

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION

BULLETIN, 1912, NO. 12

WHOLE NUMBER 483

THE DUTCH SCHOOLS
OF NEW NETHERLAND AND
COLONIAL NEW YORK

By WILLIAM HEARD KILPATRICK

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1912

174004
MAY 12 1913

DAF-5
1913
12-19
CONTENTS.

A6
1912
12-19

	Page.
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.....	7
PREFACE.....	9
CHAPTER I.—GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	11
The West India Company, 11; the patroons, 12; slow growth of New Netherland, 13; the government of New Netherland and of New Amsterdam, 13; the Reformed Dutch Church, 15; currency of New Netherland, 16; the first English occupation, 16; the duke's laws, 17; the second English occupation, 17; attitude of the English authorities toward schools, 18.	
CHAPTER II.—THE SCHOOLS OF THE NETHERLANDS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.....	19
Interest of the church synods in schools, 19; secular interest in education, 20; the relation of church and state in the control of schools, 21; the parochial school of the Netherlands, the teacher, his certification, 25; <i>Monsterkaarts</i> , 26; appointment of teachers, 26; remuneration, 26; auxiliary occupations of teachers, 27; subordinate teachers, 28; the school calendar, 28; schoolhouses and furniture, 29; schooling of girls, 30; school hours, 31; school prayers, 31; rules of conduct, 31; the curriculum and textbooks, 32; religious instruction, 34; Latin schools, 35; number of schools, 37; public character of schools, 38.	
CHAPTER III.—THE DATE OF THE FIRST SCHOOL IN NEW NETHERLAND.....	39
The year 1633 heretofore accepted, 39; new data, 39; certification of Adam Roelantsen in 1637, 40; Dunshee's assertions, 40; deposition of "Adam Roelantsen, schoolmaster" in 1638, 41; probable indebtedness of Dunshee to O'Callaghan and Brodhead, 42; the probable date of Roelantsen's first school, 44; did the <i>Kranken-besoekers</i> , Krol and Huygen, teach an earlier school? 44; did Roelantsen teach prior to 1638? 48; must a school prior to 1638 be admitted? 49; conclusion as to date of first school, 49.	
CHAPTER IV.—THE MASTERS OF THE OFFICIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AT NEW AMSTERDAM.....	51
Private life of Adam Roelantsen, 51; close of Adam Roelantsen's teaching career not 1639 but 1642, 53; Roelantsen's subsequent career, 55; Jan Stevensen the second schoolmaster, 57; his remuneration, 57; Stuyvesant's remark about "no school," 59; the period from 1648 to 1650, 60; Willem Vestensz, of Haarlem, 1650-1655, 62; four-year terms, 63; Harmanus van Hoboken, 1655-1661, 64; Everf Pietersen from 1661 to the close of the period, 66; Pietersen's instructions, 67; two masters possible, 69; summary, 70.	
CHAPTER V.—THE SUPPORT AND CONTROL OF THE OFFICIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF NEW AMSTERDAM.....	71
Control by the church officials, 71; regulations made by the classis of Amsterdam for schools of the East and West Indies, 72; ultimate control of New Netherland church affairs, 73; cooperation of civil and ecclesiastical bodies in securing Willem Vestensz as teacher, 73; local control by church masters, 76; interest of consistory and of ministers, 77; control by secular authorities, 78; little done by States-General, 79; actual support and control mainly by lords directors, 81; their instructions executed by direc-	

	Page.
tor general and council, 83; the nine men, 85; the burgomasters and schepens, 86; dispute between Stuyvesant and the city over salary payments, 86; control of the burgomasters, 91; schoolhouses, 92; tuition charges, 93; relation of the church and state in the control of the school, 93.	
CHAPTER VI.—THE LATIN SCHOOL AT NEW AMSTERDAM.....	95
No "academy" contemplated in 1650, 95; the trivial school of 1652, 95; meaning of "trivial" established, 96; school not taught in a taphouse, 99; petition for a Latin school in 1658, 99; election of D ^r Curtius, 100; his salary, 100; the herbarium from the Leyden garden, 101; the hog suit against D ^r Curtius, 101; complaints against excessive tuition charges, 102; probable number of pupils, 103; bad conduct of the boys, 104; dismissal of Curtius, 104; support and control of the Latin school, 104; Aegidius Luyck chosen as master, 105; difficulty about salary, 105; Luyck's career, 107; textbooks used in the school, 108.	
CHAPTER VII.—THE PRIVATE SCHOOLMASTERS OF NEW NETHERLAND.....	110
Aegidius Luyck and Jacque Cortelyou as private tutors, 110; no dame schools found in New Netherland, 110; Adriaen Jansen van Ilperdam, 111; David Provoost, 111; Joost Carelsen not a teacher, 112; Hans Steyn, 112; petition of Andries Hudde for license referred to minister and consistory, 113; Frans Claessen's boys in the neighbor's corn, 113; Jacob Corlaer and the necessity of procuring a license, 114; Jan Lubberts, 116; varied career of Jan Juriaens Becker, 116; Johannes van Gelder, 117; conclusion, 117.	
CHAPTER VIII.—THE SCHOOLS OF THE DUTCH VILLAGES OF NEW NETHERLAND.....	119
Rensselaerswyck and its schoolmasters, 119; public support of <i>voortzetter</i> , 122; Brooklyn, Carel de Beauvois, his duties, help from Stuyvesant, 123; Midwoud (Flatbush), school lands, first school in 1659, succeeding masters, 124; the schoolhouse, leasing of school lands, 127; this village typical, 128; no school found at Flatlands, 129; New Amstel had schoolmaster from the first, 129; Dutch system of names, 130 (note); New Haerlem, its settlement and village court, help from company on schoolmaster's salary, 131; Wiltwyck (Kingston), its settlement, schoolmasters, 133; village charter contains school reference, 134; Stuyvesant's Bouwery, Harmanus van Hoboken, 135; Bergen, dispute over a tax on schoolmaster, 137; Roswyck, Boudewin Manout and assistance from Stuyvesant, 138; no school found at New Utrecht, 139; summary of schools in Dutch villages, 139.	
CHAPTER IX.—THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOL, 1664-1674.....	142
Dutch public school continued, 142; Evert Pietersen's prolonged efforts to get a salary, 142; rent of house hired for city school demanded, 143; support of school by a rate, 146; continuity of the school, 146.	
CHAPTER X.—THE SCHOOL OF THE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH OF NEW YORK CITY, 1674-1776.....	147
Abraham de Lanoy succeeds Pietersen, his term of service, 147; catechetical instruction in 1698, 499; Gov. Cornbury declines to license a master for the school, 149; contract of Barend de Forest, his imprisonment for debt, 150; Gerrit van Wagenen, and his son Huybert, 151; a second Dutch school under Abraham de Lanoy, 152; William van Dalsem, close of the second school, 153; Daniel Bratt, 158; controversy within the Dutch churches over adaptation to American conditions, decline of Dutch language, 153; Johan Nicolaas Welp brought from Holland, his large salary,	

CONTENTS.

5

	Page.
154; decline of Dutch school, 156; suit of the reactionaries, 156; both languages under Master Peter van Steenbergh, 157; continuity of the school, 159.	
CHAPTER XI.—THE SCHOOL AT NEW HAERLEM AFTER 1664.....	160
Small population, same building for church and school, 160; Hendrick Vander Vin succeeds Montagne, 160; abortive effort at a tax for school support, 160; 46 householders in 1674, 161; Vander Vin uses the church as a dwelling, 161; compulsory "free will contributions," 162; the new schoolhouse, 163; Jan Tibout succeeds Vander Vin, 164; passive resistance, 164; résumé, 165.	
CHAPTER XII.—THE SCHOOLS OF FLATBUSH AFTER 1664.....	166
Arent Evers Molenaar succeeds Clocq, 166; Jan Tibout's contract of 1666, 167; Jacob Joosten's detailed contract of 1670, 167; the new schoolhouse, 168; Jan Gerritsz van Marken, his quarrel with De van Zuiuren and dismissal, 170; relation of court and consistory in the control of the school, 171; election of Jan Tibout (1681), his downfall and dismissal, 172; Johannes van Ekelen sides with Leisler and is dismissed, 174; the contest over the schoolhouse, 176; strengthening of the popular party, 177; Johannes Schenck and Van Ekelen in turn succeed each other, 177; factional strife over ministers, two vopreizers, separation of school service from church service, 179; Jan Gancel (1714-1718), 181; Adriaen Hegeman's long term (1718-1712), change to English money, 181; Jores Rensen, 182; English introduced in 1758, 183; Petrus van Steenbergh, 183; tuition of poor paid by the deacons, 183; growth of popular government, 184; election of Antony Welp, his contract, 185; the school at Oostwood (New Lots), its masters, 186; the only Dutch school dame found in the records, 189; evening schools, 190; the schoolhouse as a dwelling, 191; school furniture, 192; administration of public affairs in Flatbush, 192; the village court, the town meeting, 193; school committees, 194; church masters, 194; the consistory, 195; an unexplained instance of school supervision, 196; illiteracy of Flatbush men, 196; of Flatbush women, 198; introduction of English language, 198; summary, 199.	
CHAPTER XIII.—THE SCHOOLS OF OTHER DUTCH VILLAGES AFTER 1664.....	201
Albany, its masters, its large school in 1744, 201; illiteracy at Albany, 204; Bergen, Van Giesen's long service (1684-1707), 205; dispute over school tax, 205; little known of the Flatlands school, or of Brooklyn, 207; Kinderhook and Poughkeepsie, 209; New Utrecht, De Baeni's trouble with the Leislerians, 210; Schenectady, its masters, use of expression "trivial school," 211; Kingston, its masters, evening school, probable tax for school support, 212; Gov. Cornbury's interference, 213; conclusion, 214.	
CHAPTER XIV.—THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FROM WITHIN.....	216
School hours and calendar, 227; schoolhouses, 227; school attendance of girls amply shown by records, 217; education of the schoolmasters, 219; the curriculum, 220; religious instruction, 222; church attendance of the pupils, 222; school books, 223; résumé, 226.	
CHAPTER XV.—CONCLUSION.....	228
Review, 228; illiteracy of American Dutch as compared with Virginia, the German, 228; immigrants and Massachusetts, 230; American Dutch schools properly called public, 230; influence of the Dutch on American education, 230.	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	231
INDEX.....	235

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1912.

SIR: No comprehensive history of education in America has yet been written. Until quite recently there has been little general interest in the growth and development of educational institutions, systems, and practices in this country. We have been busy building new institutions, making and remaking systems, and trying to adapt our practices to the needs of our rapidly-growing political and industrial democracy. Our interests have been in the present and the future. There has been little time for gathering, organizing, and interpreting the materials of history. There must soon come, however, an insistent demand for such work. No people can afford to remain ignorant of its past life and the means by which its institutions have grown. Everywhere history, truthfully recorded and rightly interpreted, becomes the best guide to progress. This is true in education no less than in government and economics.

Before any comprehensive history can be written, the materials must be collected and verified. Little of this preliminary work has yet been done. It must be accomplished by many industrious students working patiently at the task in different sections of the country. It should be done for every section of the country while the material is available and before it is permanently lost.

Several years ago some valuable studies of this kind were made under the direction of the Bureau of Education, and the results were published in separate bulletins or in the Annual Reports of the Commissioner, but for want of funds to do the work thoroughly and because of more important duties, they were discontinued. Recently Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick, Assistant Professor of the History of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, has made a very thorough and accurate study of some of the Dutch schools of New Netherland and colonial New York. Much of the material used in this has since been destroyed by the fire in the capitol at Albany. Dr. Kilpatrick has kindly offered his manuscript, which has much present and permanent value, to the Bureau of Education, and I recommend that it be published as a bulletin of this bureau.

Very respectfully,

P. P. CLAXTON,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

PREFACE.

The scope of this work is probably indicated with sufficient clearness by the title. There were in New Netherland both Dutch and English settlements; the schools of the former only are included in the study. For a long time after the English took over the colony, the Dutch clung to their language and customs. The effort herein made is to trace the history of these Dutch schools, beginning with their first transplanting from the United Netherlands and continuing down to the American Revolution, by which time the Dutch population was in large measure merged in the common American stock.

The investigation has been made with varying degrees of exhaustiveness. So far as concerns the New Amsterdam schools and the part played by the central colonial authorities in educational affairs, it is believed that few important references have been overlooked—that is, in so far as the material exists at present in America or has been made available in Europe. Likewise, the New Amsterdam school, as continued in the school of the New York (City) Reformed Dutch Church, is probably presented with approximate fullness. The Dutch villages, however, have not been treated with the same thoroughness. Their records, even where they survive, are on the whole relatively inaccessible. Flatbush only has been presented with even tolerable adequacy. Much remains to be done in the way of bringing together the materials for a history of these village schools. If this bulletin will in any degree lead to so desirable a result, one main purpose of publication will be attained.

Of those who have rendered assistance a few only can be named. The authorities of the Flatbush Reformed Dutch Church kindly granted me access to their manuscript records. Dr. F. L. van Cleef, of the Kings County Hall of Records, has helped me with these church records as well as with the public records in his care. To Mr. A. J. F. van Laer, the archivist of the State of New York, I am indebted for invaluable assistance along many lines. In addition to help with the colonial records under his care, he has read my entire manuscript and has made many suggestions which I have been glad to accept. To Prof. Paul Monroe I am indebted for the standards of scholarship which I have sought to embody in this work. To the encouragement and untiring cooperation of my wife I am due a debt beyond the knowledge of those who have not received similar help.

W. H. K.

THE DUTCH SCHOOLS OF NEW NETHERLAND AND COLONIAL NEW YORK.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.¹

The West India Company, which founded the colony of New Netherland and controlled it throughout the whole of the Dutch period, was chartered in 1621 by the States-General of the United Netherlands.² The powers granted were ample; among them a monopoly of the Dutch trade within certain wide areas, including "the countries of America, or the West Indies;" and authority "in our name" to "promote the settlement of fertile and uninhabited districts," to appoint governors and officers of justice, and "to do all that the service of this land and the profit and increase of trade shall require." The government of the company was "vested in five chambers of directors," of which that at Amsterdam was the most important. The "general assembly of the aforesaid chambers" was to "be by nineteen persons," divided among the several chambers, except "that the nineteenth person, or so many more as we shall at any time think fit, shall be deputed by us for the purpose of helping to direct the affairs of the company in the aforesaid assembly." This assembly of the XIX assigned the direct supervision of New Netherland to the Lords Directors of the Amsterdam chamber.

The States-General retained an interest in such work of colonization as might be carried on by the company. In addition to the stipulated right of appointing one or more deputies to the XIX, they reserved also the right of approving the selection of the director general (the governor of the Province), and of reviewing his instructions. Besides these, as events show, they retained a general oversight of the company's control of New Netherland, in accordance with which they interfered at times to reform abuses.

The West India Company, after two years of preliminary preparation, began the colonization of New Netherland as its first work. Some 30 families were sent over in 1623 and scattered among the

¹ The chief authority in the discussion of the chapter is Brodhead's *History of New York*. Osgood's *American Colonies of the Seventeenth Century*, vol. 2, covers much of the same ground. To neither of these will footnote references be given in this chapter.

² For the charter, both in Dutch and in English, see the Van Rensselaer-Bowier Manuscripts, pp. 86-128.

various regions which the company intended to hold, the South (Delaware) River, the Fresh (Connecticut) River, Waalbogt (Wallabout), Manhattan, and Fort Orange (Albany). Of these first settlers, Fort Orange took the largest share. The next year more families came from Holland. In 1626 Peter Minuit, the director general, purchased for the company the island of Manhattan, on the southernmost point of which he built Fort Amsterdam. The families which had settled at Fort Orange and the South River were then brought to Fort Amsterdam, which thenceforth became the most important settlement of the Province.

In 1629 the company, having found colonization very expensive, was thus finally persuaded to allow to its stockholders the privilege of establishing the quasi feudal "patroonships." To this end it adopted and promulgated (June 7) a charter of "Freedoms and exemptions for the patroons, masters, or private persons who shall plant any colony in, and send cattle to, New Netherland."¹ A patroon must "plant there a colony of fifty souls upwards of fifteen years old within four years." Within restrictions as to extent, the patroons might choose unoccupied land anywhere in New Netherland, except that "the company reserved to itself the island of Manhattan." The land so chosen they were "forever to own and possess and hold from the company as a perpetual fief of inheritance." They could "dispose of the aforesaid fiefs by will." The patroons were authorized to furnish their colonists with proper instructions for government. "In case anyone should in time prosper so much as to found one or more cities, he shall have authority to appoint officers and magistrates there." Private persons might, "with the approbation of the director and council there, choose and take possession of as much land as they can properly cultivate and hold the same in full ownership."

Clause XXVII of this charter of freedoms and exemptions, which has frequently been used by writers on the educational history of New Netherland, reads as follows:

The patroons and colonists shall in particular endeavor as quickly as possible to find some means whereby they may support a minister and a schoolmaster, that thus the service of God and zeal for religion may not grow cool and be neglected among them, and they shall for the first procure a comforter of the sick there.²

It is to be noted that the proposed scheme of patroonships contemplated a system of private colonies independent of each other save in their subordination to the general power of the company. Besides these subordinate colonies, New Netherland was to include the company's own settlement on Manhattan, and perhaps other settlements which the Lords Directors should later make. By the twenty-

¹ The original Dutch of this document and the English translation made by Mr. Van Leer are found side by side in the Van Rensselaer-Bowling MSS., pp. 136-153.

² Van Rensselaer-Bowling MSS., p. 151.

eight article of the Freedoms, each such subordinate colony was to appoint an agent who should report at least once a year to the director and council. We may anticipate by saying that only two such subordinate colonies, other than those settled by the company, progressed sufficiently far to have an educational history, that of Kiliaen van Rensselaer just above Fort Orange (Albany), begun in 1630, and that founded in 1656-57 by the city of Amsterdam on the South River (New Castle, Del.).

New Netherland grew slowly. The company was more concerned to secure immediate returns through the fur trade than it was to further the progress of colonization. Wouter van Twiller (1633-1638), the third director general, and Willem Kieft (1638-1647), his successor, were both incompetent. Peter Stuyvesant (1647-1664), the last of the Dutch governors, was far from being incompetent; but it is open to question as to how much the growth of the colony was hindered by his unwise and autocratic management.

