He continues: "The fort was built in the form of a redoubt . . . and the garrison consisted of ten or twelve men. Hendrick Christiaensz. first commanded here, and in his absence Jacques Elckens, on behalf of the company<sup>4</sup> which in 1614 received authority from their High Mightinesses, the States General. This fort was constantly occupied for three years, after which it partly went to decay. On this river there is a great traffick in the skins of beavers, otters, foxes, bears, minks, wild cats, and the like. This land is excellent and agreeable, full of noble forest trees and grape vines." In this connection it is pertinent to point out that Hudson's carpenter "went on land," while the *Half Moon* lay at anchor near the present site

<sup>4</sup>The allusion is to the charter granted to the United New Netherland Company, an association of thirteen merchants of Amsterdam and Hoorn, on October 11, 1614, for a monopoly during four voyages within three years of time. The original manuscript of this charter is in the Rijksarchief at The Hague, and is reproduced in facsimile in Wilson's *Memorial History of the City of N. Y.*, vol. I.

of Albany, "and made a fore-yard," the first but not the last evidence of early shipbuilding in that region.

In his tenth chapter, De Laet again speaks of Hudson, quoting from a lost report of Henry Hudson. He does this to describe the land and the manners of the Indians, and particularly the region above 42°, situate about the present Albany. He tells of the very cold winters and the "strong drift of ice in the river," which "occurs some years more than others," a condition still true today in the upper reaches of the Hudson River. From thence he proceeds, thus: "We have before stated how the country there abounds in timber suitable for ship-building [*i.e.* in his ninth chapter describing the region around Castle Island, near Albany]; it is sought by our people for that purpose, who have built *there* several sloops and tolerable yachts. And particularly Captain Adriaen Block, when his ship was accidentally burnt in the year 1614, constructed *there* a yacht with a keel thirty-eight feet long, forty-four and a half feet from stem to stern, and eleven and a half feet wide. In this vessel he sailed through Hellegat into the great bay, and explored all the places thereabout; and continued therewith as far as Cape Cod."<sup>5</sup>

Wassenaer,<sup>6</sup> in part 6 (preface dated June 1, 1624),

---

<sup>5</sup>This is the evidence relating to the burning of Block's ship, the *Tiger*, and the building of the *Onrust* (Unrest, incorrectly translated Restless). It is indeed singular that, with this evidence available, writers have uniformly placed these events on Manhattan Island and, one error following naturally upon another, have assumed that Block and his party built huts or winter quarters near the southern point of Manhattan Island, an assumption untenable from the only existing evidence.

<sup>6</sup>Nicolaes Janszoon van Wassenaer was a learned Dutch scholar and physician, son of a minister of the Reformed Church at Amsterdam. He was the compiler of one of the earliest news-journals or annals printed in Holland. Usually cited in short as *Historisch Verhael*, its fuller title, in translation, is: *Historical Narrative of all the most memorable occurrences which have come to pass in Europe*, etc. These annals were printed semi-annually in twenty-one parts, of which parts 1-17 are by Wassenaer and 18-21 continuations by Dr. Barent Lampe, another Amsterdam physician. The meagre accounts that relate to New Netherland are in parts 6-10, 12, and 16 by Wassenaer, and part 18 by Lampe. The first use of the material as a source by American historians was made by Brodhead in *Collections of New York Historical Society* (1849), and the extracts were first printed in English translations in *Doc. Hist. N. Y.*, vol. III (1850). The latest revised translation is in Jameson's *Narratives of New Netherland* (1909). The major part of Wassenaer's New Netherland material relates to the ethnology of the Indians and to the physiography and natural history of the country.



speaking of voyages made prior to those under the West India Company, says: "Many from the United Provinces did formerly and do still trade there; yea, for the greater security of the traders, a castle—Fort Nassau— has been built on an island [*i.e.* Castle Island] in 42 degrees, on the north side of the River Montagne, now called Mauritius" [*i.e.* Hudson River]. He gives no date, but the date we know is 1615. Wassenaer, however, says that "the builders let it fall into decay," and other evidence shows it was abandoned in 1617, because the spring freshets inundated the island. In another place Wassenaer speaks of "great quantities of water running into the river, overflowing the adjoining country, which was the cause that Fort Nassau frequently lay under water and was abandoned."

In part 8 (preface dated May 20, 1625), Wassenaer digresses from his story of 1624, to tell about "Hendrick Christiaensz." who "first sailed to" the "country, or the River Montagne, called by ours Mauritius"; that he had not reached there, but was "desirous to do so another time," and that "it so happened that he and the worthy Adriaen Block chartered a ship with the skipper Ryser," and were successful. Then Wassenaer continues: "This aforesaid Hendrick Christiaensz., after Adriaen Block had dissolved partnership with him, made ten voyages thither, under a grant from the Lords States, who granted him that privilege for the *first* opening up of the place. On the expiration of that privilege, this country was granted to the West India Company." Christiaensen was killed in 1616 by an Indian at Fort Nassau on Castle Island, near Albany.