Satisfactory estimates of the population are difficult to make. Manhattan (New Amsterdam) had in 1628 some 270 inhabitants all told; in 1643 some 400; in 1652 about 700; in 1656, by actual count, 120 houses and 1,000 souls; in 1664 about 1,500 inhabitants. New Netherland is estimated to have had 500 inhabitants in 1630, while Massachusetts had 1,300 and Virginia 3,000. The corresponding figures for the next three decades are, in round numbers: 1640, New Netherland 1,000, Massachusetts 14,000, Virginia 8,000; 1650, New Netherland 3,000, Massachusetts 18,000, Virginia 17,000; 1660, New Netherland 6,000, Massachusetts 25,000, Virginia 33,000.¹

The Dutch villages chartered before the English occupation were Breuckelen (Brooklyn) in 1646; Beverwyck (Albany) in 1652; New Amsterdam in 1653; Midwoud (Flatbush) and Amersfoort (Flatlands) in 1654; New Amstel (New Castle, Del.) in 1657; New Haerlem (Harlem) in 1660; and Bergen (now within Newark, N. J.), Boswyck (Bushwick), New Utrecht, and Wiltwyck (Kingston), each in 1661.²

As stated above, the government of New Netherland was in the hands of the Lords Directors, who placed the local management of the Province, and to a considerable degree that of New Amsterdam in the hands of a director general and council. The powers granted by the Lords Directors to these, their representatives, were not formally defined, but were determined in good part through correspond-

¹ See discussion of colonial population in *A Century of Population Growth in the United States, 1700-1900*, pp. 3-16.

² There were on Long Island several English towns chartered by the Dutch, Hempstead (1644), Flushing (1645), Gravesend (1645), Newtown (1652), and Jamaica (1656). As these were English-speaking towns the consideration of their schools does not fall within the scope of this work. The occupation by the English here referred to is that of 1664. In 1673 other charters were issued to all these villages by the Dutch governor, Colve.

ence, as occasion arose. On the whole, the situation was quite analogous to that existing to-day between any commercial company and its distant agents. The director general was expected to see to the interests of the company and to report frequently and fully in order that he might be properly instructed. Naturally, considerable discretion was lodged in him, which—to use no harsher term—he exercised freely. In matters of civil law and procedure the Holland laws and customs were supposed to hold, unless there were specific contrary enactments. So autocratic was the government of the several directors general that repeated complaints were made both to the company and to the States-General.

The Great Remonstrance of 1649^r made such a stir in Holland that the company was forced to grant to New Amsterdam a city charter. The promised city government was to be “as much as possible” like that of old Amsterdam; but when the charter went into effect in 1653 it was “hampered,” says Brodhead, “by the most illiberal interpretations” which Stuyvesant could devise. The powers granted were few, and the two burgomasters and five schepens were all appointed directly by Stuyvesant himself. Only after repeated petitions were the outgoing burgomasters and schepens allowed to nominate a double number of each, from whom Stuyvesant chose the proper number to form the incoming magistrates. The burgomasters and schepens met conjointly to form at once a town council for petty municipal legislation and a court of justice to try offenders against the city laws. The burgomasters met, besides, as a separate body from the schepens (at least from the beginning of 1657), to attend to the more purely administrative features of the city government. Each of these bodies left fairly satisfactory minutes of its proceedings, and from them we derive much of our information regarding the schools.

Municipal government in the outlying villages was quite similar to that of New Amsterdam. Each had an inferior court of justice consisting usually of a schout and several schepens, the latter selected by the director general and council from a double set nominated by those just retiring. At no place in the whole scheme of government had the people a right to express their wishes. The company, save for a certain supervision by the States-General, was supreme. The Lords Directors appointed the director general and his council. The director general appointed the magistrates of New Amsterdam and of the outlying villages, either out and out, or by selection from nominees made by the succession which thus owed its origin and continued direction to him. While in spite of Stuyvesant's hatred of representative government the municipal governments probably did, in fact, with approximate faithfulness, represent the wishes of

^r N. Y. Col. Doc., I, 271-318.

the commonalty, still New Netherland could, in no proper sense be called a democracy.

The officially recognized religion of the Netherlands and their dependencies was that of the Reformed Dutch Church. The peculiar doctrines of this church do not concern us. As to church government, the local congregation seems to have had about the same amount of ecclesiastical independence that we see at the present among the Presbyterian Churches of America. Its executive committee—to use a secular term—was the consistory, composed (in America) of ministers, elders, and deacons, who varied in number according to local need. The consistory was, in its discretion, either directly or indirectly self-perpetuating, that is, its members might either select outright their successors (elders and deacons), “or they may propose a double number, the half to be chosen by the congregation.” The choice in either case was subject to approval by the church; but any disapproval, it appears, was expressed not so much by a vote of the church membership as by complaint to the consistory.¹ In a somewhat similar manner and with like restriction the consistories selected the minister² and any other officials, including (sometimes) the schoolmasters.³

A number of neighboring local churches (in Holland) formed a *clássis*, which had the exclusive right of examining and licensing ministers.⁴ The Classis of Amsterdam particularly concerns us because to it was given the charge of the New Netherland churches (see page 71ff), and this charge carried with it a certain oversight over the schools of New Amsterdam. The actual work of the classis was mostly carried on by a standing committee, the *deputati ad Indicaciones*, or briefly, the deputies. A number of classes constitute a particular synod, e. g., the particular Synod of North Holland. On unusual demand there might be called a general or national synod of the whole church, as, for example, the Synod of Dort (Dordrecht), which, in 1618-19, committed the Reformed Dutch Church definitely to Calvinism. The relations of these several ecclesiastical bodies to the New Netherland schools will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

The ministers of the Reformed Dutch Church were properly university graduates or of equivalent training. Apparently this standard was pretty well maintained. The customary title of respect given to the minister was “domine,” the vocative case of the Latin *dominus*. In writing, this was often abbreviated to Dom^r or D^r. In addition to the ministry there were other subordinate officers in the local church, frequently combined in one individual: The “*siecken-trooster*” or comforter of the sick, sometimes called

¹ For further discussion of this point see Ecclesiastical Records, pp. 1150, 3900-1, 4005-6, 4067-8, 4073, 4074, 4082, 4104-5, 4212, 4220, 4338.

² Eccl. Rec., pp. 618-19.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 1152-3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4219.

the "krank-besoeker" or visitor of the sick; the "voorlezer" or reader; and "voorsanger" or precentor. The siecken-trooster was charged "to instruct, admonish, and comfort the sick and ill out of God's Holy Word, every one according to his necessity, and as occasion permits."¹ He thus was an assistant to the minister. Where it was not feasible to have a regular minister, a siecken-trooster might in a measure serve instead, by leading in the service and reading a sermon. But he must "never arrogate to himself * * * under any pretext whatever anything which properly belongs to the ministerial office."² The voorlezer's duty was "before the sermon to read a chapter out of the Bible and the Ten Commandments" and besides, as clerk, to keep the church records. The voorsanger "set the psalms." The voorlezer and voorsanger were almost always one; and these offices, especially in the small places, were usually filled by the schoolmaster.

Since the schoolmaster's pay is frequently given in terms that are not self-explanatory, a few words about the currency of New Netherland may not be out of place. To speak generally, this was of three kinds, the coin of Holland, beaver skins, and wampum. The first-named was, as money goes, fixed in value throughout the period of our discussion. To distinguish it from the fluctuating wampum, such terms as Holland money, Hollands, coin, or heavy money, were used. The unit was the florin or guilder, consisting of 20 stivers, and worth about 40 cents of our money. The beaver remained fairly constantly fixed at 8 guilders, and in the absence of coin was counted "the surest pay in this country." The wampum, or seawant, was made from a shell found principally on Long Island. The black wampum was twice as valuable as the white, while whole and well-strung wampum was worth more than the broken or loose. For a time the rate was fixed at 3 black or 6 white wampums to the stiver. This rate was, toward the end of the Dutch period, many times changed, in order to keep this currency on a par with coin. But the effort was in vain; the seawant constantly deteriorated. In 1660, for example, 2 guilders of seawant were worth only 1 of coin;³ while by 1677 the rate had fallen to 5 of wampums for 1 of coin.⁴ Contracts, especially in the rural districts, were frequently expressed in terms of commodities, principally in wheat. The unit of this measurement was the schepel, about three-fourths of a bushel. When school contracts are given in wampum or wheat, the current equivalent will usually be given in coin.

The Dutch continued in power until 1664, when the Province was occupied by the English in the name of the Duke of York. The first English occupation (1664-1673) reserved to the Dutch a large

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 96.

² *Ibid.*, p. 97.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 406.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 701-2.

share of influence. The city school of New Amsterdam, for instance, was continued as the city school of New York, the same city schoolmaster was retained and, accordingly, the use of the Dutch language was continued. The Reformed Dutch Church was continued as the established religion of the city. The city government was, for about a year, continued identically; after that, it was preserved with some changes, the principal one being that the colonial governor appointed the body of officials.

For a portion of the Province, including Long Island, there were promulgated the so-called Duke's Laws, which were an adaptation of the New England township system. The villages of Flatbush and New Haerlem will show the working of this system in essentially Dutch communities. In these the town court reappeared with English constable and overseers in place of the Dutch schout and schepens. Instead of the old Dutch double nomination system, the new plan provided that the local court officials should be chosen "by the major part of the householders of the said parish."¹ The special duties of this local court were "the making and proportioning the levies and assessments for building and repairing the churches, provision for the poor, maintenance of the minister; as well as for the more orderly managing of all parochial affairs."¹ The Duke's laws further provided that "every inhabitant shall contribute to all charges both in church and state—according to the equal proportion of his estate."² The New England town meeting was recognized and given power to arrange "the private affairs" of the several towns. The vote in such was to be "given and determined by the inhabitants, freeholders, and householders without restriction."³ In particular the minister should be "duly elected by the major part of the inhabitants householders."⁴ The church arrangements here contemplated merely recognized the de facto establishments of religion already existing in the several towns, whether Reformed Dutch, Congregational, or Presbyterian. The general effect of the new laws was to grant a larger share in direct control of affairs to the people than had obtained among the Dutch.

The short return to power of the Dutch in 1673-74 has little of interest for our study. Aside from one interesting case brought before the provincial governor from Bergen (see p. 206), and a school provision in the village charters promulgated by Gov. Colve, the writer has found no school matters which were in any way concerned with this Dutch Government.

The attitude of the English upon their second return to power (1674) was quite different from what it had previously been, especially in New York City. The Reformed Dutch Church in that town was

¹ Col. Laws of N. Y., l. 24.

² *Ibid.*, p. 26.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

no longer the established church, though, in accordance with article 8 in the capitulation of 1664, it retained in certain respects a standing in the colony almost coequal with that of the Church of England. The Dutch school in New York was henceforth only the private affair of the local Reformed Dutch Church. But these changed conditions did not obtain in the Dutch villages. In these, the Reformed Dutch Church and the Dutch school, at least in some instances, continued until the Revolution to be the official church and school, supported and controlled in one form or another by the local secular authorities.

A new requirement introduced by the English was that all schoolmasters be licensed. This was in imitation of a long-established law in England, designed to guard against dissent. Before 1686 the Governor alone granted the licenses. After that date by special instructions from the Crown, the Archbishop of Canterbury (later the Bishop of London) must license schoolmasters coming from England. The last noted royal instruction on the licensing of teachers was in 1721.¹ The requirement was not rigidly enforced, the Dutch especially being exempt. The year 1712 apparently marks the end of the enforcement.

The colonial authorities of New York did little for education. Besides the establishment of two Latin grammar schools at different periods in New York City, and the legislation connected with the founding of King's College (Columbia University), absolutely nothing was done by the general assembly with intent to influence the schools of the Province. The laissez-faire policy, so far as elementary education was concerned, reigned supreme.

¹ See N. Y. Col. Doc., III, 372, 688, 821; IV, 288; V, 135-136; Dix, *Trinity Church*, I, 138; N. Y. Col. MSS., 121, 64.

T
r
ce
ce
D
to
ce
la
tr
Ju
D
de
op
in
fi
be
In
in
ric
in
ch
we
th
na
ha
cla
we
tra
ch
ter
"P

CHAPTER II.

THE SCHOOLS OF THE NETHERLANDS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

Of all colonies, those founded from commercial considerations show most nearly the identical transfer of the institutional life of the parent country. In no instance, probably, has this been truer than in the case of New Netherland. No alienating persecution had brought the Dutch to the American shores. There was no cause for its settlers to criticize even a single custom of the loved "fatherland." On the contrary, conscious pride in the deserved glory of the United Netherlands—then at the zenith of their prosperity—determined them to transplant the old life as little changed as possible.

Among the institutions carried thus to the New World, few, if any, had deeper roots in the life of the Dutch than church and school. Devotion to the principles of the reformed religion had been, in great degree, the secret of the long and stubborn opposition to Spanish oppression. That same devotion had been the greatest single force in creating the new commonwealth. As a most important means of fixing and preserving the reformed faith, the parochial school had become an indispensable part of the organization of the new church. Interwoven thus with the very life of the church was a school system in which the schoolmaster was an officer in the church, and the curriculum of the school included conscious preparation for participation in the service of the public worship.

How the school came to occupy this unique relationship to the church can here be told only in barest outline, since the account of it would be the story of the growth of the church itself. Even before the reformers could assemble openly in the Netherlands, the first national synod of the Dutch Church, held "in exile" at Wezel in 1568, had seen the strategic value of the parochial school. Music, it declared, must be introduced into the church schools, of which some were already in existence.¹ Schoolmasters as well as parents must train the children in the catechism.² Deacons were specifically charged with "the care and founding of schools;"³ and schoolmasters were reckoned along with the ministers, elders, and deacons as "public persons" of the church.⁴ The second national synod at

¹ Rutgers, F. L. *Acta van de Ned. Syn. der 17de Eeuw*, p. 20.
² *Ibid.*, p. 21.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Emden in 1571, likewise "in exile," to the same end, required all classes¹ in their regular meetings, to ask of each church "whether the care of the poor and of schools is maintained."² The provincial Synod of Dort (1574), the first on Netherland soil, treated schools in yet greater detail, emphasizing, among other things, the careful selection by the church of proper places for schools, adequate salaries for schoolmasters to be furnished by the secular authorities, and subscription to the creed by all schoolmasters. Limitations of space forbid the presentation of all the acts relating to schools of the successive national synods. The Synods of Dort (1578),³ Middleburg (1581),⁴ and The Hague (1586),⁵ all treated of schools and of the duty of the church to support them. The great Synod of Dort (1618-19),⁶ as the last of the national synods, gave final form to the creed and practice of the Dutch Reformed Church. In the matter of schools, it substantially summed up the preceding synodal enactments. Schools must be instituted in country places, towns, and cities. Religious instruction must be given. The Christian magistracy should see to it that well-qualified persons taught with suitable compensation. The children of the poor should be instructed free. If all schools only orthodox Christians might teach. To secure these ends suitable means of church inspection of schools were devised. By the time of this synod the church had not only thoroughly organized its system of parochial schools, but through the requirement of creed subscription had reached out its hand to all educational institutions of whatever grade.

But it must not be supposed that the church alone was interested in education. From an early date the Dutch had taken an increasing interest in the public control and support of education. In Haarlem the "city school" existed certainly as early as 1461.⁷ In the same city, in 1522, we find the burgomasters guaranteeing a salary of 200 carolus guilders to the rector of the school.⁸ The Hague in 1536 had a "great school" with a rector and three masters, supported in part by a per capita levy of 2 carolus guilders upon all the pupils in the private schools of the city. To this income the city added for the rector "a yearly pension of four or five great pounds."⁹ Utrecht, both city and Province, may be taken as typical of public secular

¹ A classis was an ecclesiastical body composed of a considerable number of neighboring churches.

² Rutgers, *op. cit.*, p. 100. This requirement was repeated by the first national Synod of Dort in 1578 (*ibid.*, p. 243), by the national synod at Middleburg in 1581 (*ibid.*, p. 386), and by the national synod of The Hague in 1586 (*ibid.*, p. 496).

³ Rutgers, *F. L.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 243, 246-247.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 380-1, 386, 408, 425, 442, 443, etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 492, 496, 539-557, 611.

⁶ Brandt, *History of the Reformation*, III, 33-4, 319-320, 321-2, 326; Dunshee, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-5.

⁷ Enschede, A. J., *Inventaris van het archief der Stad Haarlem*, I, 168.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 168.

⁹ Buntingh, D., *Geschiedenis van opvoeding en onderwijs in de Nederlanden*, tweede stuk, tweede gedeelte, pp. 197 E.

interest in schools. As early as 1522 is found a payment by the municipal authorities to the "rector scholarium" on account of a cherus.¹ In 1567 the city paid an item of 4 pounds for "the benches for the school children in Jesus School."² Some years later a similar appropriation was made for the free instruction of poor young children.³ In 1576 it was resolved by the city thenceforth to maintain the St. Jerome School "with adequate salaries."⁴ Numerous records of instructions issued in the seventeenth century to rectors and masters of this school give a very good account of the inner working of the Latin school among the Dutch of that period.⁵ A church order for the whole Province of Utrecht was issued in 1590 and another in 1612. In the latter were included directions for schools, schoolmasters, and sextons. Schools of four kinds were recognized, public or trivial,⁶ parochial, private, and schools for the country districts.⁷ The selection of instructors, the fixing of curricula, and the general supervision were given to municipal authorities, with varying degrees of participation in control granted to the church.⁸ In 1644 the city of Utrecht adopted a detailed plan for the free instruction of the poor by apportioning them among its four parochial schools.⁹ The country schools of the Province were regulated separately in an order of 18 sections issued in 1654, one of the best available accounts of Dutch school management of the seventeenth century.⁹ In matters of education, there is no reason to suppose that Utrecht was in advance of other Provinces of the United Netherlands. Before the Reformation public schools were found in individual cities. Beginning about 1580 the Provinces took up the work, making general regulations for the control of schools everywhere. By the middle of the seventeenth century the whole country—rural districts as well as cities and towns—appears to have been well provided with schools of various grades, controlled and often also supported by the public secular authorities.

The relation of church and state in the control of these schools was a matter of considerable concern to the interests involved. On the one hand was a vigorous minority of Calvinists who wished to use the governmental machinery to enforce their ideas of church doctrine and polity. On the other was a larger body of people, Roman Catholics, Arminians, Mennonists, and men of relatively independent

¹ Van Flensburg. Archief voor kerkelijke en wereldsche geschiedenis . . . van Utrecht, III, 183. The school (St. Jerome) had at the date named apparently been long established.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 240.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

⁴ *Ibid.*, VII, 392.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 366 ff.