From the preceding data we see that all the trading and wintering activities of the Dutch were in the vicinity of the present city of Albany. After the expiration of the privileges of the United New Netherland Company, in 1618, several detached voyages were made to New Netherland. Of them we know almost

nothing. The movement for further authorized trade through a Dutch West India Company was slow in its fruition. The *Octroy*<sup>7</sup> granting charter-rights came finally on June 3, 1621. It took two years to perfect the internal organization of the new company, and it was even longer before its funds and operations were in order for equipping its first expedition of settlers to New Netherland.

Because writers on the beginnings of New Netherland have treated as a capstone of the arch of history two depositions made at the end of the seventeenth century by Catelina Trico (or Tricot), an octagenarian, and have thereby given insecurity to the whole structure of events, it is pertinent to examine the materials upon which they have relied as granite and to show them to be made of sand. In her deposition on February 14, 1685, before Gov. Thomas Dongan, her age is given as 80 years "or thereabouts." She deposed that she came over either in 1623 or 1624 "to the best of her remembrance," in a ship, not named. she errs in giving the skipper's name as that of the Dutch governor. In this deposition she is not sure of her age, nor sure of the year when she arrived in New Netherland, nor correct as to the name of the Director or governor; does not name the ship, and alleges marriages on shipboard that are dubious. In her deposition made before William Morris, justice of the peace, on October 17, 1688, her age is given as "about 83 years."<sup>8</sup> She now deposes "that in y<sup>e</sup> year 1623 she came into this Country w<sup>th</sup> a Ship called y<sup>e</sup> Unity [*Eendracht*] whereof was Commander Arien Jorise." So now she fixes upon 1623 as the year and names the ship, and makes Adriaen Jorissen the "Commander," whilst in her 1685 deposition she

<sup>7</sup>*Octroy, By de Hooghe Mogende Heeren Staten Generael, verleent aende West-Indische Companie, in date den derden Junii 1621. In s'Graven-Haghe, By Hillebrant Iacobssz, . . . Anno 1621.* Small 4to. This is the original edition. The most reliable English translation, by A. J. F. van Laer, is in *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts* (Albany, 1908), pp. 86, ff., running parallel with a reprint of the Dutch text.

<sup>8</sup>Both depositions are printed in *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, vol. 3 (quarto edition), pp. 31-32.

dubbed him "governor." But there is nowhere evidence connecting a ship *Unity* (*Eendracht*) with voyages to New Netherland at this time, or associating Adriaen Jorissen Tienpont as skipper with a vessel of that name. Some years later, in 1630, a ship *Eendracht* is first found of record as associated with New Netherland. There were other ships' bottoms under that name. One of this name was in a group of ships commanded by Schouts of Schouten, who in 1623 and 1624 was preying upon Spanish treasure ships in the Gulf of Mexico, and the actual commander of this *Eendracht* was named Garbrandt.

The remainder of the 1688 deposition of Catelina is unsupported by any evidence of the times to which she refers, except the date 1626, when she says she "came from Albany [meaning Fort Orange] & settled at N: Yorke [meaning New Amsterdam] where she lived afterwards many years." This date 1626 is supported by ample evidence as the time when Director Minuit put into effect the concentration of all families in New Netherland at New Amsterdam. Virtually all the speculations, perhaps, buts, and maybes, connected with these two depositions to exhibit faith in them, are to be found in volume four of Stokes's *Iconography of Manhattan Island*. But these mischievous depositions are to be rejected as evidence. Dr. Jameson, in *Narratives of New Netherland*, says of them, "we are not to place much reliance on recollections stated sixty years later," and Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer, in her *History of the City of New York in the Seventeenth Century*, has characterized them as having "no value."