⁶ A trivial school was originally a Latin school teaching the trivium. See p. 66 ff.

⁷ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, pp. 36 ff.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 91-3. The ordinance was promulgated by the city authorities without (specific) reference to ecclesiastical sanction.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-76.

religious ideas, who agreed among themselves only in resisting the encroachments of the Calvinists.¹ So aggressive, however, was the strict Calvinistic party that it dominated the church almost completely, and, through that, exerted an influence on legislation out of proportion to the relative number of its adherents. In this contest, the school was one of the strategic points. The party which could fix the curriculum, select the textbooks, and certificate the teachers, all to suit its ideas, would eventually carry the day; for practically every child in the provinces went to school. The Calvinistic party saw this point with clearness, and moved toward it with a precision admirable in its effectiveness. At this time it was a part of the common law of the Netherlands—if we may use an English term and theory—that, with regard to schools of whatever grade, the local magistracy should appoint the masters and give instructions as to books and curriculum. The strict church party accordingly sought through church orders, promulgated by cities and Provinces, to have by statute law the power granted to church officials of certificating teachers and advising with the magistracy in the control of schools. The fact that Roman Catholics were suspected of favoring Spain aided the Calvinists in securing such legislation. Thus in the Province of Zeeland, where the Calvinists were early in power, there was issued by 1583 a kerkenordnung which gave larger power over the schools into the hands of the church. "No one henceforth in the lands of Zeeland," so reads this ordinance, "in the towns, as well as in the country districts, shall be accepted for the school service, nor shall any already in service be allowed to continue, except those who shall have been judged thereto fit and capable by the classis of each island of Zeeland, respectively, where the same resides or will reside, having been beforehand examined in life and doctrine. * * * These and no others may be accepted or retained by the magistrates."² And it was further enacted that "the aforesaid schoolmasters shall not be allowed to teach other books than those judged to be fit and suitable for the youth by the classis, as well in the little children's schools as in the Latin schools for the advanced pupils."³ To the same effect, the Earl of Leicester, representing Queen Elizabeth in the control of Dutch affairs, issued in 1586 an order intended to be binding throughout the United Netherlands, in which the consistory or classis was to certificate all schoolmasters, after an examination "first as to purity of walk and then in knowledge and godliness of life." All schoolmasters must first "subscribe to the confession of the Netherlandish church." For the management of Latin ("particu-

¹ It is not generally known that as late as 1584 a majority of the people, except in Zeeland, were Roman Catholics. (Blok, *History of the People of the Netherlands*, iii, 190.); while even in 1640 nearly one-third of the total population were still adherents of this faith. (*Ibid.*, iv, 124.)

² Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

lar") schools, there should be chosen each year "certain curators from the magistracy and the consistory" "so that the success of these (schools) may be assured."¹ It was to secure the enforcement of such regulations that the Great Synod of Dort (1618-19), the climax of Calvinistic power, made it "the duty of the ministers, with an elder, and if necessary, with a magistrate to visit all the schools, private as well as public"; and to the same end, placed a somewhat similar obligation upon the classis to inspect the churches and schools within its territory.²

The party in opposition to the Calvinists was able to thwart in some considerable measure these efforts of the strict church people. In the first place, the edicts of church synods by no means controlled the action of the civil authority. On the contrary, approval by the government of a Province was necessary to give to the synodic acts the force of law in that Province. We accordingly find the States General of Holland giving only a "provisional and limited approval" to the kerkenordnung of the synod of The Hague (1586),³ especially as pertained to the choosing and installing of ministers and schoolmasters. The same Province later took similar action with regard to edicts of the Great Synod of Dort (1618-19), and not only specifically declared that "no acts, or decrees, of a synod should be of force to bind any person, without a previous approbation by states;" but even adopted amendments to the twenty-first and forty-fourth articles of church order whereby the right of appointing schoolmasters was specifically reserved to the civil authorities.⁴ Actual school orders of the period show the same disposition to keep control in secular hands. The school order of the Province of Utrecht in 1590 provided that "so far as concerns the schools, they shall stand at the disposal and order of the magistracy in each city." Elsewhere in the document the reformed religion was distinctly recognized, but nowhere in it were the church officials given any power whatsoever in the management of schools.⁵ In another school order of the same Province, that of 1612, it was arranged that rectors of the city trivial schools should be appointed and installed by the magistrates, who were also to give instructions, "with the advice of the deputies of the synod." There seemed, however, no legal way of enforcing the "advice." Similarly, "the parochial schoolmasters in the city and towns, together with the voorlezers and sextons," were to be appointed "by the respective magistrates with the advice of the consistory." "Books and authors" were to be prescribed by the respective magistrates, but must be such as would not "turn the youth away from the Christian reformed religion."⁶ Still further, even when the laws

¹ Rutgers, *op. cit.*, p. 639 ff.

² Dunshoe, *op. cit.*, p. 4; *Ecol. Rec.*, p. 422.

³ Rutgers, *op. cit.*, p. 625.

⁴ Brsrdit, *op. cit.*, lv, 163, 166.

⁵ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26 ff.

allowed the church a certain control, the local civil authorities exercised a broad discretion in their enforcement of such laws. Thus the particular Synod of South Holland was informed in 1624 that the rector of a Latin school at Gouda had published a school program in which optional catechism was advertised, and the substitution of a lesson in Cato's Distichs was allowed in place of attendance upon the regular Sunday church service.¹ The synod strongly disapproved of this advertisement and tried for six years to have the laws forbidding such executed; but in vain. The magistrates agreed in theory with the synod, but would not reduce the rector to obedience; and in this status the affair finally rested.² In 1628 Lutheran and Catholic masters in the same school declined to subscribe to the creed, but after being dismissed according to law, they were brought back by the magistrates.³ In like manner, Catholic schools at Noordwyk and Culemborg troubled the synod for many years. Although the law required the creed subscription of all, nothing could be done to close these schools; the civil authorities would not act.⁴ In such ways did political expediency thwart religious zeal. The schools remained the joint concern of both church and state, with the state the dominant party.

This joint control, while differing in different times and places, seems on the whole to have been settled in such a way that in religious affairs the church had a determining voice, while in all other matters the secular authorities controlled. The division of influence would thus differ according to the kind of school. In the Latin schools of the city the church saw to it that the masters signed the creed, that the catechism was taught, that no bad books were used, and that the pupils attended the regular Sunday church service. But even here the minister and consistory could only use moral suasion; the enforcement of the laws lay finally with the secular body. As regards the parochial school, whose master was usually also voorlezer and voorzanger, the church had a larger share of influence. The master was seldom, if ever, chosen without at least the advice of the consistory.

In the control, however, of even the parochial schools the secular authorities might act without specific reference to the consistory. Thus the Utrecht act of 1644, adopted by the common council for the free instruction of the poor, prescribed how many such free pupils each parochial school should teach without even a suggestion that the churches had any voice in the decision.⁵ In conclusion, then, as to the relation of church and state in school affairs, the principal power of the church lay in the generally acknowledged right to examine as

¹ Acta der Particuliere Synoden van Zuid-Holland (Knuttel), I, 144.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 141, 167, 206, 249, 302-3, 329.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 309, 418; III, 15-7, 51-2, 97, 114-5, 187, 219, 271, 280, 317, 336, 429, 534, 585.

⁵ Boddinck, *op. cit.*, p. 91 f.

to creed subscription,¹ to enforce which there had been devised the regular visitations of church and consistory for local supervision, and that of the deputies of the classes for a more general oversight. On the other hand, the strength of the secular side lay in the facts, first, that, most strictly speaking, the Reformed Church had never been officially established as the exclusive State church of the Netherlands,² and, second, that not only did financial support come from the civic authorities, but legal ownership and control was vested in the Government. So that even parochial schools—nay, the churches themselves—were public institutions under the ultimate control of the secular Government.

Because of our primary interest in the schools of New Netherland, it is the parochial school of the Netherlands that interests us most. In the early seventeenth century one "Dirck Adriaensz Valekoogh, schoolmaster at Barsingerhorn," published "a fit and profitable little book called the Rule of the Dutch Schoolmasters."³ The book gives Valekoogh's own practice, and as such forms our best source for the period. "The ideal teacher," so says Mr. Valekoogh, "is a man who is gentle, true, of good family and of good reputation. He is a man who knows how to write a good hand and who is good at reading; who knows *sol-fa-ing* and who can sing the psalms from notes; who neither lisps nor speaks too low; who can write letters and requests; who understands the Scriptures so that he can educate the people; and who knows how to set a clock, how to manage oil, and clean it."⁴

No master could teach even in a private school before he had been granted a license.⁵ For this an examination was usually prerequisite, at least so far as to ascertain the religious and moral fitness of the candidate. Apparently none but elementary schoolmasters were examined as to scholarship. Letters of credential as to life and doctrine were of course passed upon by the appropriate appointing bodies. Subscription to the creed, made formally in a book kept publicly for that purpose, was common.⁶ Actual examination as to scholarship was frequently conducted by the local ministry, by the consistory, or by the classis.⁷ The license to teach was variously

¹ This power the church authorities sought to render more secure by insisting that no one be allowed to teach who was not at the same time a member of the church. Sometimes even the whole family must be members of the orthodox church. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction over church membership would thus readily give increased leverage in school control. Brandt, *op. cit.*, iv, 138; Nederl. Archief v. Kerkel. Gesch. (Kist en Royaards), iv, 30; Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

² Blok, *op. cit.*, iv, 276.

³ Alckmaer, 1607 (reprinted 1875). For selections, see Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 104 ff. and Schotel *Het Oud-Hollandsch Huisgezin der 17de Eeuw*, p. 78 f.

⁴ This is an adaptation from Valekoogh given by Douma, *Geschiedenis van het lager onderwijs in Nederland*, p. 68.

⁵ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 12 (Holland and W. Friesland, 1581); *ibid.*, p. 7 (ditto, 1591); *ibid.*, p. 34 (Utrecht, 1586), etc.

⁶ For example, the city of Haarlem has in its archives a register of such creed subscriptions covering the years 1638-1706.—Enschede, *op. cit.*, ii, 96.

⁷ *Acta van part. Syn. van Zuid-Holland*, iii, 47; Buddingh, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 77; Rutgers, *op. cit.*, p. 640 (Leicester's school order, 1606).

granted; usually by the civil authorities,¹ at other times by the classis or the consistory,² occasionally in the country districts by the pastor alone,³ and finally at times by the joint action of church and state.⁴ The license carried with it permission to hang out a card before the door of the schoolroom, naming the subjects in which the master was proficient and for which he had been licensed. In some places, in order to prevent fraud, it was legally required that such cards be hung out, written by the master's own hand.⁵ Such a placard was sometimes called a sample card (*monster kaart*), and frequently contained specimens of handwriting odd to us of these days. Thus, on a schoolmaster's card at Rotterdam was a picture of the whale with Jonah but recently cast forth, and underneath the words:

"As soon as Jonah was cast forth by the whale, he went to Nineveh to preach and to teach.

"Here we teach children the prayers, the questions by heart, and we go out catechizing."⁶

The election and appointment of teachers varied greatly. The more important Latin schools were under the immediate control of the city burgomasters,⁷ and appointment seems to have been made directly by them without reference to the church, except that generally the requirement of creed subscription was enforced.⁸ The elementary schools might be so managed, but on the whole the church authorities had more voice in appointments to lower schools. The synods sought indeed to secure to the consistories the legal right of joint action with the magistracy on all appointments,⁹ but in this they were never entirely successful.

The remuneration of the teachers was partly by stipulated salary, partly by approved school fees, and oftentimes by sundry extras, as entrance (matriculation) fees, stipulated presents, and free lodging. A *Nijkerk* contract of 1619 illustrates all of these. There were two masters, one Dutch and one Latin. Each should receive "a yearly

¹ Holland and W. Friesland, 1581 (*Buddingh, op. cit.*, 12), 1591 (*ibid.*, p. 7), Utrecht, 1586 (*ibid.*, p. 34), 1613 (*ibid.*, p. 40), etc.

² Zealand, 1583 (*Buddingh, op. cit.*, p. 8).

³ *Acta van part. Syn. van Zuid-Holland*, III, 479.

⁴ Leicester's school order, 1586 (*Rutgers, op. cit.*, p. 640).

⁵ *Buddingh, op. cit.*, p. 86 (Utrecht city, 1631); *ibid.*, p. 75 (Utrecht country schools, 1654); *Schotel, op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁶ *Schotel, op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁷ *Van Flensburg, op. cit.*, VII, 266 ff; *Enschede, op. cit.*, I, 166.

⁸ *Brandt, op. cit.*, III, 321-2; IV, 98, 138, 158.

⁹ Thus in the particular Synod of North Holland in 1604, the question was asked "whether or not it be not desirable, even necessary, that the schoolmasters, as well in the cities as in the villages, should henceforth be named with the consent of the churches." To which the synod made reply: "Yes, by all means, and it were to be desired that this might be consummated. The churches, however, shall in particular use all diligence to secure this consent as far as possible." (*Rietsma, and Van Veen, Acta der provinciale synode gehouden in de Noordelijke Nederlanden*, I, 353.) The Synod of South Holland in 1622 similarly answered: "It is the opinion of the synod that the appointment and dismissal of teachers cannot take place without the advice of the consistory." (*Acta, etc.*, I, 57.)

salary of two hundred gulden to begin with, as well as free lodgings and as much peat as their predecessors had." Besides, were the regular tuition fees: Three stivers a quarter for Dutch reading; five stivers for reading and writing; Latin pupils, six stivers. In addition was a matriculation fee of "two blanken." And in addition to all the foregoing, "as a special encouragement, both schoolmasters shall receive at Christmas two stivers from each child and two stivers on St. John's day in the summer, and nothing more."¹ The salaries of masters came sometimes from the town treasury, and sometimes from church funds which had (apparently) been sequestered from the church orders at the Reformation.² It was common for the school ordinances to regulate the tuition fees. Thus the schoolmaster in the Utrecht country schools (1654) should "receive monthly or weekly from each child a certain sum as much as had been fixed by the scholars with the approval of the magistrates or of a court of justice." The master could enforce his claim by proper appeal. "Poor children who asked for free tuition shall all be taught for nothing." If there were too many the scholars or consistory should arrange a "compensation payable out of the deacons' fund."³

At that period—as well as since—the question as to the sufficiency of the schoolmaster's remuneration was an insistent one. The most common expedient then to bring the teaching income up to a living wage was for the master to engage in various side occupations. Valcknoogh mentions a long list of possible occupations, ludicrously compounded of all sorts of odds and ends. "The schoolmaster was allowed to be a notary, a tax collector, a secretary; he might compute the taxes, cut hair, cure wounds, act as glazier (*glazemaken*), make balls (to play with) and coffins, cut stone, stain and varnish chairs, mend shoes, make wooden shoes, prepare all mourning articles, hoe gardens, bind books, knit nets, keep a few cows, fatten oxen, earn a stiver by sewing, carve wood, write books, compose love letters—but—before school time."⁴ We probably can gather from this a fairly accurate idea of the various occupations that were followed in connection with schoolkeeping. Certain activities, however, were specifically forbidden. The Classis of Nijmegen forbade its schoolmasters to keep inns or tap houses, either to farm or collect the excise, and even to write legal papers in public tap houses. If the schoolmaster lived in the church steeple, he might not keep a retail store.⁵ In Holland there was found a combination of offices after-

¹ Beernink, *Het onderwijs te Nijkerk* (Bijdragen en Mededeelingen der Vereeniging "Geire," deel X, 113 ff.).

² Enschedé, *op. cit.*, i, 166; Beernink, *op. cit.*, p. 116; *Acta der part. Syn. van Zuid-Holland*, i, 310; *ibid.*, iii, 417.

³ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 74. The scholars here mentioned were practically a school board composed jointly of members of the magistracy and of the consistory. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁴ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

⁵ Kist and Rooyard, *op. cit.*, iv, 81.

wards usual in America, those of voorlezer, voorsanger, and sexton.¹ These were commonly combined to make up the office of parish schoolmaster. Valckoogh's list is rather of the side occupations of private masters.

The masters needed supervising in various ways. Some sought to turn over a part of their work to incompetent assistants. Accordingly the Zeeland regulations of 1583 specify that the masters "shall be required themselves to hear and examine and correct all the lessons and the compositions of the children; and not by an assistant master, nor one child by another; unless the assistant masters have been found capable by the aforesaid classis; or the pupils by way of preparation recite their lessons to each other in order to learn, or that having recited them to the master they repeat them to the assistant master or to the other children in order to retain them the better."² In this connection, Valckoogh speaks as if the younger pupils regularly recited to the older ones.³ There is some indication of a system of quasi apprenticeship in connection with assistant teachers.⁴ In the larger Latin schools there are of course a number of subordinate teachers. The duties of the subordinate teachers (lectores) in the St. Jerome school at Utrecht were set out in most precise schedules.⁵

The records abound in references to school mistresses. These had to be licensed in the same manner as the men.⁶ They had likewise to sign the confession of faith.⁷ Schotel in discussing these schooldames says that they taught in great numbers in the slums, and that frequently they were unable to write, having to sign the confession with the cross mark.⁸ No evidence has been found that the schooldames kept other than private schools.

The school calendar is not easily settled. Speaking generally, the schools were supposed to continue the year round. No one of the general school regulations studied even refers to a vacation. The University of West Friesland in 1601 had six vacations, aggregating nearly three months,⁹ but there is no good reason to conclude from this as to the practice of the lower schools. The weekly holidays varied. Valckoogh considered a half holiday on Thursday as sufficient.¹⁰ In 1640 St. Jerome, at Utrecht, changed from three half holidays to two, Monday after 2 o'clock and Thursday after-

¹ Douma, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-92.

² Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 10. A similar regulation was found at Leiden in 1668. *Ibid.*, p. 146.

³ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 85-8.

⁵ Van Ffensburg, *op. cit.*, vii 372-376 (1640), 382-385 (1643-1666).

⁶ Leicester's School order 1586 (Rutgers, *op. cit.*, p. 640); Utrecht, 1613 (Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 40).