Great expectations awaited the publication of a series of six documents, contemporary copies of 1624 to 1626, five of which relate to New Netherland. These have lately appeared in a sumptuous form—facsimiles, transliterations, and English translations, with introduction and annotations by Arnold J. F. van Laer.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Documents relating to New Netherland 1624-1626. In *The Henry E. Huntington Library*. Translated and Edited by A. J. F. van Laer. San Marino, Cal. *The Henry E. Huntington*

The form in which they have appeared permits the historical scholar to use them and make his own deductions. They have value with respect to an understanding of the methods for colonization and provincial administration provided by the Dutch West India Company at this juncture, and add new information about persons who came over and had a part in the public affairs. But the documents, whilst revealing provisional ideas or instructions of intention, do not add to the solution of the history of the origin of settlements. Mr. van Laer has added an introduction in which he essays to make some observations about settlements, but he draws for his conclusions not from these documents, which are helpless in this matter, but upon other materials, such as Baudart and the depositions of Catelina Trico. And this is all the more surprising as we shall see from an examination of his points. Baudart,<sup>10</sup> an author not over careful as to dates, refers to a ship, unnamed, returned to Holland, after having taken over to New Netherland some families from Holland. This unnamed ship Mr. van Laer seeks to connect with the yacht *Mackreel*, but he himself otherwise demolishes any hope in that. He assumes that another ship sailed from Holland on January 25, 1624, antedating the ship *Nieuw Nederlandt*, and that that ship may have been called *Eendracht* (Unity) and have been commanded by Adriaen Jorissen Tienpont. This is a result of looking at Catelina Trico's depositions. None the less, in another place Mr. van Laer says that "Catelina Trico's

*Library and Art Gallery, 1924.* Folio. These documents have come to be called by the confusing designation of "The Van Rappard Documents," because a family of that name, in no way identified with their origin, had a late possession of them and offered them for sale with other materials at auction by Frederik Muller & Co., of Amsterdam, on June 16-17, 1910. They were bid in by Mr. John Anderson, Jr., of New York, who had them translated by J. A. J. de Villiers, chief of the Map Room of the British Museum. Mr. Anderson later sold them to Mr. Huntington, under whose auspices they have now appeared, after revision of the transcripts and retranslation. The second piece, designated Document B, does not relate to New Netherland.

<sup>10</sup>Memoryen . . . der gedenckweerdichste geschiedenissen van *Nederland*. (Arnheim, 1624-5). By Willem Baudart, latinized Baudartius. See also Stokes's *Iconography*, IV: 60.

statements cannot be depended upon," and that "most writers have treated the depositions of Catelina Trico as being unreliable." Yet, after playing safe like that, he accepts Catelina's name of the ship in which she declared she had come over, the *Unity* (*Eendracht*), even though he knows that she named the ship only in her latest deposition of October 17, 1688, and that in the original document the name was first written as "y<sup>e</sup> hope," then crossed out and "unity" written in its stead and above the line, presaging a faulty memory and a changing mind in the aged deposer. To support his theory that a ship sailed on January 25, 1624, preceding the *Nieuw Nederlandt*, Mr. van Laer alleges that "there is one contemporary statement . . . which seems to imply . . . that the 'Nieu Nederlandt' must have been preceded by another ship, which left Holland on or shortly after January 25, 1624." This alleged evidence is a memorandum in the *Copie-Boek* of the Consistory of the Dutch Church of Amsterdam, relative to Bastiaen Jansen Krol, appointed "kranken-bezoeker" or visitor of the sick. But in order to make out a case, Mr. van Laer is obliged to find Krol's own depositions, respecting the length of his service in New Netherland, as inaccurate; and he avers "there seems to be no sufficient reason for rejecting the explicit statement in the *Copie-Boek* that Krol sailed for the West Indies on January 25, 1624." But in order to fasten this claim he attacks the reliability of the "Report of the Board of Accounts," alleging that it has an error, whereas we can see no error at all, merely Mr. van Laer's misunderstanding of the limited language of the documentary entry, since the reference to building Fort Amsterdam in 1626 is not allocated to Mey and Tienpont. Then, having so far set aside evidence that collided with his theory, Mr. van Laer adds: "The supposition that there was such another ship, and that this ship was the 'Unity,' is rendered plausible by the fact that in the instructions to Willem Verhulst, which were issued before the end of January 1625, . . .

reference is made to 'trading-goods sent with Jan Brouwer and Cornelis Jacobsz Mey and those that came over for Pieter Courten.'" But just because of this passing reference in this undated document and because he finds that in 1630 and later a Jan Brouwer made voyages as a skipper to New Netherland in a ship called the *Eendracht* (Unity), though no records have shown a ship of that name in New Netherland earlier than 1630, Mr. van Laer comes to the final declaration, that "therefore, it is not impossible that this same ship came to New Netherland in 1624, and that it was the ship referred to by Catelina Trico." So Catelina bobs up again and makes possibilities out of imagination. But Mr. van Laer having hoisted his petard now blows up the superstructure he has reared. He adds: "From the foregoing facts it appears that the date of settlement of New Netherland cannot be determined with absolute certainty, and that, apart from the question whether the colonists who came over on the 'Mackreel', or those who followed on the 'Nieu Nederlandt,' must be regarded as having established the first permanent settlement in the colony, there is a possibility that the latter vessel was preceded by another ship, which sailed from Holland on January 25, 1624." And he adds again: "The question whether there was such a ship not only affects the date of settlement, but is of considerable interest in connection with the location of the first settlements that were made in New Netherland."

Another theory is broached by Mr. van Laer. In this one he argues for 1625 as the year of the first permanent settlement of Manhattan Island, and refers to a statement by Wassenaer about cattle that were transferred from Noten Eilant (now Governors Island) to Manhattan. Mr. van Laer thinks "it is evident, however, that when the cattle were transferred to Manhattan Island, there must have been some people there to guard them." Of course a study of Wassenaer shows that the reference is to temporary

herders, who cared for the cattle while the Fort Orange colony was preparing its journey northward on the river.

#### FIRST SETTLEMENTS IN NEW NETHERLAND

In this thesis we design to demonstrate that there were no settlements of families in New Netherland before 1624; that, so far as the present confines of the State of New York are concerned, the first settlement was made in 1624 at Fort Orange (now Albany); that this settlement was augmented by other settlers in 1625; that the first permanent settlement on Manhattan Island was begun in 1626 by the founding of New Amsterdam, and that later in the same year the families at Fort Orange and on the Delaware River were removed to New Amsterdam, which then became the only settlement with family-life in New Netherland until patroonships, under the Freedoms and Exemptions promulgated in 1629, gave birth to other settlements in the Dutch jurisdiction.

In the eleventh chapter (Virginia section) of the 1625 Dutch edition of De Laet's *Nieuwe Weereldt*, he makes no mention of either a fort or settlement on Manhattan Island. His first mention thereof is in the Dutch edition of 1630, and again with some additions in the Latin version of 1633 and in the French version of 1640. The reference in the 1630 Dutch edition is thus: "Into New Netherland, and upon both these rivers [*i.e.* the Hudson and the Delaware] described by us in the foregoing chapters, several colonies have been sent by the Directors of the Chartered West India Company, from the very commencement of that company, to wit, from the year 1623<sup>11</sup>, in order to

<sup>11</sup>The West India Company was still engaged during the first half of 1623 in setting up its internal organization, and funds for sending out a party of settlers and other arrangements pertinent thereto were not completed before the autumn, when the season was unfavorable for undertaking the new adventure; therefore, although the arrangements had been begun by the Company "from the year 1623," execution was deferred to a more propitious season.

continue the possession of those quarters, and to maintain the trade in peltries. They have there, at the upper-most part of the North River<sup>12</sup>, in the latitude of 43 degrees or thereabouts, a small fort, which our people call Fort Orange [*t fort van Orangien*], round about which several colonizers have settled themselves under the patronage of the aforesaid company. And again another fort of greater importance at the mouth of the same North River, upon an island which they call Manhattes or Manhatans Island, because this nation of Indians happened to possess the same, and by them it has been sold<sup>13</sup> to the company. Here our people have made, as it were, their headquarters or principal colony, which they call New Amsterdam [*Nieuw-Amsterdam*]. The ships which are yearly sent thither harbor there, and prosecute their trade with boats and sloops higher up the North River, in the South River, and in all the other rivers and bays hereinbefore described by us."

A document of the West India Company, containing "Provisional Regulations," of March 28, 1624, for the conduct of the expedition of settlers sent out at this time, has been known from a superior text in the Algemeen Rijksarchief at The Hague, in a "Resolution Book," 1623-1624. This Dutch text was known to Mr. Stokes and the writer before its publication in Dr. J. S. C. Jessurun's *Kilaen van Rensselaer*, and an English version is given in the fourth volume of the Stokes *Iconography of Manhattan Island*. Another and inferior text, from a contemporary copy, is given in facsimile and translation, as Document A, in the recent publication of the so-called "Van Rappard Documents," already cited more definitely on a preceding page. In the "Resolution Book" is the following minute: "Whereas the colonists going to New Nether-

<sup>12</sup>North River (*Noord Rivier*) means the Hudson, as South River (*Sud or Zuid Rivier*) means the Delaware.