⁷ Brandt, *op. cit.*, iv., 158.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

⁹ Eight days in the beginning of May, four weeks "kers vacantie," two weeks at Easter, two weeks at Pinkster (Whitsuntide), six weeks in summer, and eight days at "kermes vacantie" in October. W. B. S. Boeles, *Frislands Hoogeschool, etc.*, i, 351.

¹⁰ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

noon.¹ The Utrecht country school regulations (1654) say two weekly half holidays on such days as the scholars may determine, and no attention to be paid to Shrove Tuesday or kermises.² The usual custom, however, seems to have been half holidays on Wednesdays and Saturdays.³ The church holidays, which may be supposed to have been also school holidays, were Christmas, Easter, and Pinkster, "with the day following each," and sometimes "the day of the circumcision (New Year's day) and of the Christ's ascension."⁴ To these may be added, as school holidays, St. Nicholas day (Dec. 6) and generally the kermis.

The school buildings of the period seem on the whole not to have received much attention. In the cities, as with us, special buildings were set aside for the public schools; elsewhere the schools were generally held in the dwellings of the masters, which were near the parish church. Nor was the interior of the schoolroom any more considered. Light and ventilation were all too frequently ignored. In summer the rooms were too often intolerably hot. In winter, peat and candles furnished a scant supply of heat and light.⁵ The room itself (apart from the contents of the master's desk) would seem to us quite bare, accustomed as we are to modern schoolrooms. The furniture consisted of nothing more than a chair and desk for the master, and for the pupils bare benches, sometimes with backs, but quite often without. In the Latin schools might be found also a blackboard and shelves for books. The parish schoolmaster of the villages, who might be notary besides, would need a varied stock of supplies, according to Douma (following Valekoogh): "A good handtplacke (paddle for striking the open hand of the naughty pupil), and a strong *roe* (fabricated whip) made of willow branches, a sharp penknife, a sandbox (for blotting), a writing desk which could be locked, containing pens, a seal, green wax, an ink pot, a bundle of goose quills, a glass full of black ink, a blue tile on which to mix ink, small and large bowls for inks of various colors, parchments, three or four books of white paper, an ink horn to hang by his side when he went out, a brass candlestick with two lights, notes from which to teach letter writing, an arithmetic board on which to lay the counters, a rule, a roll book for the names of the pupils, three or four little books, a Bible, a prayer book, a psalm book, a Testament, a reading desk for the Bible, and an oil can or lantern for the clock work."⁶ There is no reason to doubt that much of this description would apply as well to the schoolmaster's outfit in New Netherland.

¹ Van Flensburg, *op. cit.*, vii, 372, 382.

² Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

³ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 86; Boernink, *op. cit.*, 114.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., 424 (Article 67 of Synod of Dort church order).

⁵ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 69. The *roe* was more frequently called *roede*. The handtplacke likewise often appears as *placke*, *plack*, or *plak*.

Of special interest for our subsequent discussion is the question of the education of girls. Of the general opportunity of the girls to attend the elementary schools there would seem to be no doubt. The Zeeland regulations of 1583 say that: "Furthermore, separate schools shall be kept for boys and girls, when this is feasible. Where this is not feasible, the said boys and daughters shall be separated as much as possible from each other, not only on benches, but also in all places in the schools and out."¹ Douma, following Valckoogh, says of the latter part of the sixteenth century: "The pupils, girls and boys separated from one another, sit on low benches without backs. The girls sit in a corner all by themselves."² Douma further reproduces (p. 70) a picture ascribed by him to the beginning of the seventeenth century, in which the girls are evident by their distinctive dress, sitting furthest from the master. One of the best pictures we have of the interior of a Dutch school is that depicted on the gable stone of the orphan house at Enkhuizen, done in 1616, an excellent reproduction of which is found in Prof. P. L. Muller's *Onze Goude Eeuw* (vol. 2, p. 368). In this the dress of the little girls is as distinctive as any photograph of present-day conditions could show. In the school regulations of Nijkerk in 1627 there were three masters—one Dutch, one Latin, and one for the girls. Each master, it appears, taught separately from the others.³ In the Utrecht rural school regulations (1654), already several times referred to, the eleventh item states that "the boys over ten years of age shall sit separately from the girls, and the oldest shall sit next to the school-master."⁴ Douma quotes (verbatim) a school regulation of the seventeenth century that "Schoolmasters instructing both girls and boys in the same school must have sufficient space so that they may be separated from one another and that they may be taught separately."⁵ Gelderland (1681) has a similar regulation to which it adds: "If boys are taken to board, no girls shall be received with them in the house above nine or ten years of age; and likewise, if girls are taken to board, no boys shall be received with them above twelve or thirteen years old, on pain of six guildens to be paid by the schoolmaster for each child."⁶ While Holland, in common with the rest of the seventeenth century world, excluded girls from all public higher learning, the references given show amply that girls were ad-

¹ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 69. In Schajel, *op. cit.*, p. 80, we find Mr. Valckoogh's verses:

"De meyskens eullen sitten op een hoek alleen
En de knechtkens sullen ook sitten by een."
The girls shall sit in a corner alone
The boys shall also keep together.

³ Beernink, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁴ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

⁵ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁶ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

mitted to the elementary schools along with the boys; in separate rooms, if the numbers permitted; if not, in the same room with the boys, though in different parts of the room and in different classes. In respect to the education of girls, Holland conditions were much in advance of those that prevailed even at a much later date in some of the English colonies of America.

In general the regulations for the Dutch schools of that time show at once likenesses and diversities in school management as compared with the present. Both the similarity and the diversity are illustrated in the school hours. These varied from place to place, and were different in winter and summer. Summer hours in some places were 6 to 8 a. m., 9 to 11 a. m., 12 to 2 p. m., 3 to 5 p. m. (Groningen and Ommelanden).¹ Nijkerk in 1619 had the same fourfold division, only dismissing at 10 and 4.² Utrecht, however, had the hours which were afterwards common in Dutch America, 8 to 11 a. m., 1 to 4 p. m.³ Winter hours varied "according to the circumstances of the time and place," being usually shorter than those for summer. Then, as now, tardiness and absences demanded attention. "On the appointed hour for the assembling of the children," say the Zeeland (1583) regulations, "the aforesaid schoolmaster shall look over the roll to see whether all are present and shall punish suitably those who come too late, and shall ascertain from the parents * * * the cause of the absence of those who are not found present in school."⁴ Manners were not forgotten; as soon as the children, especially the boys, entered the school, they must bow to the master. The boys, however, kept on their hats, except when reciting.⁵ Religious nurture was ever in the foreground. "The schoolmaster shall make his pupils say by turn the morning prayer when they enter the school in the morning; when leaving towards noon, the prayer before dinner; when returning in the afternoon, the prayer after dinner; and again on leaving the evening prayer."⁶ This must have been well-nigh universal. The same thing occurs in nearly every set of regulations found either in Holland or in America.

It was a general requirement that the master hang up in the school-room the rules governing his school. Valckoogh has left in rhyme a long list of such rules, the rhyme and meter of which are unfortunately destroyed by translation:

Those who do not take off their caps before a man of honor,
 Who run and scream and swear,
 Who race wildly or improperly through the streets,
 Who play for money or books, or who tell lies,
 Who chase or throw at people's ducks or animals,
 * * * * *

¹ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

² Beernink, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

³ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁵ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

⁶ Utrecht (1664) regulations Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

Who play with knives or run their hands through their hair,
 Who run into the fields, or jump into the hay with sticks,
 Who stay at home without the teacher's or parent's leave,
 Who make noise in church or who buy candy,
 Who do not say prayer at table, before lessons,
 In the morning or in the evening,
 Who tear their books, or spoil their paper,
 And who call one another names here,
 Who throw their bread to dogs or cats,
 Who wish to keep what they find in school,
 Who spit in the drink of another, or step on his dinner,
 Who run away from school and do not tell it,

* * * * *
 Who do not go nicely to church and home again,
 And who read these rules and do not mind them,
 Shall receive two paddlings (placken) or be whipped.¹

An interesting school rule full of "local color" was a requirement that the masters forbid swimming in dangerous places: "and to this end they shall appoint *notators* who will look after their fellow pupils, take note of them, and report such to the schoolmasters."²

The instruments of punishment were mentioned above, the *plak* and the *roede*. The former was a stout wooden paddle with which the teacher struck the pupil's outstretched palm. The latter was a bundle of switches, the use of which belongs to the common educational history of mankind. Even in that day regulation of punishment was necessary. Douma quotes an order of the time: "Discipline or punishment must be neither too easy nor too harsh, but should be moderated according to the character, health, and disposition of the pupil, and after the customary school discipline, only with *plak* and *roede*."³ That contrary emotions were aroused in parents, then as now, is evident from a picture on the title page of a contemporary arithmetic by Jan Belot Dieppois. The scene is a schoolroom. A devil peers from the wall behind the master's desk, a father enters with his little son and says: "Beat him freely and spare neither *plak* nor the *roe*, before I do something else to him." A mother at the same time comes in with her son and says: "I am nearly crazy, I cannot stand it that you should thus beat my good child." Then the teacher groans: "'Unhappy is the man,' says Aristotle, 'who is in charge of the children of several mothers.'"⁴

The curriculum of the elementary school was very simple. The A B C's, spelling, reading, writing, the barest acquaintance with figures, and, later on, a history of Dutch wars—these with the religious instruction made up the whole. The Utrecht instructions for the country schools (1654) seem to give a fair idea of what was taught

¹ Quoted in Schotel, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

² Utrecht (1654) regulations, Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 90.

⁴ The picture is reproduced in Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

as well as some insight into the methods of teaching: "In teaching, the schoolmaster shall pay special attention that the fundamentals of spelling shall be well laid before the children come to the reading, that they may accustom themselves to read distinctly and learn to distinguish well the syllables and the words, and they shall not make the children proceed too quickly from one book to another; and they shall also teach the youth to understand the numbers of the chapters of the Holy Scriptures and the Psalms." "On a certain day the pupils shall challenge one another to spell the most difficult words." "And that the pupils may be the better stimulated to do their duty, they shall write every week a prize which shall be hung in the school and those who have the most prizes shall sit the whole week at the front." "The school shall be divided into classes, each class shall learn from one kind of book; those who will learn from the same book together shall also be called at the same time and shall recite the same lesson, the others standing near by and following in their book. All those who have been heard, they shall return together quietly to their seats, and another class shall be called."¹ The master "shall hear each pupil (recite) twice and shall show (i. e., instruct) him once before noon, and the same after noon."

The amount of arithmetic included in this curriculum for the country schools of the Province of Utrecht (1654), simply the "numbers of the chapters of the Holy Scriptures and the Psalms," is less than that prescribed in 1612 for the schools of the city and towns of Utrecht. In the latter the schoolmaster was required to teach the pupils "with all diligence in addition to reading, writing and arithmetic (rekenen) etc., the Our Father, The Creed, and the Ten Commandments."² Evidently the commercial demands of the cities and towns gave arithmetic a greater importance than it had in the country. That students not destined for the commercial life need not know arithmetic is shown by the fact that in England at this same time boys about ready to leave the Latin grammar school for the university³ were often barely able to read the numbers of the books they studied.⁴ The Nijkerk (1619) regulations show also that arithmetic was looked upon as a special subject: "Neither of the two masters [Latin or Dutch] shall teach anything during school time but Latin and Dutch. Arithmetic and other subjects must be studied in private lessons."⁴ On the whole, then, arithmetic seems to have occupied about the same place among the Dutch of that day that commercial bookkeeping now has with us. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the course prescribed for the school-

¹ This is one of the earliest known references to class recitation.

² Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

³ Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, p. 25 f. (London, 1612).

⁴ Beernink, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

masters sent out by the West India Company to New Netherland included "reading, writing, ciphering, and arithmetic."¹

The textbooks used in the better elementary schools are probably pretty well represented by the list officially promulgated at Utrecht in 1650:²

Het groot en kleyn A. B. C. boeck;
 De Heydolberchse Catechismus;
 De Evangelien ende Epistelen;
 De Trap der Jeugt;
 De Historien van David;
 Proverbia Salomonis;
 De spiegel der Jeugt van de Nederlandse oorlogen;
 De sendbrieven van de nieuwe editie met eenige stichtelyke dichten daar achter.

The first three of these are sufficiently indicated by their translated titles: The Great and Small A B C Book, The Heidelberg Catechism, and The Gospels and Epistles. The alphabet books were generally called "cock books," from the picture of a crowing cock found thereon. On the title page of one of these appeared:

We must know the alphabet very well
 Before we can readily read any book.

In addition to the alphabet, these books contained the Lord's Prayer, the commandments, and the prayers.³ The Heidelberg Catechism was the authoritative catechism of the Reformed Dutch Church. The Gospels and the Epistles served as a reading book. "De Trap der Jeugt" means literally "The Stairway of Youth," but the writer has not been able to find any indication of its contents. The Proverbs of Solomon is again a reading book. "De Spiegel der Jeugt," literally "The Mirror of Youth," treated of the wars of the Dutch people.⁴ "De Sendbrieven," etc., are the epistles of the New Testament.

As has been many times said, the teaching of religion was a main function, perhaps the main function of the school. Attention has been called to the use of prayers at the opening and close of the forenoon and afternoon session. We have seen also that the ordinary school studies were taught with religious content and material. Besides all of this, specifically religious exercises are stated with precision in most of the contracts. The Utrecht (1654) regulations require the master to teach "the prayer of our Lord Jesus Christ, also the twelve articles of the Christian faith, the Ten Commandments, and afterwards the confession of sin, being the prayer before the sermon; also the questions and answers of the Christian catechism."⁵ In Zeeland (1583) the masters must exercise their pupils "on certain hours daily or weekly, in the singing of the Psalms, to the end that

¹ Soc. Rec., p. 88.

² Biddings, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

³ Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

⁴ Biddings, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

they may help to sing them well in the meeting."¹ "On Sundays the children shall again come to school at 7 o'clock in the morning, go to church with the schoolmaster at 9 o'clock and listen quietly to the sermon. After dinner at 1 o'clock they shall again go to school in order to learn their lessons; and at 2 o'clock they shall sit in the church under the pulpit and recite their catechism. And the schoolmasters shall be at pains to see that all this takes place orderly and quietly."²

While the extracts here presented are from three distinct sets of regulations, there is no reason to believe that the combined result is not typical. Almost the same procedure was explicitly or implicitly required in the New Netherland contracts. While there are minor variations at different times and places, we may feel sure that in four essentials there was well-nigh universal agreement; first, the religious subject matter to be memorized, never less than what is indicated above; second, the learning of the Psalms for the Sunday church service (it is to be noted that the parish schoolmaster is generally also the leader of the congregational singing); third, the attendance of the school children upon church service in a body under the direction of the master; and fourth, the public catechizing of the school children. This last in New Netherland was often, if not generally, on one of the week days.

So much attention given to such perfunctory religious exercises would not at the present period receive general approval. But there is one aspect of the question which turned this religious function of the schools to an unexpectedly valuable account. It seems fairly clear that by the religious character of the curriculum the Dutch colonists were led through their zeal for religion to provide schools in connection with their churches; because, without parochial schools, the people did not see how their children could receive what seemed to them to be the absolute essentials of religious teachings. This fact will account for the presence of schools in struggling frontier villages of Holland America, where, without this religious zeal, interest in education alone would not have sufficed to maintain adequate schools.

So far but little has been said about the Latin schools. Quite probably the teaching of Latin was at that time much the same throughout the Protestant world. There were Latin schools in every important town. Many long antedated the Reformation.³ The Synod of Dort (1618-19) petitioned the States-General to "reform" the higher and lower Latin schools. The clause relating to the latter we quote as bearing on our subsequent study. "But as for the trivial or inferior schools the synod likewise most humbly prays your High

¹ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

² School Contract at Rynsburg, 1601. Douma, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-3.

³ That at Amsterdam seems to date certainly as far back as 1242. Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

Mightinesses that you would be pleased to order that some general rules for the government of such schools be drawn up and prepared, by and with the advice of such learned men who understand best what relates to the instruction of youth whereby those defects which are so frequently observed in schools may be mended, and as far as possible a uniform method of teaching be established, especially in the principles of grammar, logic, and rhetoric."¹ The particular synods concerned themselves with the Latin schools mostly, it is true, about subscription to the creed on the part of the masters, but also about matters more interesting to us now. In 1627 the question was raised in the synod of South Holland as to whether the fundamentals of Hebrew should not be taught in the trivial schools (*in scholis trivialibus fundamenta Hebraicæ linguæ*). The answer was that, while this was desirable, it had better be left to the discretion of those concerned with the schools.² In 1634 "a rector of a trivial school, who is a member of the church and in a certain sense also a servant of the church, asks whether children under pretext of good exercises should be allowed to learn to present a comedy." It was answered that such was opposed to God's word and could not be granted.³ The inquiry referred, of course, to the common Renaissance practice of presenting classical plays as school exercises, to which, however, strong opposition had now arisen from moral and other Puritanic considerations. The strong hold which the Latin school had then is partly explained by the fact that Latin was necessary to advancement along any professional or official line. Schotel quotes some verses:

Those who want to become men of importance,
Will be prepared in school.
Notaries, clerks, treasurers, or those who want an office
Must go to school and learn Latin well.⁴

Following Douma (p. 94), we may say that the trivial or Latin schools were found in nearly all cities. These schools were not always higher than ordinary elementary schools, but stood on the same level as the latter. The pupils were often admitted in their eighth year. The school laws of Locuwarden (1638, renewed 1701) show a school conducted by a rector and four subordinate teachers, all owing obedience "to the honorable magistrates." No pupils were admitted who did not know how to read. Declensions and conjugations were at first the chief subjects. Then came explanations from Latin and Greek authors. The Heidelberg Catechism was of course not forgotten. The *Vestibulum* of Comenius or the Distichs of Cato were used. The New Testament was translated from the Greek, and Greek composition taught.

¹ 177th session. Brandt, *op. cit.*, III, 326.
² *Acta*, I, 220.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 22.
⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 101.

That education was, on the whole, widespread throughout the Netherlands is abundantly evident, although definite statements are difficult to make. Woltjer quotes a traveler of the latter part of the sixteenth century, one Guiciardini, who says of Holland: "The common people generally know the fundamentals of grammar, and all the people, even the peasants and the country folk, know at least how to read and write. Besides, they know the art and science of the ordinary languages so generally and so well that one is really surprised. Many people who never left the country speak several foreign languages, especially French, which is spoken by almost everybody. Many speak German, English, Italian, and other foreign tongues."¹ The same author quotes the Englishman, Josiah Child, as saying in 1665: "The Dutchmen always take good care of the education and instruction of their children, daughters as well as sons * * *. A Dutchman, however inferior in class or station or ability he may be, always takes care that his children learn how to write a good hand and the art of counting; he even wants them to become competent in the arithmetic of commerce."²

While these statements are too sweeping to be accepted literally, evidently both writers considered that the educational situation among the Dutch was much in advance of what they know more intimately elsewhere; an opinion in which it is easy to concur.