<sup>13</sup>This statement of the sale of Manhattan Island is confirmed more particularly by Pieter Schaghen's letter of November 5, 1626, and by *New York Executive Council Minutes*, vol. I (Albany, 1910), p. 47, under date of April, 1670.



land for the Chamber of Amsterdam will be mustered to-morrow, there is read an *articulbrieff* [*i.e.* the Provisional Regulations] for the colonists, drawn up by Messrs. Albert Coenraets, Samuel Godyn and Johannes de Laet (heretofore appointed thereto by the Chamber of Amsterdam), which is approved and hereby ratified" [*i.e.* by the Nineteen, or executive body of the Company]. Then the text of the "Provisional Regulations" follows. Now it is very important to observe in this connection the name of the historian Joannes de Laet as one of a committee of three charged with this business. Moreover, he and his fellow-committeemen, Coenrats and Godyn, were identified later with patroonships in New Netherland and their names were a part of the primitive geographical nomenclature of New Netherland. And we see why the evidence of De Laet as a primary participant in this enterprise, as well as the trusted historian of the Company, should not be brought into clash with the depositions of Catelina Trico. Again, we here see that the "Provisional Regulations" were recorded the day preceding the mustering of the colonists. Two days after this record, on the 30th, the "Provisional Regulations" were read to the colonists, then in readiness to sail on the ship *Nieuw Nederlandt* to the country in America of the same name.

The historian Wassenaer, who at Amsterdam had access to the records of the Company and contact with its adventurers, in part 6 (preface dated June 1, 1624), under his chronological section for February, 1624, states that the Dutch were "intending now to plant a colony among the Maickans [Mohicans], a nation lying 25 leagues on both sides of the river." This relates to the region about Albany. Again in the same part 6, he continues: "A ship is fitting out<sup>14</sup> under a commission from the West India Company, and freighted with families, to plant a colony among this

<sup>14</sup>The translation of the tense is not correct in Jameson's *Narratives of New Netherland*, and the correction is important.

people. But to go forward safely, it is first of all necessary that they be placed in a good defensive position and well provided with forts and arms, since the Spaniard, who claims all the country, will never allow any one to gain a possession there." Remember that Wassenaer says this in 1624, and that he promises more at length in his next or seventh part of the annals, because "this Book cannot contain it."

Now in part 7 of Wassenaer (preface dated December 1, 1624), his promise of further details is kept. By November persons had returned from New Netherland to Holland, notably Bastiaen Jansen Krol, the *krankenbezoeker* or visitor of the sick, and the people of the yacht *Mackreel*. From them Wassenaer had first hand knowledge of what had been accomplished by the expedition. He digresses to discuss man as a social animal, living together in peace, in hamlets, etc., as applicable to the new situation in New Netherland. He says: "And whereas, God be praised, it hath come about that the Honorable Messrs. Directors of the West India Company, have, with the consent of the Noble High and Mighty Lords States General, undertaken to plant some colonies, I shall give the paritculars of them, as follows:

"We treated in our preceding discourse of the discovery of some rivers in Virginia [*i.e.* New Netherland]; the studious reader will learn how affairs proceeded. The West India Company being chartered to navigate these rivers, did not neglect so to do, but equipped in the spring<sup>15</sup> a vessel of 138 lasts, called the *Nieu Nederlant*, whereof Cornelis Jacobsz May of Hoorn was skipper, with a company of 30 families, mostly Walloons, to plant a colony there. They sailed in the beginning of March, and directed their course by the Canary Islands, steered towards the Wild Coast, and gained the west wind which luckily [took] them in the

---

<sup>15</sup>It is to be remembered that he gives this under date of April, 1624, in his part 7, the preface of which is dated December 1, 1624. It is at this point that so many writers have fallen down by assuming the year to be 1623.

beginning of May [1624] into the river called, first *Rio de Montagnes*, now the *River Mauritius* [the Hudson], lying in  $40\frac{1}{2}$  degrees. He found a Frenchman lying in the mouth of the river, who would erect the arms of the King of France there; but the Hollanders would not permit it, forbidding it by commission from the Lords States General and the Directors of the West India Company; and in order not to be frustrated therein, with the assistance of those of the yacht [*Mackreel*] which had lain above [*i.e.* trading with the Indians during the winter, from December, 1623, on the upper Hudson, and which had come down the river with its cargo in the spring when the river was open], they caused a yacht of two guns to be manned, and convoyed the Frenchman out of the river, who would do the same thing in the South River [Delaware] but he was prevented by the settlers there" [*i.e.* those settlers who has been sent ahead to settle on the Delaware and whom the Frenchman immediately thereafter met to his sorrow]. "This being done [*i.e.* the Frenchman having been gotten rid of from New York Harbor], the ship sailed up to the Maykans [Mohicans, who at this time had a settlement near Albany], 44 leagues, and they built and completed a fort named 'Orange,' with four bastions, on an island, by them called Castle Island."<sup>16</sup> Wassenauer goes on thus: "They forthwith put the spade in the ground and began to plant." By the time the yacht *Mackreel* left them, "the grain was nearly as high as a man." Wassenauer hopes this good beginning will be "zealously sustained," adding: "For their increase and prosperous advancement, it is highly necessary that those sent out be first of all well provided with means both of support and defence, and that being freemen, they be settled on a free tenure." Regarding their government and superiors, he avers: "'Tis better to rule by love and friendship than by force."

<sup>16</sup>Here Wassenauer has a geographical error, confusing the deserted older Fort Nassau on Castle Island, and putting the new Fort Orange on the island instead of upon the main land, the present site of Albany.

In part 8 (dated May 20, 1625), Wassenaer, under the chronological heading of December, 1624, tells what had been learned from Skipper May, of the ship *Nieuw Nederlant*, who had returned to Holland the previous month (November, 1624). Here is an extract: "As regards the prosperity of New Netherland, we learn by the arrival of the ship whereof Jan May<sup>17</sup> of Hoorn was skipper, that everything there was in good condition. The colony began to advance bravely and live in friendship with the natives." Here is a reference to the "prosperity of New Netherland" relative to "*the colony*," which he had already located in his annals at Fort Orange (now Albany). Not a word is anywhere found in any of these annals before 1626, relative to a colony on Manhattan Island. Bastiaen Jansen Krol, the lay worker or comforter of the sick, returned with Skipper May on the *Nieuw Nederlant*, in November, 1624, and before the Classis of Amsterdam interposed for the colonists of Fort Orange, who wanted a minister to baptise their expected children, a need of which Krol was aware before he sailed with Skipper May for home. Moreover, Krol had been seven and a half months with the colonists, as he tells in a deposition; and, being what we would now call a religious social worker, he certainly had unusual opportunities for observation and information.

Wassenaer, in part 9 (preface dated December 1, 1625), states under the chronological heading of April, 1625, that the Directors have been solicitous of "*the colony . . . near the Maykans*" [Mohicans], adding: "an extraordinary shipment was sent thither *this* month [April, 1625], to strengthen it with what was needful." He refers several times to *the colony*. With this expedition of 1625 he says "forty-five new comers of inhabitants are taken out, to remain there," among them being "six completely equipped families," the others were "single persons." In the so-called "Van Rappard Documents," published in 1924 by The

<sup>17</sup>Here Wassenaer errs in the given name, which was Cornelis Jacobsen (not Jan) May.

Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, are three that fit in here. Document C is the "Instructions" to Willem Verhulst, undated but assigned to January, 1625, in which he is addressed as "Commis op de voyage naer Nieuw-Nederlant ende by provisie directeur van de coloniers die reede daer te lande syn ende noch ghebracht sullen worden" (*i.e.* "supercargo on the voyage to New Netherland and, provisionally, director of the colonists, as well those that are already in the country as those that shall yet be transported thither"); and this provisional appointment was "until another government shall be erected there at the pleasure of the Company." These "Instructions" also show that Verhulst was "to have his usual place of residence on the South River, the skippers being present there "being joined unto him as councilors, with whom" he was charged to "deliberate and act upon all matters of importance." This South (Delaware) River station was Fort Nassau (in present Gloucester County, N. J.), which had been established the preceding year (1624) by Cornelis Jacobsen May. But although instructed to make his headquarters there, Verhulst was at the same time directed "also from time to time, as occasion may require, betake himself to the North River to regulate matters there, leaving there in the North River in his absence Adriaen Jorissen Thienpont as vice-director and Daniel van Cryeckenbeeck as sub-commissary of trading-goods. These, with the skippers present and Franchois Fezard and Johan Lampo" were "to serve as councilors," with whom Verhulst, "when present," was to "deliberate and act upon everything as above, but in his absence the aforesaid Adriaen Jorissen Thienpont" was to "preside." All these directions were provisional, subject to the further order of the Company. Another of the directions to Verhulst was that he should "have Pierre Minuyt<sup>18</sup> as volunteer, and others whom he

<sup>18</sup>In the few autographs that are known he always signed himself "Peter Minuit." A new fact brought out in these newly-discovered documents is the evidence that Minuit came over to New Netherland at this time, serving as a councilor and in other useful capacities in the Dutch affairs of New Netherland.

deems competent thereto, sail up the river [Hudson] as far as they can in any way do so, in order to inspect the condition of the land, supplying them with provisions and arms, as well as with some trading-goods, in case they should be able to do some bartering with the Indians on their way."