That public schools abounded throughout the Netherlands is equally evident. Every study of the archives of town or province discloses their presence. The minutes of every religious body bear overwhelming testimony not only to the existence of schools but also a zealous interest in their maintenance. It is proper to note that while the sixteenth century church enactments call for the establishment of schools, almost none among the multitudinous school references of the seventeenth century are concerned with this problem. The complaint of the seventeenth century synods is not the lack of schools, but the poor pay of teachers and the consequent inferior service; not the need of Protestant schools, but the presence of Roman Catholic and other heterodox masters; not the establishment of schools, but the proper regulations of schools already in existence.³

¹ Woltjer, *Christelijk Nationaal Schoolonderwijs*, p. 75.

² Two specific references may properly be mentioned in this connection. In 1608 at a regular session of the Classis of Drenthe the Roede church reported that it had no school. However, not only was a reasonable excuse offered for such a delinquency, but the report further stated that a private school had been maintained (Itelzma, *op. cit.*, viii, 91-2). This is a clear instance of the exception that proves the rule. The second reference has been widely used as implying lack of schools in the Netherlands. In fact, it is perhaps the most widely known of all sources bearing on early Dutch schools, being an act of the Synod of Dort (1618-9), seventeenth session: "Schools * * * shall be established not only in cities but also in towns and country places, where heretofore none have existed." (Translation from Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 4.) A frequent interpretation of this has been that heretofore no schools have existed in towns and country places; and the words as given appear to authorize, though not to demand, this interpretation. The Latin original, however, decides otherwise: "Scholae * * * in singulis pagis instituantur, sicuti hactenus nulla institutae fuerunt" (*Acta Synodi* * * * Dordrecht, p. 61). So that a truer rendering

The word "public" used just above in connection with these schools was chosen advisedly. Although tuition was regularly charged—contrary to the present American conception—nevertheless the public authorities, partly civil and partly ecclesiastical, provided the school, examined, and licensed the teacher, paid him a salary, and by law regulated what he should teach, what books he should use, and the conditions under which he should in general conduct his school. In many places school supervisors (*scholarchen, opzienders*), corresponding in part to our school board and in part to school inspectors, were provided by civil enactment to exercise general supervision of school affairs.¹ In at least one instance (Leiden, 1652) an officer, much like a modern expert supervisor, was provided at public expense to see, among other things, that the masters and dames "treated the children well."² In these many respects did seventeenth century Holland approximate the public school system of to-day.

The elementary school of the Netherlands was thus a public parochial school, admitting girls and boys alike, teaching them two of the three R's, less often the third, but never omitting the catechism. The master, while serving the school, generally served also the church by taking a stated part in its regular Sunday service. The control of the school devolved upon both ecclesiastical and secular authorities. It was this school which was reproduced almost identically in the Dutch villages of Holland America.

of the doubtful clause would be, "if anywhere heretofore none have been established." The contemporaneous Dutch rendering of the original Latin is to the same effect: "Soe erghens voor desen geene en sijn opgerecht gheweest" (*Acta ofte Handelingen . . . Synodi . . . tot Dordrecht*, p. 55). Mr. Van Laer translates this, "if (in case) in any of these places (literally 'anywhere') heretofore none have been established." (Letter to the writer, March 6, 1911). The proper interpretation, then, of the act of the synod puts the presumption on the other side. Schools were so general that even the exceptional lack had to be expressed contingently.

¹ Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 75; Rutgers, *op. cit.*, p. 641; Van Flensburg, *op. cit.*, vii, 382, etc.

² Buddingh, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-4.

CHAPTER III.

THE DATE OF THE FIRST SCHOOL IN NEW NETHERLAND.¹

"In the year 1633 the first school was established by the Dutch at New Amsterdam,"² Statements to this effect have found their way into print many times in the past 60 years; and the fact thus asserted has been accepted as a fact established by practically all writers on the history of education. But some information recently made accessible seems to point to a later date as being the more probable.

The Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York³ give, for the first time in accessible English form, certain records of the Reformed Dutch Church in Holland that throw considerable light on the educational history of the Dutch in New Netherland and colonial New York.

In a way, which will be more exactly shown in Chapter V, the conduct of the public schools in New Netherland was partially under the control of the Classis of Amsterdam, which was that division of the Reformed Dutch Church of the Netherlands exercising ecclesiastical control over New Netherland throughout most of the Dutch period (and over the Reformed Dutch churches in New York till 1772). In the records of this classis we find the following among the "Regulations relating to the East India and West India affairs, etc., devised by the deputies of the classis appointed therefor April 7, 1636:"⁴

VI. Of the Schoolmasters:

In case any schoolmasters shall be sent to any of these foreign fields, the same course shall be pursued with them * * * as with the siecken-troosters * * *

II. Of the siecken-troosters (comforters of the sick):

1. The siecken-troosters must present themselves, as far as practicable, before the classis. The classis must endeavor to have a good supply of these on hand, and shall decide which out of all of them shall first be recommended by the deputies to the companies.
2. The examination of the siecken-troosters shall be conducted by the brethren deputies, who shall bring in a report thereof at the next classis.⁵

From the "Instructions and letter of credentials for schoolmasters going to the East or West Indies or elsewhere," adopted June 7, 1636,

¹ A portion of this chapter has previously appeared in the *Educational Review*, and is here reproduced by permission.

² Dexter, *History of education in the United States* (1904), p. 12.

³ 67, Albany, 1901-4.

⁴ *Ecc. Rec.*, p. 89.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

the following extract is quoted to show more fully the method of examination and appointment:

Inasmuch as has offered his services, in this capacity, to the committee on ecclesiastical affairs of the said company, and which committee is especially charged therewith by the Classis of Amsterdam: and the said classis having previously inquired as to this individual, and by examination have ascertained his fitness and experience for such a position; that on the report rendered by the said classis, and with the approbation and consent of the said honorable directors, he has been appointed schoolmaster and sent in such capacity to N. N. with these specific instructions.¹

In accordance with the foregoing regulations, we find the following:

Acts of the deputies,
Adam Rolands

1639, July 18.

Adam Rolands, having requested to go to New Netherland as schoolmaster, reader (voorlezer), and precentor (voorsanger), was accepted, as accepted, upon his good testimonials and the trial of his gifts, on August 4, 1637; and was sent thither.²

The date 1639 need not concern us here, but the other date, August 4, 1637, is crucial to our discussion. The Adam Rolands thus examined and licensed on August 4, 1637, bears the same name³ as the "first schoolmaster" whose teaching career in New Amsterdam is generally supposed to have begun in 1633. But in the document just quoted, he is licensed for that position in 1637. If this certificate were the only evidence bearing upon the date of his entrance into the position in question, no one would hesitate to say that a date earlier than August 4, 1637, should not be assigned. But inasmuch as educational historians, such as Mr. Dexter, say⁴ that it is "certain that in 1633" Roelantsen was sent from Holland to be master of the school, we must therefore examine closely before we accept the date indicated by this newly found reference.

So far as appears, it was Mr. Dunslee⁵ who first gave explicit statement to the since current opinion, and in these words:

1633—In the spring of 1633, Wouter Van Twiller arrived at Manhattan as the second director general of the New Netherlands. In the enumeration of the company's officials of the same year, Everardus Bogardus is mentioned as officiating as minister at Fort Amsterdam, and ADAM ROELANTSEN as the first schoolmaster.⁶ (This has as substantiating footnote, Albany records,⁷ i, 52):

In an extended list of the officers and servants of the Dutch West India Company, in 1638, Rev. Everardus Bogardus is again mentioned as minister at Fort Amsterdam where Adam Roelantsen was still the schoolmaster.⁸ (This has as substantiating footnote Albany records, ii, 13-15).

¹ Ecol., Rec., p. 98.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122, where one finds August 4, 1673. Mr. Van Dyke of the Sage Library writes me, however, that "The original transcript says 1637."

³ The name appears variously as Roelants, Roelantsen, Rolands, Roelandson; he himself used the first two of these forms.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁵ History of the school of the Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York (1853).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28-9.

⁷ Van der Kemp's MSS. translation of New York Col. MSS. (Dutch) in the State Library.

⁸ Dunslee, pp. 29-30. The edition of 1887 gives the same words for these two quotations except that in the first one in place of "in the spring of 1633," we have "In April (prior to the 12th), 1633;" and a reference to "1633" is given in O'Callaghan's History of New Netherland, i, 141-2.

We would naturally understand these quotations to mean (1) that in some original document, presumably Albany Records, i, 52, is to be found an enumeration, perhaps formally drawn, of the company's officials for the year 1633, with "Adam Roelantsen, schoolmaster," thereon; (2) a similar list for 1638 in Albany Records, ii, 13-15, likewise containing "Adam Roelantsen, schoolmaster."

Now, the fact is that in no extant document is there to be found any such list, or anything like it, either for 1633 or for 1638. Such lists have been compiled—the first ones by O'Callaghan¹ from widely separate sources. As an illustration of one such source, and also that the reader may see for himself the contents of Albany Records, i, 52, that reference is here given in its entirety, excepting only the epithets applied to Grietje and her unprintable response thereto:

This day, date underwritten, before me, Cornelis van Tienhoven, Secretary of New Netherland, appeared Adam Roelantsen, schoolmaster, aged about 32 years, at the request of Domine Bogarde, and hath by true Christian words, in place and with promise of a solemn oath if needs be, declared, testified and attested it to be true and truthful that in the year 1633, Grietje Reyniers, being with the deponent at the Strand, the late warehouse for cargoes, he heard the sailors of the ship The Soutberg, the day in the roadstead, cry out to Grietje aforesaid, whereupon she saying All which deponent declares to be true, and that this is done by him without simulation and without any regard of persons.

Done on the Island of Manhate this 13th 8ber 1638.

Adam Roelants.²

It is clear from this paper that "Adam Roelants" was "schoolmaster" on the "Island of Manhate," October 13, 1638, and also that he was on Manhattan in 1633.³ The further bearing of this declaration we postpone for the moment, while we consider more fully the lists to which Mr. Dunshee refers. It will be observed that the Albany Records, i, 52, which Mr. Dunshee gives as his reference to substantiate his 1633 statement, bear no resemblance to a list of officials. The other references, Albany Records, ii, 13-15, are equally far from resembling a list and go no further toward establishing Adam Roelantsen's connection with the school than to show by the records of a certain case in court that he was in Fort Amsterdam, June 10, 1638.

Before we ask how Mr. Dunshee came to make such statements, it may be well to say a word about Mr. O'Callaghan and Mr. Brodhead. These men were incomparably the best students in Mr. Dunshee's day of the period in question. Shortly before Mr. Dunshee wrote, each published a history covering this period;⁴ each issued a second edition, shortly after Mr. Dunshee wrote; while both are quoted in Mr. Dunshee's work. Neither of these historians in either edition refers to such an original list as one would infer from Mr. Dunshee to be still extant. On the contrary, Mr. O'Callaghan took the pains to compile

¹ O'Callaghan's History of New Netherland, vol. 1, pp. 142, 180-1.

² The translation here given is O'Callaghan's (p. 53), which is better than Van der Kemp's.

³ The "Strand" is here in Manhattan, and not in Holland.

⁴ O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, 1st edition 1845, 2d edition, 1855; Brodhead, History of the State of New York, 1st edition (v. 1) 1858, 2d edition (do.) 1878.

such lists. The one for Kieft's administration (1638-1647) includes 28 names with 21^m distinct references in substantiation.¹ It may further be said that the only references that these historians give as to Adam Roelantsen at the time in question are to the declaration regarding Grietje Reyniers and to the case in court above referred to.

Considering that Mr. Dunshee was not primarily an historian, what is more natural than that he should avail himself of these two excellent works which had but recently been issued when he wrote? This, we find, is just what he did. In a footnote Mr. Dunshee says² that the contents of his first chapter were "culled from * * * Brodhead's New York, and here as elsewhere throughout the work his language has at times been appropriated;" while in Chapter II (in which our question is discussed) occur 19 footnote references to O'Callaghan.

In order to exhibit the probable indebtedness of Mr. Dunshee to these two historians in the construction of his paragraphs quoted above, and thus to show that O'Callaghan is Mr. Dunshee's actual authority for his assertion about the lists of company's officials, we show herewith, in one column, Mr. Dunshee's statements, and in a parallel column what seems their probable source in Brodhead and O'Callaghan:

[Brodhead and O'Callaghan.]

"1633 * * * Director general of New Netherland was Wouter van Twiller * * * van Twiller arrived at Manhattan early in the spring."³

[In O'Callaghan we find for 1633 a compiled list of sixteen] "officers in the service of the company" [concluding with] "at Fort Amsterdam, at which place the Rev. Evarardus Bogardus officiated as a minister of the gospel," * * *⁴

"Adam Roelandsen, 'schoolmaster,' arrived * * * about the same time,"⁵ * * * "first schoolmaster in New Amsterdam * * *"⁶

"Among the other officers and servants of the company [in 1638], we find mention made of * * * [here follow twenty-six names, after which this sentence:] The Rev. Evarardus Bogardus continued to officiate as clergyman at Fort Amsterdam where Adam Roelantsen was schoolmaster."⁷

[Dunshee.]

1633.—In the spring of 1633, Wouter van Twiller arrived at Manhattan, as the second director general of New Netherlands. In the enumeration of the company's officials of the same year, Everardus Bogardus is mentioned as officiating at Fort Amsterdam, and Adam Roelandsen as the first schoolmaster.⁸

In an extended list of officers and servants of the Dutch West India Company, in 1638, Rev. Everardus Bogardus is again mentioned as minister at Fort Amsterdam, where Adam Roelantsen was *still* the schoolmaster.⁹

¹ *Op. cit.*, 1, 181.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

³ Brodhead, *op. cit.*, 1, 229-3.

⁴ O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, 1, 142.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 141 (chapter heading).

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

⁸ Dunshee, *op. cit.* (1st ed.), p. 26-9.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29-30. Italics not in original.

The reader will note how helpful for Mr. Dunshee's purpose are the words "still the," introduced by him into the last sentence taken from O'Callaghan.

Each one will judge for himself how successful has been this tracing of the genesis of Mr. Dunshee's words. But whatever may be the verdict on that point, the fact remains that there are no such original official lists known, and that every particle of known evidence, connecting or tending to connect Adam Roelantsen with the school on Manhattan (except certain documents that establish the fact of his presence on Manhattan from June, 1638), is included in the declaration quoted and in the record of his certification at Amsterdam given above.¹

Before the certification record was known, it was an easy, if not very compelling inference, that Roelantsen, who was schoolmaster in 1638, had held that position from the time of his coming, which was generally agreed to have been in 1633. Valentine,² who wrote much on Dutch affairs, frankly restricts our knowledge of the beginning of Roelantsen's career to what can be gained, directly and by inference, from the declaration above quoted. And Pratt,³ in the *Annals of Public Education in New York*, can give no further evidence. But the writers on educational history have preferred to follow Dunshee, possibly feeling that there was no escape from such explicit references to original official lists.

With this preliminary discussion over, let us now take up our evidence, the certificate record of August 4, 1637, and the declaration of October 13, 1638, and see what is contained explicitly or implicitly in them:

1. Adam Roelantsen had come to Manhattan as early as 1633: for what purpose and with what business we do not know.
2. At some time after the 1633 episode and before August 4, 1637, he returned to Holland.⁴
3. On August 4, 1637, "Rolands" was examined by the committee of the classis and duly authorized to teach for the West India Company in New Netherland.
4. At some time after August 4, 1637, and before June 10, 1638 (using the law court records above referred to), he left Holland, arrived in Manhattan, and began his teaching career.

Postponing the consideration of some other points frequently mentioned in this connection, let us now endeavor to fix more exactly the date of Roelantsen's arrival at Fort Amsterdam.

¹ Mr. A. J. F. van Laer, the present archivist of the New York State Library, agrees with the writer that "There are no original lists of officers and servants of the West India Co. for 1633 and 1638 in existence," and expressly justifies him in using the sentence above to which this footnote is given.

² Corporation manual, 1863, p. 339

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 4.

⁴ Trips to Holland were common enough; Roelantsen seems to have taken two such trips in after years (1646 and 1650).

Besides the court record of June 10, 1638, and the declaration of October 13, 1638, we have another record giving an agreement to which Adam Roelantsen was a party and bearing the date of January 27, 1638. The year 1638 of this date must be rejected in favor of 1639 for the following reasons. The record of this agreement is in an original and bound volume containing the register of the provincial secretary from the beginning of Kieft's administration (March, 1638), where it appears between instruments of December, 1638, and February, 1639. Moreover, the nature of the subject matter of this agreement under discussion is such as must follow the lawsuit of June 10, 1638; which date is in its turn similarly determined by conditions like those urged above. With this instrument put into its proper place of January 27, 1639, we are ready to consider a certain probable line of evidence as to the more exact date of Roelantsen's second appearance in New Netherland.

When we recall that the number of vessels sailing between Holland and Fort Amsterdam during these years was small, and that the records, beginning with Kieft's administration, are fairly continuous, we are authorized to ask when Roelantsen could probably have reached Fort Amsterdam after his certification on August 4, 1637. Mr. van Laer, in the letter already referred to, says that Roelantsen "sailed probably either in den *Harink* (*Herring*) with Kieft, or else in den *Dolphijs* (*Dolphin*); both these vessels sailed from the Texel in September, 1637, and arrived at New Amsterdam in the spring of 1638." Mr. van Laer elsewhere¹ gives the date on which the *Harink* arrived as March 28, 1638,² and in the letter quoted says "presumably the vessels kept together all the way over." We thus seem authorized to fix the most probable date when Adam Roelantsen opened his school in New Amsterdam at a time slightly after March 28, 1638.