Document D of the so-called "Van Rappard Documents," dated April 22, 1625, is the "Further Instructions" for Verhulst and the council in New Netherland. It is signed by Albert Coenraets [*i.e.* Dr. Albert Coenraetsz Burgh], S. Godin [*i.e.* Samuel Godin or Godyn], and Kiliaen van Rensselaer, all persons afterwards numbered in the first grants of patroonships in New Netherland. Instruction no. 2 directed as follows: "The officers and head-farmers now going over shall as soon as with God's help they have arrived in the North River, before they discharge any cargo or allow any cattle to be landed, summon Willem Verhulst, our commissary, or Adriaen Jorissz Thienpont and Daniel van Cryeckenbeeck, or those who in the event of their decease occupy their places, in order by common advice to choose the most suitable places for their dwellings, pastures, and cultivated fields, taking care that they choose the most suitable, healthful, and largest before others, it being especially advisable that the choice were made near the entrance of the river, preferably at a spot where some shallows secure it against approach, to which end we recommend to them in the first place the west side, about where the runners pass from the North to the South river, then the hook of the Manattes, north of Noten [now Governors] Island, or such other spot as upon inspection they may find most advantageous, taking care that the place chosen is well provided with water and with timber for fuel and building, and that the rivers thereabouts are full of fish."

These "Further Instructions" of April 22, 1625, then continue, thus: "After the choice has been made the Commissary or the person who occupies his place

shall, with the advice of the Council, consisting of Willem van der Hulst [*same as Verhulst*], Adriaen Jorissz Thienpont, Joost van den Boogaert, Daniel van Cryeckenbeeck, Gerrit Fongersz, Pierre Minuyt, Cryn Fredericxs<sup>19</sup>, the skippers who come there from time to time, Johan Lampo, colonist, and Franchoy's Fezard—which persons or such of them as are present we appoint general councilors, in order that from among them may be chosen councilors required in particular places, saving the order made in our previous instructions [Document C, undated, but attributed to January, 1625]—immediately divide the people in the most expedient manner, to the end that each one may be in his [proper place and the] work may be done and the needs be supplied by the common labor and diligence of all.”

From the analysis of the above quoted documents we get a glimpse of intentions in the minds of the Directors of the Company in Amsterdam. The various instructions were provisional enough and they were not executed to the letter.

Under date of July, 1625, Wassenaer tells of the arrival of a small ship from New Netherland. It brought no news of the arrival of the 1625 expedition. This ship and those of the expedition had crossed each other in transit. Wassenaer describes the matter, thus: “The vessels with the cattle had not yet got there; the crops which our colonists had planted, looked well, but there was no certain information thereof. The next [ship] will bring their owners full information.”<sup>20</sup> So Wassenaer, under the chronological date of November, 1625 (in his part 10, preface dated June 1, 1626), is able to tell that in November, 1625, a ship “laden mostly with peltries” had arrived in Holland,

<sup>19</sup>Document E of the series is also dated April 22, 1625, and is the particular instructions for the engineer and surveyor Cryn Fredericxs (or Fredericksen), as well as for the Director and the Council, with respect to building fortifications and houses, etc., but naming no more definite spot.

<sup>20</sup>A better translation and more pertinent than the “good news” in Jameson's *Narratives of New Netherland*.

and he adds: "The cattle carried thither [New Netherland] were removed *upwards* to a convenient place abounding with grass and pasture." In his part 12 (preface dated June 14, 1627), he makes a further statement about this matter, thus: "In our preceding discourse mention was made of New Netherland and *its colony* planted by the West India Company . . . and that some families were sent thither out of Holland . . . and *afterwards* [1625] some ships" with horses, cows, and hay, and "two months afterwards a fly-boat . . . carrying sheeps, hogs, wagons, ploughs and all other implements of husbandry." Then he goes right on, as follows: "These cattle were, on their *arrival*, first landed on Nut [now Governors] Island . . . where they remained a day or two. There being no means of pasturing them *there*, they were shipped in sloops and boats to the Manhates, right opposite the said island. Being put out to *pasture here*, they throve well, but afterwards full twenty in all died," supposedly from having eaten "something bad from an *uncultivated soil*."<sup>21</sup> He says "they went in the middle of September [1625] to meadow grass, as good and as along as could be desired, which agrees with what he had stated in part 10, under November, 1625, that "The cattle carried thither were removed *upwards* to a convenient place abounding with grass and pasture."

It is also in part 12 (preface dated June 14, 1627), that Wassenaer gives *his first statements*, as well as the fullest known account<sup>22</sup>, of the founding of Minuit's

<sup>21</sup>The colonists were not able to get away from Nut (Governors) Island at once, and as their cattle could not feed there and the nearest place that seemed promising was across on Manhattan, they naturally got them over there, under herders; but the loss of some twenty was disastrous and so they were removed.

<sup>22</sup>Document F of the so-called "Van Rappard Documents" is an important addition to our knowledge of this time. It is a letter from Isaack de Rasière to the Directors of the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company, dated at Fort Amsterdam on Manhattan Island, September 23, 1626. It reveals that De Rasière came over as provincial secretary, sailing from Plymouth on May 29th and arriving at "Fort Amsterdam" on July 28th. When he landed Minuit was absent at Fort Orange, where he had gone "to inquire into the disaster caused by the reckless adventure of Crieckenbeeck," who had been killed. De Rasière handed to Minuit his papers when Minuit came down again to Man-



settlement of New Amsterdam, and this information he records under his chronological date of November, 1626, the month in which the ship *Wapen van Amsterdam* (Arms of Amsterdam) returned to Amsterdam, recording the news of events to September 23, 1626, when that ship sailed from Manhattan for Holland. Wassenaer clearly presages a new establishment—a settlement that has made a beginning. Here are his words: "The colony is *now* established on the Manhates, where a fort has been *staked out* . . . It is *planned* to be of large dimensions." The people were living in houses "of the bark of trees," as we know from other sources, mere temporary hovels. These "thirty ordinary houses" were "on the east side of the river" (Hudson).

It is also in this part 12 (printed in 1627), that Wassenaer has been able to set forth Minit's plan for consolidating the several colonies with his own at New Amsterdam. Already he is able to say: "Those of the South River will abandon their fort [Fort Nassau], and come hither"; and that "at Fort Orange . . . no more than fifteen or sixteen men will remain; the remainder will come down." Again, in the same part, Wassenaer says that in 1626 "There were eight families . . . and ten or twelve seamen in the Company's service" at Fort Orange, and that "The families were to leave there this year—the fort [there] to remain garrisoned by sixteen men, without women—in order to strengthen with people the colony near the Manhates"; and in the same part 12, he tells us that the total population of New Netherland, up to September, 1626, when the *Wapen van Amsterdam* sailed from there, had "now increased to two hundred souls."

Now, as Wassenaer's parts were written as annals,

---

hattan. We also can now understand from this new text that Minit, who had been in New Netherland and had returned to Holland, and had come back in 1626, was upon his return to New Netherland "placed in command by the Council, on account of the bad conduct of Verhulst." It has hitherto been supposed that he came over in 1626 under direct commission as Director General of New Netherland. The De Rasiere letter casts doubt upon that.

sequentially, as he obtained new information, this fact must be considered by the historian. In the same part 12, before it was closed by him (preface dated June 14, 1627), he was in possession of new data and able to amplify parts of that chapter, for example, he still mentions the fort as "staked out at the Manhates," but adds that when "completed it is to be named Amsterdam"; and with respect to the fort on the Delaware he now says: "The fort at the South River is already vacated, in order to strengthen *the* colony," namely *the* colony is now the concentration which Minuit has brought about since his elevation to the director-generalship.

And, again, in part 12 Wassenaer mentions the cargo<sup>23</sup> of the ship *Wapen van Amsterdam*, the data agreeing mainly with the facts given in Peter Schaghen's letter of November 5, 1626. Adriaen Jorissen Tienpont is revealed as the skipper "who went out there on the 19th of December of the year 1625 with the ship *Sea-mew* and conveyed Pieter Minuit . . . who now sends for his wife thither. The *Sea-mew* arrived there [New Netherland] 4th May, 1626." In part 16 (preface dated June 1, 1629), it is said that Minuit "went thither from Holland on January 9, Anno 1626, and took up his residence in the midst of a nation called Manates, building a fort there, to be called Amsterdam."

The Mohican (*Maykans*) who went to war against the Mohawks in 1626 were assisted by the Dutchman Krieckenbeeck, who lost his life in the expedition. Minuit, who had his hands full in forming a settlement on Manhattan, was obliged to go up to Fort Orange on account of the disturbed conditions there in consequence of the aforesaid affair. His visit to Fort Orange, what he learned there, as well as what he knew of the

---

<sup>23</sup>The new De Rasière letter of September 23, 1626, is undoubtedly the source, directly or indirectly, for the data about the peltries given by both Schaghen and Wassenaer. The figures are prolix, so that the calculation of sum totals of furs accredited to the Company, apart from those mentioned as of private credit, is subject to disagreement.

feeble conditions of the settlers in general, may explain his action before the end of the year in withdrawing all families from Fort Orange and Fort Nassau, concentrating them on Manhattan Island. The concentration included all persons except certain traders and officials. By October, 1628, this concentrated population at Manhattan had come to number "two hundred and seventy souls, including men, women and children." Wassenaer was able to add: "There are now [October 1628] no families at Fort Orange . . . They have all been brought down. Five or six and twenty persons, traders, remain there. Bastian Jansz Crol [Krol] is vice-director there; who has remained since the year 1626, when the others came down."

In 1628, there was another war near Fort Orange between the Mohawks and Mohicans, when the latter were driven out of that region and settled on the Connecticut River. Getting rid of these Algonquian Indians from the environs of Fort Orange changed materially the intercourse of the Dutch with the Mohawks and other Iroquoian Indians.

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.