Certain other interesting suggestions have been advanced by various writers as to the beginning of schools on Manhattan. Some have thought it probable that either Bastiaen Jansz. Krol or Jan Huygen, comforters of the sick in 1626, taught a parish school prior to Roelantsen's coming; others that the 1637 certification of Roelantsen was merely the conforming, on his part, to some newly made ecclesiastical machinery, and that therefore we are free to suppose that he had then been teaching on Manhattan since 1633; and still others, not able to give name and date, nevertheless say that an elementary school in New Netherland prior to 1638 is so inherently probable that we must believe that such a school was established, even though we can not point to the specific documentary proof therefor.

Did Bastiaen Jansz. Krol teach school in connection with his duties as *kranken-besoeker*? Of course, properly speaking, it is obligatory

¹ Van Rensselaer-Bowier MSS., p. 316.

² See also O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, I, 180.

on those who suggest Krol's name in connection with the schoolroom to adduce some evidence in support of such a suggestion. So far no specific evidence has been brought forward; but there has been a frequent tendency to fall back upon some supposed custom and ask whether the comforters of the sick did not customarily teach school, and whether the mere presence on Manhattan of a *kranken-besoecker*—no other schoolmaster being at hand—does not warrant the presumption that the *kranken-besoecker* did conduct a parish school. It has, indeed, sometimes been stated that the instructions of *kranken-besoecker* actually included the duty of holding school. On the last point, however, the evidence is directly contradictory. In the Ecclesiastical Records (pp. 96-97) is found a "letter of instructions for *siecken-troosters* (another name for *kranken-besoecker*) going to the East or West Indies, etc." drawn up in 1636 by the Classis of Amsterdam, which gives in accessible form the duties of the *kranken-besoecker*. Even a casual reading of this will show that no school-keeping was contemplated in these instructions. But more important to our point is the fact that the identical instructions given to Bastiaen Jansz. Krol himself by the consistory of Amsterdam, December 7, 1623, are now available. Before we present them to the reader, however, it may be proper to say a word about such instructions, and the connection of the Amsterdam consistory with them. Dr. A. Eekhof has published (1910) a sketch of the life and work of Bastiaen Jansz. Krol in which he gives such source selections from the minutes of the consistory of Amsterdam as show the work of the consistory in sending out ministers, *kranken-besoekers*, and schoolmasters. The selections show in detail what we have already known in general, that in the first part of the seventeenth century it was the consistory of Amsterdam that exercised immediate ecclesiastical control over the East and West India church affairs. Later the Classis of Amsterdam assumed and directed this work. Among the data presented in Dr. Eekhof's book is an abstract of the "Copie-Boek" of the consistory from 1589 to 1635, in which is included, among other things, a list of the instructions given to the several men sent out under the auspices of the consistory. To give the reader some idea of the acts of the consistory, we here present in shortened form a portion of one page (viii) of the abstract:

23 Dec. 1610. D. Casparus Couradi Wiltons was sent with instructions as minister to the East Indies.

23 Dec. 1610. Willem Van Langenhaven was sent with instructions as schoolmaster to the East Indies.

31 March, 1611. Gillie Hendriexsz was sent as schoolmaster to the East Indies.

[Undated.] A letter about certain disputed questions.

8 Dec. 1611. Copy of instructions for Josia Bax as *sieckentrooster* to the East Indies. The same for Abraham Van Loo (with power to baptize).

8 Dec. 1611. Copy of instructions for Lubbert Claesz as schoolmaster to the East Indies.

3 July, 1612. Copy of instructions for Meynart Assueri as kranken-besoecker to Guinea with authority to baptize.

It is evident from this abstract that the instructions not only differentiated the general activities of minister, kranken-besoecker, and schoolmaster from each other, but even went into closer details, such as to say, for instance, whether the kranken-besoecker was also authorized to baptize. Under these circumstances we feel warranted in concluding that the presumption is against Krol's keeping school, unless he were specifically authorized so to do. That the reader may judge for himself whether Krol's instructions included school-keeping, we present herewith a translation of them as they appear in Dr. Eekhof's book:

7 Dec. 1623. Copy of instructions for Pieter Bonnissen, who will journey to the East Indies as a kranken-besoecker. An instruction of the same content has been handed to Bastiaen Jansz. Krol. It reads, word for word, as follows:

As it has been found needful and edifying that on board the ships sailing to the West Indies there be appointed persons who may read from God's holy word and from books of the reformed ministry something good for the edification [of the people], who may privately exhort the people to salvation, may instruct in their illness those who fall sick on shipboard, and may comfort them. So by the consistory of this city, who are charged thereto by the classis, with the consent and approbation of the noble lords, directors of the West India Company, is the bearer of these presents, named Pieter Bonnissen, appointed as kranken-besoecker to the end aforesaid. And that the same therefore may be recognized by everyone, and that he may know how he shall have to behave himself in this service, these credentials are given him in the letter of instruction. The points according to which he shall have to regulate himself in this service are the following:

First, he shall every morning and evening, also before and after dinner, make the customary prayers.

Second, he shall, when needed and required, zealously instruct and comfort all sick.

Third, he shall privately admonish with God's word all who desire such admonition or who may need it.

Fourth, he shall at the appointed times read from God's word or from the books of the reformed ministry some chapters or a sermon.

All of which things the aforesaid Pieter Bonnissz. shall fulfil diligently and in the most edifying manner, and he shall discharge these duties in a Christian and God-fearing manner, so that he may edify the people both by word and manner without assuming to himself anything else that belongs to the preaching office under any pretext whatsoever. Thus done in the meeting of the consistory at Amsterdam; in witness thereof the seal is affixed and this subscribed by us the 7th December, 1623, in the name and by the authority of all:

Rudolphus Petri, Praeses.
Jacobus Triglandus, Scriba.
D. van den Emden, Elder.¹

¹ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, pp. x, xi.

And with the same instructions was Bastiaen Jansz. sent to the West Indies, 7 December, 1623. As Bastiaen Jansen has fallen sick, so is Gerryt Pieterz sent in his place. With these same instructions did Bastiaen Jansz., after recovered health, journey to the West Indies, the 25th of January, 1624.¹

It is evident that school-keeping was not included in Krol's instructions; and from what we have already seen, it is a fair conclusion that if he had been expected to keep school he would have been so instructed. To complete the discussion we may include two or three other references. In 1634 Krol was examined before a notary at Amsterdam. The first question and answer in this examination are pertinent here.

In what capacity and for how long was he in the service of the West India Company in New Netherland?

He states that he set out as comforter of the sick and made a voyage and stay of 7½ months in that country. He went out for the second time in the same capacity, and after he had been away about 15 months, he was appointed to the directorship at Fort Orange [Albany] on the North River, and held the same for three years. The third time he went out again to the best of his recollection, served again for about two years. After which he was elected Director general of New Netherland at Fort Amsterdam on the Island of Manhates * * * and served in this office 13 months.²

Clearly then there could be no school-keeping by Krol on Manhattan unless during the "stay of 7½ months" in 1624,³ and the 15 months in 1625-6.⁴ But we can hardly suppose that there was much need of a school on Manhattan at either time. The first serious attempt at colonization in New Netherland (1623) had brought about 30 families from Holland and scattered them over a wide area; 18 families were sent to Fort Orange (Albany), some settled Wallabout, others were stationed at the South River, "two families and six men" went to the Connecticut River, and eight men were left at Manhattan.⁵ Evidently there was no school during the "stay of 7½ months" (1624). In 1625 "six entire families" and other settlers were sent, but it was not until after Krol had been sent to Fort Orange that Fort Amsterdam was built and the 18 families were brought down from Fort Orange to Manhattan. So that it seems impossible that Krol could have done any teaching during his second stay on Manhattan. Taking into joint consideration the presumption that Krol would not teach since he was not so authorized, and the fact that there could not have been any demand for teaching on Manhattan during his service as *kranken-besoecker*, we seem authorized to dismiss as too baseless for serious consideration any thought of Krol's serving as schoolmaster.

¹ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, p. xii.

² Van Rensselaer-Bowier MSS., p. 302; cf. Eekhof, *op. cit.*, p. xxvi.

³ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, p. xxiii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35 ff.

⁵ Brodhead, *op. cit.*, I, 150 ff.

As for Jan Huygen, we read as follows in the same consistory minutes:

2 April, 1626. Jan Huygen having been an elder in Cleve, and by the same [certain before-mentioned men] examined and judged capable, shall also be recommended and proposed to sail to the West Indies as a *siecken-trooster*.¹

No detailed instructions are given, but we are authorized to suppose that the customary instructions held in this case, and these, as we have seen, contained no reference to school-keeping. Beyond this, little is known of Huygen. He and Krol are mentioned together in 1626 as "comforters of the sick, who, whilst waiting a clergyman, read to the communionally there on Sundays from texts of the Scripture, with notes and comment."²

Dr. Michaelius, in his well-known letter (11 Aug., 1628), refers to "the storekeeper of the company, Jan Huygen," in such connection as to make it practically certain that the *kranken-besoecker* had by that time become "the storekeeper of the company." It would seem improbable, therefore, both from the contrary presumption, as with Krol, and from this direct evidence of another occupation, that Huygen taught school during his service as *siecken-trooster* on Manhattan.

But may it not be that Adam Roelantsen really began to teach on Manhattan in 1633 and only went for certification to Holland in 1637, because of the new regulations promulgated the preceding year? To this plausible-sounding question a sufficient answer would seem to be that, presumptively, no man teaches first and is certificated afterwards, and that accordingly those who wish to claim that Roelantsen taught before he was certificated should present some positive evidence to that effect. Moreover, the mere presence in New Netherland of Roelantsen in 1633 is far from being a positive indication that he had charge of the school. A more convincing answer, however, to the question is found in the records of the consistory of Amsterdam: We have seen enough from the "Copie-Boek" of this consistory to show that there existed in Amsterdam prior to 1636 a competently authorized body to examine and send forth ministers, *kranken-besoeckers*, and schoolmasters. We have seen further that this body did send to New Netherland two *kranken-besoeckers* and one minister,³ and, still further, that it kept a list of the men authorized by it to fill these various positions. If, then, Roelantsen or any one else taught school in New Netherland in an official capacity during the period under consideration, we ought to find a record of it either in the minutes of the consistory or in those of the *classis*. In the case of the consistory, Dr. Eekhof's book furnishes us a list cover-

¹ Eekhof, *op. cit.*, p. xxiii.

² Jameson, *Narratives of New Netherland*, p. 83. Cf. Eekhof, p. 24.

³ Dr. Michaelius; see *Ecol. Rec.*, pp. 54, 66; Eekhof, *op. cit.*, p. xxiv.

ing the period from 1589 to 1635, while the Ecclesiastical Records give the American data of the classis from 1632. But no reference is made in either to any schoolmaster for New Netherland prior to the certification of Roelantsen in 1637. We seem thus authorized to say with some considerable degree of certainty that there was no official schoolmaster in New Netherland prior to the date already assigned in the first part of this chapter for the beginning of Adam Roelantsen's term of service.

But, after all, is not the existence of a school in New Netherland prior to 1638 so inherently probable as to force us to believe that existence, even though no specific data can be adduced to show its actual presence? While this question is in a way more vague than either of the preceding two, there is much to commend it. In favor of the suggestion can be urged the general interest of the Dutch in education, shown, for example, by the schoolmasters we saw above sent to the East Indies in 1611. Moreover, the clause in the charter of freedoms and exemptions of 1629, while having no legal force on Manhattan, still seems to indicate that the West India Company was interested in schools; and it would seem a peculiar inconsistency for the company to demand of subordinate colony makers more than it was willing to do itself. Furthermore, there were quite possibly at least 50 children about Fort Amsterdam for some years prior to 1638. Finally, a certain contemporaneous document seems to demand the actual presence of a school. A marriage contract drawn up "in New Netherland on the Island of Manhates [sic] and at Fort Amsterdam, the last of April anno 1632," referring to "resel [Rachel] Vienje and Jan Vienje, both minor children" of the bride by a former marriage, states that the contracting parties agree "to clothe and rear the above-named children as children ought to be, to keep them at school, to teach them a trade as good parents ought to do."¹ Now, would these people promise to keep their children at school if there were no schools available? On the other hand, we have to face an absolute absence of evidence as to any particular school or schoolmaster, and further, as we have seen, there are good grounds for concluding that no official schoolmaster was licensed prior to 1637. We might surmise that there was a private school, but this would be mere surmise; there is no evidence for it.

In view of all the facts now known concerning the question of the date of the first school in Netherland we seem forced to make the following conclusions:

1. The earliest known schoolmaster in New Netherland was Adam Roelantsen.

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., 1, 6. The provisions of this marriage contract may, however, have been set down rather as a matter of form, in imitation of the Holland custom.

2. He was licensed to teach August 4, 1637, and began his school in Manhattan probably not earlier than April 1, 1638.

3. It is improbable that there was any official schoolmaster licensed for New Netherland prior to August 4, 1637, and it is accordingly improbable that there was any official school prior to the one opened in 1638.

4. It is improbable that either Bastenaen Jansz. Krol or Jan Huygen ever taught in Manhattan.

5. It is impossible either to affirm or deny that there was a private school on Manhattan prior to 1638.

6. The year 1633 has no known or even probable significance in the school history of New Netherland.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MASTERS OF THE OFFICIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF NEW AMSTERDAM.¹

In spite of the excellent study made by Mr. Dunshee of the public elementary school of New Amsterdam, many points in the history of the school yet remain unsettled. The terms of service of the successive masters, for example, are almost as difficult to fix as was the date of the first school. In fact, when we consider on the one hand the material that has come to light since Mr. Dunshee wrote, and on the other the recklessness of statement found in some of his successors, it is not too much to say that most of the conclusions hitherto reached regarding the history of this school during the Dutch period demand close scrutiny. In particular the reputation of all the schoolmasters of New Amsterdam has suffered through an unwarranted emphasis upon the shortcomings of one. The recent publication of the new material in the Ecclesiastical Records gives opportunity for a reconsideration of the whole subject.

Of Adam Roelantsen's service in the schoolroom next to nothing is known. What salary he received, and from what source it came, can only be surmised from facts to be brought out in connection with his successors. In fact, practically nothing can be said directly of his school keeping. As to his private life more is known. He was married at least twice. His first wife was, at the time of her marriage with Roelantsen, a widow with a daughter. The first reference to Roelantsen recorded in this country (June 10, 1638) is of a suit brought by his stepdaughter's husband, Cors Pietersen, for the balance of her patrimony. The court "decided that fl. 12. 10 stivers are still due to Cors Pietersen and no more."² This lawsuit is the first of many in which Adam figured, not usually to his credit. The following August (19th and 26th) he was engaged in one of the most tangled slander suits that could be imagined. He had, it seemed, stated in some quarrel that "he did not care about the country and the council." This being publicly reported, he brought suit for slander against the reporter, but unsuccessfully. Then he brought suit against three others, apparently for testifying against him. Two

¹ For convenience sake we shall call the company's settlement on Manhattan by its final name of New Amsterdam, although not until 1662 was it officially so denoted.

² N. Y. Col. MSS., iv., 11.

of the defendants in turn brought suit against him. In one of the latter suits he admitted "in the presence of the court that he hath nothing to say against the pliff. and knows and esteems him to be an honest man." In another, the parties were "condemned each to pay 25 stivers to the poor." One of the men slandering him was similarly fined.¹ In another slander suit a little later a certain woman, named in the records "fair Aleeta," and Adam were "ordered to cease slandering one another on pain of being fined."² In a worse case, "after defendant had acknowledged that he knew nothing against the plaintiff's wife, and nevertheless had slandered her, he was condemned to pay fl. 2. 10 to the poor."³

Of all Roelantsen's suits probably that for washing has excited most comment:

On Thursday being the 20th of September (1640), Adam Roelantsen, plaintiff against Gilles de Voocht, defendant, for a bill for washing. Plaintiff demands payment for washing defendant's linen. Defendant says the only objection he offers to the payment for washing is that the year is not yet expired.

Ordered plaintiff to fulfill the contract, and at the expiration of the time to demand payment.⁴

So far as at present appears, the record here given tells all that is known of this matter. There is no evidence in this that the schoolmaster had given up the public school to run a public laundry.

In 1642 Roelantsen engaged—

Ian Teunissen to build a house thirty feet long, eighteen feet wide, with an eight-foot story under the beams, the end cross beams resting on corbels, all hewn square, the house enclosed all around with clapboards, and covered with a good reed roof such as shall be proper, a tight ceiling of clapboards, three square windows, two outer doors, one portal, one pantry, one bedstead, a winding staircase to ascend to the garret; the part of the chimney that projects above (the house) to be of wood and the chimney to be provided with a mantel piece; a passage way three feet-wide, with a partition:

Which house aforesaid he, Ian Teunissen, promises to deliver built and properly covered in the aforesaid form on the first of August for the sum of three hundred and fifty carolus guilders, Hollands, payable by Adam Roelantsen one-half when the lumber belonging to the above-mentioned house shall be brought on the ground where the house is to stand; the other half when the house shall be properly completed.⁵

Apparently the house was delivered on time, for we find Roelantsen selling on August 8 what may well have been his old house. This house, "only the building and not the grounds," together with "half the vegetables which are growing at present" in the garden brought him 90 guilders.⁶ A year later (on August 7, 1643), in accordance with the newly adopted rule of the company, he patented what was probably the lot that he had hitherto occupied. The description of

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., iv, 17-18.

² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ii, 28.

this lot as given in the patent¹ and in a deed of sale² (December 2, 1646) is such as to allow the fixing of the probable site of Roelantsen's home.³ Since the Dutch schoolmaster of those times usually taught in his dwelling, as we shall later discuss, this has been taken to be the site of the earliest known school in Manhattan; and a tablet to mark the site has been placed (1910) on the Produce Exchange on Stone Street by the Schoolmasters' Club of New York.

How long Roelantsen taught in the New Amsterdam school is a question the difficulty of which far exceeds its importance. But as his leaving has been publicly fixed at 1639⁴ upon what seems to be insufficient data, an examination of the evidence becomes necessary. So far as appears, the only basis for the fixing of this 1639 date is a statement in O'Callaghan's History of New Netherland,⁵ that "Adam Roelantsen van Hamelwaerd, previously schoolmaster at New Amsterdam," settled at Rensselaerswyck (Albany) in 1639. The statement is made without substantiating footnotes other than a general prefatory remark that the list was "compiled from the books of monthly wages and other manuscripts." It contains a direct contradiction of the abundantly established fact that Adam Roelantsen was not van (from) Hamelwaerd, but from (van) Dockum.⁶ In no known instance is Roelantsen assigned to any other place than Dockum, which is widely separated from Hamelwaerd. It may be added that the known dates of the presence of Roelantsen in New Amsterdam made any settling in Rensselaerswyck improbable, and render his extended stay there impossible.⁷ The examination of the records to which O'Callaghan had access is of course the final means of deciding the accuracy of the statement in question. Fortunately this examination has been made, and by the masterly hand of Mr. van Laer, who prepared a list of settlers, similar to O'Callaghan's, for the Van Rensselaer-Bowier Manuscripts. In a letter⁸ to the writer he says: "I examined page by page all the account books, court records, and other papers for that period that have been preserved among the Rensselaerswyck Manuscripts, but found no Adam Roelantsen van Hamelwaerd mentioned * * *. I am confident that he (O'Callaghan) made a mistake."

Thus setting aside the 1639 date as unfounded, we ask for a more probable date of the termination of Roelantsen's teaching career.

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., G O, p. 86.

² *Ibid.*, II, 153.

³ See Innes, J. H., *New Amsterdam and Its People*, p. 63.

⁴ This date appears on a bronze tablet erected in 1883 in the school of the Reformed Dutch Church. See Dunabee, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, I, 438.

⁶ For instances see N. Y. Col. MSS., I, 20, 284; II, 7, 93; III, 72; IV, 17.

⁷ The known dates covering this period are Oct. 13, 1638 (N. Y. Col. MSS., I, 50); Jan. 13, 1639 (*ibid.*, IV, 20); Aug. 9, 1640 (*ibid.*, IV, 74); Sept. 20, 1640 (*ibid.*, IV, 77).

⁸ Dated Mar. 3, 1896.

The apparent successor to Roelantsen was Jan Stevensen. In a letter of September 2, 1648, D: Backerus wrote to the classis: "Master Jan Stevensen, who has served the company here as a faithful schoolmaster and reader for six or seven consecutive years * * * is now leaving for home."¹ Accepting this at its face value, for Stevensen's career is abundantly substantiated, we fix by simple subtraction the beginning of Stevensen's connection with the New Amsterdam school at 1641 or 1642. The spring of 1642 would give six and a half years for Stevensen's term, which fits sufficiently well with the Domine's "six or seven" years. Shall we take it for granted that Roelantsen served until his successor took up his work? Our knowledge of the period is so slight that any conclusion at all seems hazardous, though certain considerations help us. The four years' term of service that the spring of 1642 would give to Roelantsen carries with it some independent probability derived from similar service elsewhere. Annual appointments, on account of the long time of the passage to and from New Netherland, were naturally not satisfactory. The Van Rensselaers generally contracted for three years, sometimes four, and sometimes for six years.² The South River term was fixed for four years,³ and what little we know about the customs of the West India Company in this regard points also to four-year contracts. Thus a schoolmaster in 1646 was appointed by the company to Curaçao for four years;⁴ schoolmaster Vestensz at New Amsterdam was probably appointed for the same term;⁵ D: Backerus, appointed in 1642, and D: Selyns, in 1660, each had a contract term of four years.⁶ We may add that no contradiction to the four-year term is seen in Stevensen's "six or seven consecutive years," since the formal request that D: Backerus and others made for dismissal after the contract time had been fulfilled shows that service was not to stop, ipso facto, at the expiration of the term agreed upon.⁷

Accepting then, tentatively, four years as the probable term of service in the company's contracts, we get, by counting forward the full term from the beginning of Roelantsen's work as previously determined, the spring of 1642 as the close of his teaching career. Counting backward six and a half years ("six or seven") from the close of Stevensen's service (September, 1648), we get as the beginning of his career the spring of 1642. That these two dates, fixed by independent lines of reasoning, should coincide, carries with it some force of prob-

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 237.

² Van Rensselaer-Bowler MSS., pp. 176, 179, 186, 188, 250, 256, 258, 675, 677, 678, 679; Eccl. Rec., p. 309.

³ O'Callaghan, *Laws of New Netherland*, p. 277.

⁴ John Walraven; he was also and primarily *alouken-trooster*, *voorzitter* and *voorsanger*. See Eccl. Rec., pp. 202, 212, 281.

⁵ Eccl. Rec., pp. 271, 228, 331, 333; N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 122-123.

⁶ Eccl. Rec., pp. 235, 540.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 222, 226, 255, 259, 328, 331, 336, 337, 540.

ability. It may be added that nothing in the record prevents the acceptance of this date. Roelantsen was apparently in the Province until some years afterwards.¹

Furthermore, the records are sufficiently full to give some weight to an *argumentum e silentio* that the school once begun was not allowed to lapse. This consideration is strengthened by recorded solicitude on account of the absence of schools in the West India Company's colony of Brazil, both before and after the period in question, but with no such solicitude for New Netherland.²

Having now before us, first, the unsatisfactoriness of O'Callaghan's 1639 date as the close of Roelantsen's connection with the New Amsterdam school; second, the proof that Stevensen began his career about the spring of 1642; third, the presumption that the school was kept up continuously; fourth, the apparently continuous presence of Roelantsen in New Amsterdam; and fifth, a reasonable probability that the West India Company's contract term was four years, we conclude after this somewhat lengthy discussion that the probabilities point, perhaps not strongly but still unmistakably, to the spring of 1642 as the close of Roelantsen's service and the beginning of Stevensen's.

As Adam Roelantsen is the first and best known of these schoolmasters, it may be interesting to trace his career after he gave up the school. O'Callaghan states in the Register of New Netherland (p. 31) that Roelantsen was weighmaster in New Amsterdam in 1643. But Mr. Van Laer thinks there is no evidence to support the statement.³ In 1646, while Roelantsen was away in Holland, his wife died, leaving several children. The director and council accordingly appointed "the four nearest neighbors" (among them "Jan Stevensen, schoolmaster") "curators over the children and property" "until the arrival of the father or some news of him."⁴ When Roelantsen came, he was straightway arrested on charges of violating the customs law and for his old failing of slander,⁵ this time uttered in Amsterdam. From both charges he seems to have been cleared, only, however, to be quod immediately for the passage over for himself and his son. But in this the plaintiff was at fault, for the evidence showed "that Skipper Hays had agreed at Amsterdam with Adam Roelantsen that he should be allowed his board and the freight of his chest on condition that he would perform a seaman's work on shipboard." While the chief boatswain himself declared "that the skipper said on board the ship that he did not require any

¹ Dates additional to those already given are June 20, 1641 (N. Y. Col. MSS., iv, 97); July 31, 1641 (*ibid.*, i, 264); Aug. 8, 1641 (*ibid.*, iv, 98); Feb. 7, 1642 (*ibid.*, ii, 7); Aug. 8, 1642 (*ibid.*, ii, 26), etc.

² 1638, N. Y. Col. Doc., i, 106; 1643, Eccl. Rec., p. 170-1; 1646, *ibid.*, p. 198

³ Private letter to the author, Mar. 3, 1900.

⁴ N. Y. Col. MSS., ii, 248.

⁵ *ibid.*, iv, 264.

board money from Adam's son, because he said the prayers." The pronoun is a bit puzzling, but probably it was the son who "said the prayers."

In December, 1646, Roelantsen was arrested for an attempt "forcibly to violate Harck Sybaltzen's wife in her own house." After hearing the evidence the court decided that such conduct could not "be tolerated or suffered in a country where justice is wont to be maintained," and condemned "the above-named Adam Roelantsen to be taken to the place where justice is usually executed and there to be scourged with rods and then to be banished from the country as an example to others." However, "in consideration that the culprit is burdened with four motherless children and the cold winter is at hand, the honorable director and council have postponed the execution to a more convenient occasion, when the criminal must depart."²

For some reason the sentence was never executed. Perhaps the confusion at the end of Kieft's administration, the quarrel of Kieft with Dr. Bogardus, and the change in the administration to Stuyvesant (May 11, 1647) so occupied public attention that Roelantsen was forgotten. Or possibly—to use a new name for an old thing—Roelantsen had a "pull" of some sort with the new director general, for within a very few weeks after Stuyvesant's arrival we find the director and council (June 14) solemnly appointing this justly condemned malefactor to assist as provost in the administration of justice.³

Two months later the new provost's superior officer stationed him at the door of the tavern to keep watch. But the crowd inside proving too inviting, Roelantsen joined them. His superior called out: "What are you doing here? Why do you not watch at the door?" Thereupon Adam answered, there was nothing to watch. Upon which his superior said, 'You are my servant, you must wait at the door;' and at the same time struck said Roelantsen twice with the back of his hand, and cried, 'Throw the blackguard out of doors.' Thereupon the above-named Adam Roelantsen was thrown out of doors."⁴

It is 1653 before anything else exciting is told of Roelantsen. In that year it was charged that Stoffel Elzers "had called Adam Roelantsen, the woodcutter, from his work in the church, outside of the fort and then attacked and beaten him on the public street."⁵ Apparently; however, the court took the view that the report had been exaggerated and released Elzers on his own recognizance. A month later Roelantsen was sued on a bill for some pork. "Defend-

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., iv, 275.

² *Ibid.*, iv, 277.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ii, 164.

⁵ Rec. of N. A., i, 54.

ant admits having received the bacon and says he has sold it to Luycas Eldersen, who refuses to pay for it, as bad." The court decided against Roelantsen; thereupon he in turn sued Eldersen and recovered damages.

Thus, as woodcutter and dealer in old meat, ends the career of the first schoolmaster in New Netherland, the worst and, shall we say, therefore the most discussed of all the Dutch masters; the one who has most unjustly been taken as typical of all. It is, moreover, but fair to the Dutch schoolmasters to recall that only the shortcoming of slander is to be charged against Roelantsen during his service as schoolmaster. He had been four years out of the schoolroom when his worst crime was committed.

The beginning of Jan Stevensen's connection with the New Amsterdam school we have already fixed with some probability as in the spring of 1642. A few scattered references to his life in New Netherland are found in the records. On July 2, 1643, "Jan Stevensen, schoolmaster," patented a lot of land "north of Fort Amsterdam."¹ Later in the same year "Mr. Jan Stevensen" had his son Jan baptized.² One rather interesting reference shows the source of Stevensen's salary. In 1647 "Jan Stevensen, from Hærlern, schoolmaster here," gave power of attorney to Luycas Smith to collect for him "from the Honorable Directors of the Incorporated West Indian Company in Amsterdam the sum of seven hundred and forty-seven guilders, two stivers, twelve pennies due him Jan Stevensen, by balance and settlement of his account according to the Book of Monthly Wages No. F. folio 34, earned from their honors in New Netherland."³ A more definite statement that Stevensen received a salary from the company is contained in a letter from D^r Backerus to the classis (Sept. 2, 1648): "Master Jan Stevensen now leaving for home has been informed by the Directors and Council that he must pay his own fare. If this is so understood in Holland, then the poor man will retain but little of his salary; for the fare for his passage would swallow up most of it. Considering this fact, will not your Reverences please to assist him with the Directors that he may be exempted from this hardship."⁴ While the foregoing tells us only of the fact of a salary from the company, we have other information bearing on the amount probably received. On December 15, 1644, there was presented by a commission of the XIX a "Report and Advice on the Condition of New Netherland—how the decay there can be prevented, etc." This included among much else an "estimate of the expense which the company would have to bear in New Netherland for the following persons to be rationed at their own expense."

¹ Rec. of N. A., 1, 62.

² N. Y. Gen. and Blo. Soc. Coll., II, 16.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 267.

⁴ N. Y. Col. MSS., G G, 70.

⁵ N. Y. Col. MSS., II, 169.

This list comprises 69 persons at a total expense of 20,040 florins. Among other officers are:

1 Director, at fl. 250 per month	fl. 3,000
1 Clergyman, at fl. 120 per month	1,440
1 Schoolmaster, precentor, and sexton, at fl. 30	360
40 soldiers, at fl. 13 each	6,240

"These [69] officers and servants would be sufficient for the business; and carpenters, masons, smiths, and such like ought all to be discharged."¹ Arranging these salaries in order of size, the schoolmaster, with his 360 florins, stands ninth from the greatest; while the thirty-fifth man (the median) was to get 156 florins. The average of the whole was 290 florins. This showing for the schoolmaster, even ignoring tuition fees, is probably as good as one could reasonably expect.

Apparently this "estimate of expenses" was prepared with the intent of saving as much as possible to the company. We do not know that the estimate was accepted. Quite possibly it was not. In that case Stevensen's salary would be possibly greater than 360 florins; and some other considerations support this suggestion. In 1646, when the classis was arranging for the company to support a schoolmaster at Curaçao, the directors replied relative to Walraven, the candidate proposed, that "if he wished to journey thither as siecken-trooster and voorlezer and voorsanger in the church, that they would accept him as such. They would then consent also to maintain a school, and would give for this 36 florins per month."² Of the four offices here named Stevensen filled three and probably all four, besides acting as sexton. Apparently then his salary would be equally great. A later New Amsterdam schoolmaster, Harmanus van Hobocken, was in 1655 given 35 guilders per month and 100 guilders per year board money, or 520 florins all told.³ We thus feel safe in supposing that Stevensen's salary was somewhere between these extremes—that is, more than fl. 360 and less than fl. 520 a year; and rather probably was the same as Walraven's, i. e., fl. 432 a year.

In addition to the salary allowed by the company, tuition money was almost certainly paid by the pupils. This we infer from the Holland custom, and from the existence of a scale of tuition charges in the case of one of Stevensen's successors, Evert Pietersen;⁴ while, in addition, a reference in the case of Schoolmaster Hobocken can hardly be otherwise interpreted.⁵ Further indication is seen in the

¹ N. Y. Col Dec., I, 139-156.

² Eccl. Rec., p. 201-2.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 236-7. See also Vestensi's salary, p. 64, and note 4.

⁴ Minutes of the Orphan Masters, II, 115.

⁵ Records of N. A., II, 86.

fact that the above-named siecken-trooster at Curaçao, being prevented from keeping school, regretted the loss of his school fees, although, as we saw, his salary was definite.¹ With tuition fees and a definite salary, Stevensen's income would be better both absolutely and relatively than was stated in the comparison given above.

The close of Stevensen's connection with the school is fixed rather definitely. On August 31, 1648, power of attorney was given to "Jan Stevensen, schoolmaster."² Three days later Dr. Backerus wrote a letter (already several times quoted) to the classis in which he refers to "the bearer hereof Master Jan Stevensen." Elsewhere in the letter he says Stevensen is "now leaving for home" and "it will be necessary * * * to send over * * * a good schoolmaster."³ These statements, taken in connection with the assertion of his "six or seven years" continuous service and corroborated by the known references to "Jan Stevensen, schoolmaster," make it certain that Stevensen began to teach about 1642 and taught continuously until about September 2, 1648.

A remark made in 1647 by Stuyvesant about the school has so often been forced to convey an erroneous impression that it seems proper to give not only the remark but also the situation in which it was uttered. Just five months after Stuyvesant arrived,⁴ he presented, in an effort to reform various abuses, certain "propositions to the members in council assembled," among which was the remark in point:

Fifthly. Whereas, for want of a proper place, no school has been kept for three months, by which the youth here run wild, it is asked where school can be kept, in order that the youth may be kept from the street and be accustomed to discipline.⁵

This has been interpreted by one to mean that "public education was entirely suspended;" and by another that schools were not "very much in evidence." Although the school in New Amsterdam did ordinarily run 12 months in the year, a cessation of 3 months hardly warrants the judgments passed above. But so prone are some writers of history to exaggeration by spectacular emphasis that we may expect again and again to see Stuyvesant's solicitude for proper schools taken as proof of Dutch indifference to education.

The question of the schoolhouse here introduced may properly be considered a little further. In answer to Stuyvesant it was "decreed by the council, as the point particularly interests commonalty, to propose it to the nine Tribunes, so that the best means may be employed at the smallest expense to the inhabitants." Accordingly, Stuyvesant a few days later addressed a communication "to the

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 202, 230.
² N. Y. Col. MSS., 41, 7.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 230.
⁴ Brodhead, op. cit., 1, 452.

⁵ N. Y. Col. MSS., 17, 349.

nine elected Tribunes," suggesting that they take steps regarding the fort, the church, and—

Third, not less important than the preceding matter is the erection of a new school and a schoolmaster's dwelling, for the convenience of the community and the proper education of children. We are willing to contribute privately and for the company a reasonable sum thereto and to help support this laudable work constantly; meanwhile, we shall in the near future give orders to provide a suitable place during the winter, either in the kitchen (combuys) of the Fiscale (prosecuting officer), which seems the most suitable place to me, or else some other place inspected by the church wardens.¹

Whether the church wardens arranged a better place than the Fiscale's kitchen, we do not know; but since the nine men did nothing, we may easily suppose that Stevensen did use a kitchen as his schoolroom for a short period toward the close of his career.

We note here a reference to the apparently universal Dutch custom of having one house for a school and the schoolmaster's dwelling. If we had no other knowledge than this document, we might not certainly conclude from the words here given that one house was intended; but other evidence on the point is ample. The word "new" used here in connection with this school might naturally be interpreted to imply that there had previously existed a building owned and set apart by the company as a school building. While the point is not without its difficulty, such an interpretation would probably not be justified.

Between the leaving of Stevensen, September 2, 1648, and the arrival of Willem Vestensz in the spring of 1650² there intervened a period of a year and a half which has been a good deal discussed in connection with the Dutch schools. The Great Remonstrance, signed July 28, 1649, treating of how New Netherland should be "relieved," said, among other things:

There should be a public school, provided with at least two good masters, so that first of all in so wild a country, where there are so many loose people, the youth may be well taught and brought up, not only in reading and writing, but also in the knowledge and fear of the Lord. As it is now, the school is kept very irregularly, one and another keeping it according to his pleasure and as long as he thinks proper.³

This remonstrance was especially directed against Stuyvesant's administration, and in it was brought forward everything derogatory of Stuyvesant and indicative of decay in New Netherland that the wit of the remonstrants could devise. We, therefore, scrutinize most closely its accusations, but we accept as understatement any admissions favorable to Stuyvesant that may be found therein. When, keeping this in mind, we consider that the complete suspension of the public school for any appreciable length of time

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., iv, 351 (Mr. Van Lear's translation).

² Narratives of New Netherland, p. 333.

³ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 123.

would have been a stronger indictment than the mere assertion of frequent change of teachers, we feel authorized to conclude that the school was not allowed to go long without some sort of teacher. That, however, the arrangement was not satisfactory to Stuyvesant any more than to the remonstrants is evident from his writing to the classis in August of 1649 that "we need a pious and diligent schoolmaster and precentor. A year has now passed since we were deprived of such help."¹

If this statement of Stuyvesant's had come from the remonstrants, and the words quoted above from the remonstrants had come from Stuyvesant, satisfactory harmonizing might have been impossible. But as the two statements stand, with the known motives of the writers, we must conclude that Stuyvesant did not mean to deny what the remonstrants clearly admit, namely, that some sort of school had been kept up practically the whole time, though with frequent change from one unsatisfactory teacher to another. The words "such help" give the key to Stuyvesant's meaning. There had been teachers, but they had not been "pious and diligent."

As said above, the Remonstrance was directed against Stuyvesant. Accordingly, in anticipation of its promulgation, Secretary Van Tienhoven was sent to Holland to defend the administration. In an extended reply occur these words, following a reference to the schoolhouse not as yet built:

Meanwhile, there is the place designated for a school, where school is kept by Jan Cornelissen. The other schoolmasters keep school in hired houses; so that the youth, considering the circumstances of the country, are not in want of schools.²

That Cornelissen, here referred to, was simply another of the temporary teachers we may accept without question. This reference to him is absolutely all that is known about him. There were then several Jan Cornelissens, just as there are now many John Smiths; but identification, in the one case as in the other, is difficult. One Jan Cornelissen was a bad man, and some have said that this was the schoolmaster. But, so far as appears, such imputations are purely gratuitous. Of other temporary teachers, we know nothing, unless Pieter van der Linde was one. As to this possibility, two pieces of evidence may be brought forward. In the Acts of the Deputies of about 1639, we learn that Pieter van der Linde asked to go as *siecken-trooster* to the West Indies. Having been heard, he was advised to exercise himself still further in reading and singing.³ Apparently he was discouraged by this answer and came to New Netherland in a different capacity. That he was well esteemed is

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 263.

² Narrative of New Netherland, 362. The translation here given is Mr. Van Leer's amending of Prof. Jameson's.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 122.

evident from the second reference, a council minute, which explains itself:

1648, October 26. At the meeting it was considered very necessary that another suitable person should be appointed [precentor] in place of Jan Stevensen. It was learned that, for the present, no more suitable person could be found on the Island of Manhattan to perform the duties of Reader, etc., than Pieter van der Linde. They have, therefore, appointed the said Pieter van der Linde at an annual salary of one hundred and fifty guilders, until another qualified person should be sent out from Holland.¹

The question whether the voorlezer and voorsanger was always also the schoolmaster must be answered in the negative.² But so usually were they all one and the same person that on this point alone we might be led to put Van der Linde among the list of schoolmasters. The difference, however, between the pay offered him and the usual schoolmaster's salary is so great as to leave the matter in grave doubt.

The schoolhouse of this period has been much discussed on account of a passage in the Remonstrance and Tienhoven's reply thereto. Says the Great Remonstrance:

The bowl has been going around a long time for the purpose of erecting a common school and it has been built with words, but as yet the first stone is not laid. Some materials only are provided. The money,³ nevertheless, given for the purpose has already found its way out and is mostly spent, or may even fall short, and for this purpose also no fund invested in real estate has ever been built up.⁴

To this Tienhoven replies:

Although the new school towards which the commonalty had contributed something, is not yet built, the Director has no management of the money, but the Church Wardens have, and the Director is busy in providing material.⁵

It appears from this that building the schoolhouse was not the company's function, but the commonalty's. This agrees with the action of the council already seen, in referring the building of the school to the tribunes of the people. Also, as there, we see that it is the church wardens who must look after such matters. They had charge of the temporalities of the church, including the schoolhouse (see pp. 76, 194).

In conclusion of this 1648-1650 period, it can only be said that there were several who served temporarily as schoolmaster, and among them was a Jan Cornelissen. Pieter van der Linde was possibly another. There was as yet no schoolhouse built. It seems, however, quite probable that the school was kept going continuously.

Willem Vestensz, of Haerlem, was secured after prolonged effort⁶ to take charge of the New Amsterdam School. He left Holland about April 20, 1650,⁷ so that he may be supposed to have begun teaching in the early summer of that year. He was reported as being "an

¹ Ecol. Rec., p. 242.

² For discussion of the point, see p. 120.

³ Narratives of N. Netherland, p. 337.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

⁵ For the details of the search see p. 73 ff.

⁶ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 129-3.

excellent God-fearing man;"¹ while the Lords Directors expressed the hope "that he may confirm the good character which he has borne here, and continue for a long time in the odification of the youths."² He was comforter of the sick, vóorsanger, and sexton, as well as schoolmaster.³ That he was voorlezer also may be taken as certain, although this office happens not to be mentioned specifically.

On the question of his salary as sexton there was some misunderstanding. Apparently Stuyvesant understood that a single salary was given for all of his various offices put together. Vestensz evidently felt otherwise, for he petitioned both in New Amsterdam and in Holland, both during and after his time of service, both in person and through the classis and the minister that he might receive "compensation for his office as sexton."⁴ We have no evidence, however, that he gained his point. He also complained of slow payments,⁵ and besides asked for "an increase of salary on account of his burdensome family."⁶ The classis feeling pity for him wrote the minister at New Amsterdam to intercede. The reply of D: Megapolensis (1655, March 18) indicates that Vestensz had not met the early expectations:

As to William Vestiens, who has been schoolmaster and sexton here, I could neither do much nor say much in his favor to the Council, because for some years past they were not satisfied or pleased with services. Thereupon when he asked for an increase of salary last year he received the answer that if the service did not suit him he might ask for his discharge. Only lately I have been before the Council on his account, and spoken about it, in consequence of your letter, but they told me that he had fulfilled his duties only so-so (taliter-qualiter) and that he did little enough for his salary.⁷

In discussing Roelantsen's term of service, the opinion was expressed that probably Vestensz had had a four-year contract and that explicit permission was necessary to give up an office even after the contract had expired. We have direct evidence on both points. That permission to resign was necessary is clear, since on January 26, 1655, Vestensz asked of the council that "he might be favored with his dismission, as he had completed his service."⁸ His request, however, was not granted till March 23, when we find it stated he had "earnestly and repeatedly sought permission to return to the Fatherland."⁹ As to the four-year's term of service, the evidence unfortunately is neither abundant nor specific. That there was some specifically stipulated term of service is evident from the statement that "he had completed his service." Every such specific term of service anywhere in New Netherland, so far as noted, was for an integral and not for a fractional number of years. Was, then, Vestensz's term for

¹ Ecol. Rec., p. 265.

² N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 123.

³ Ecol. Rec., pp. 265, 306, 333.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 306, 325, 331, 335, 335.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 334.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

⁸ Council Minutes. See Rumsbee, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

three, for four, or for five years? It could not have been for as many as five years, since his service which began after April, 1650, had been completed by January of 1655.¹ As between three and four years, we can only say that there is not the slightest hint that points to three years, while several references fit well with four years. At the end of four-years' service Vestensz wrote to the classis asking to be transferred,² and requested of the director general and council an increase of salary,³ and wrote also to the classis for its help with regard to this request. Thus with a definitely specified term of service, of almost certainly an integral number of years, with proof that this could not be as much as five years in length, with no hint in rather full records that it ended at three years, we feel warranted in accepting the pointings of the references quoted, and in fixing accordingly the contract term of Vestensz as probably one of four years.

The salary received by Vestensz was 35 guilders per month for 12 months, together with 100 guilders per year board money.⁴ It was during his term of service that New Amsterdam became a city and promised, when the excise was turned over to it, that it would support "one of the ministers, one precentor, being at the same time a schoolmaster, one dogwhipper." The burgomasters and schepens did not keep the promise so made, and there resulted a prolonged quarrel with Stuyvesant.⁵ During the controversy the classis received a letter from Vestensz "in which he complained of slow payment."⁶

It only remains to conclude that while Vestensz was probably a "God-fearing man," he was not very capable as a schoolmaster. We saw above that he "fulfilled his duties only so-so (taliter-qualiter), and that he did little enough for his salary." That Vestensz in asking for his discharge did not wish to change his work, but his location, appears from the record that "William Vestensz returning home from New Netherland * * * asks that he may be sent in the same capacity to the East Indies."⁷ Six months later he obtained his request.

The date of the severance of Vestensz's connection with the New Amsterdam school and the entrance of his successor is shown in the following council minute:

1655, March 23. Whereas, William Vestiens, Chorister and Schoolmaster of this city, has earnestly and repeatedly sought permission to return to the Fatherland, his

¹ No service that the writer has examined commenced before the voyage out had begun; most began after the arrival in New Netherland. See Ecol. Rec., pp. 144, 209; Van Rensselaer-Bowler MSS., pp. 176, 186, 195, 230, 256, 288, 678, 678; O'Callaghan, Laws of New Netherland, p. 272.

² Ecol. Rec., pp. 326, 331.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 334, 336.

⁴ These figures are obtained from certain loose sheets of Dutch MSS. found in the New York Public Library (Moore-Sales collection, no. 1791, item 1223, p. 206). The history of these sheets is not known. They appear to have been torn from a MS. book, and have every appearance of being genuine productions of the period under consideration. Mr. Van Laer thinks they possibly belonged to Director Bontemantel.

⁵ For details of the controversy, see pp. 86 ff.

⁶ Ecol. Rec., p. 327.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 338, 381.

request is hereby granted. Therefore the Honorable gentlemen of the High Council, with the consent of the Rev. Consistory of this city, have appointed Harmanus Van Hoboeken as Chorister and Schoolmaster of this city at thirty-five guilders per month, and one hundred guilders extra per year for expenses. He promises to conduct himself diligently and faithfully according to the instructions given, or which may be given him hereafter.

Casius De Sille.

Done in Amsterdam, in New Netherland, March 23, 1655.¹

Of Van Hoboeken thus elected as master, we know little prior to the date named. That he had been in New Netherland for at least a short period previously is evident from the record February 12 (1655) of the baptism of his child Emmetje in New Amsterdam Reformed Dutch Church.²

It is to be noted that the director and council, on the civil side, and the consistory, on the ecclesiastical, are sufficient to place him in his position without apparent reference to Amsterdam, and that both Hoboeken and his predecessor are officially styled "voorsanger (chorister) and schoolmaster of this city." As we saw above, New Amsterdam had already been granted municipal powers. The school accordingly became officially the city school, and as such, should have been, according to Holland custom, under the control of the burgomasters and schepens, subject to certain advice from the consistory. But Stuyvesant³ was loath to yield his former prerogatives to the city and accordingly his council and not the city officials effected the change of masters. The salary stated here so definitely was not paid at the first with regularity. On August 19 following, Hoboeken sets forth that "he is burdened with a wife and four small children, without possessing any means for their sustenance," and so asks "that his salary may be paid to him monthly, or at least quarterly. He is told that "he may depend on the punctual payment of his salary." The next February he made request for further financial assistance, but with what success we do not know. In November, 1656, he asked the burgomasters and schepens for the "hall and the side room" of the Stad Huys "for the use of the school and as a dwelling, inasmuch as he, the petitioner, does not know how to manage for the proper accommodation of the children during winter, for they much require a place adapted for fire and to be warmed, for which their present tenement is wholly unfit." In reply he is told that "the hall and little room whereof the petitioner now requests for a school and a dwelling are not at present in repair, and are moreover needed for other purposes," but he is allowed to rent a certain house "for which one hundred guilders be paid him yearly on a/e of the city."⁴

This is the first unassailable testimony in our records to the union of schoolhouse and dwelling. In connection we have the third dis-

¹ Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

² N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Coll., II, 28.

³ Records of N. A., II, 219-220.

inct reference to the obligation of the people, and not the company, to furnish the schoolhouse. In this case the church masters are not mentioned. We are dealing now with a city school, to which burgo-masters and schepens must attend.

Three years later Hobocken requests "an allowance from the city as he is behindhand with the building of the school, and for divers other reasons set forth in the petition." Evidently by this time there has arisen dissatisfaction, for the reply was "Petitioner is allowed to receive his current year's salary * * * and his allowance is henceforth abolished."¹ The dissatisfaction expressed against Hobocken did not take final effect until more than a year hence, but the men of the opposition were evidently determined. On looking about, they found one, Evert Pietersen, an efficient schoolmaster at the South River (New Castle, Del.), whose time was soon to expire and whose salary was likely to be reduced.² Whether in fact they sought Pietersen or he them, we can hardly say, but both sides evidently agreed on the proposition to have Pietersen succeed Hobocken. Before Hobocken's year was out, we find Pietersen, apparently through Stuyvesant, petitioning the Lords Directors for the place;³ while the burgomasters requested that he be appointed⁴ and Stuyvesant recommended it.⁵ On December 14, 1660, the Lords Directors wrote Stuyvesant: "We will consider the petition of Mr. Evert Pietersen * * * and inquire here about his character, conduct, and abilities." On May 2, 1661, they sent Pietersen's commission commanding "all persons without distinction to acknowledge the aforesaid Evert Pietersen siecken-trooster, voorlezer, voorsanger, and schoolmaster in New Amsterdam in New Netherland, and not to molest or disturb or ridicule him in any of these offices."⁶

Whatever dissatisfaction may have been felt with Hobocken's teaching, there was none as to his moral character, for we are specifically told that he was "a person of irreproachable life and conduct."⁷ That he continued in the New Amsterdam school until Pietersen actually assumed the work need not be doubted. In fact we are told explicitly (October 27, 1661) that "Harmanus Hobocken, before schoolmaster and chorister, was removed because another was sent to replace him."⁸ And just when this transfer took place we can fix with some exactness. On October 27, 1661, Hobocken, who "was removed because another was sent to replace him," was "employed on the bouwery of the director general as schoolmaster." This would lead us to accept some date slightly before October 27 as the time of formal transfer of the school from Hobocken to Pietersen.

¹Records of N. A., vii, 244.

²See p. 129; N. Y. Col. Doc., ii, 169.

³Pratt, *op cit.*, p. 18.

⁴Minutes of the Orphan Masters, ii, 97.

⁵*Ibid.*: Pratt, *op cit.*, pp. 18, 19.

⁶Council Minutes, Pratt, *op cit.*, p. 17.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 17.

The matter seems settled by the sixth item of Pietersen's instructions, drafted November 4:

He shall be allowed to demand and receive from everybody who makes arrangement to come to his school and comes before the first half of the quarter preceding the first of December next the school dues for the quarter, but nothing from those who come after the first half of the quarter.¹

From this regulation it appears that December 1 was the middle of the current quarter. Counting backward we arrive at a date about the middle of October as the beginning of Pietersen's service.

The salary granted by the Lords Directors to Evert Pietersen was "g. 36 per month and g. 125 annually for his board."² The city evidently was bound to furnish him a house, as we see from the minutes of the burgomasters, August 1, 1661:

Master Evert Pietersen is sent here as schoolmaster, precentor, and comforter of the sick by the directors of the company, and he absolutely requires a proper dwelling and schoolhouse, which the director general requests the burgomasters to consider, giving an answer to-day.³

The question of return passage to Holland, which troubled Stevensen, was settled favorably for Pietersen, as we see from his statement (Oct. 11, 1664) after the English occupation, and his salary had been "thirty-six florins per month, one hundred and twenty-five florins for board, Holland currency, free house for school and residence, and free passage to *patria*."⁴ We note here incidentally again that school and residence were one house, and that his salary remained unchanged throughout his term of service under Dutch control.⁵

For Evert Pietersen alone, of New Amsterdam masters, have we a copy of the instructions which were given by the authorities, probably in all cases. As these have not heretofore been published in any educational discussion, we present them here entire:

Instructions and Rules for Schoolmaster Evert Pietersen, drawn up by the Burgomasters of this city with advice of the Director General and Council.

1. He shall take good care, that the children, coming to his school, do so at the usual hour, namely at eight in the morning and one in the afternoon.
2. He must keep good discipline among his pupils.

¹ See p. 69.

² Letter of Lords Directors, May 9, 1661 (Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 19).

³ Minutes of the Orphan Masters, II, 97. We may add that the burgomasters resolved to "ask for the lot behind the house of the fiscal to build a schoolhouse" (*Ibid.*, pp. 97, 103), but apparently nothing came of the request.

⁴ Records of N. A., v, 137.

⁵ This statement needs perhaps some modification. The two quotations given here in connection show Pietersen's salary at the beginning and end of his service under the company. Since the two sums are identical, it seems an easy inference that the salary remained unchanged throughout the period, but the Dutch manuscripts in the New York Public Library (Moore-Sales collection, No. 1791, item 1221, p. 816) give for apparently this same period a salary to the vooleser at New Amsterdam of 35 guilders a month with 200 guilders board money, or 620 guilders a year (cf. Van Rensselaer's History of the City of New York, I, 431-2). If these figures be accepted as representing Pietersen's salary, we must conclude that it was at one time advanced and subsequently reduced to the original figure.

3. He shall teach the children and pupils the Christian Prayers, commandments, baptism, Lord's supper, and the questions with answers of the catechism, which are taught here every Sunday afternoon in the church.

4. Before school closes he shall let the pupils sing some verses and a psalm.

5. Besides his yearly salary he shall be allowed to demand and receive from every pupil quarterly as follows: For each child, whom he teaches the a b c, spelling and reading, 30 st.; for teaching to read and write, 50 st.; for teaching to read, write and cipher, 60 st.; from those who come in the evening and between times pro rata a fair sum. The poor and needy, who ask to be taught for God's sake he shall teach for nothing.

6. He shall be allowed to demand and receive from everybody, who makes arrangements to come to his school and comes before the first half of the quarter preceding the first of December next, the school dues for the quarter, but nothing from those, who come after the first half of the quarter.

7. He shall not take from anybody, more than is herein stated. Thus done and decided by the Burgomasters of the City of Amsterdam in N. N., November 4, 1661.¹

The tuition charges, it is to be noted, are expected of all except "the poor and needy," whom upon proper request he should "teach for nothing." How much income this tuition brought to the master can not be estimated very satisfactorily, since we have no specific knowledge of the attendance, and we do not know whether the tuition was in coin or in wampum, which latter had declined at this time to about one-half the value of the coin. If we estimate 40 pupils paying the three rates of tuition in numbers of, say, 20, 14, and 6 pupils, respectively, we should have a sum of 352 guilders. If this be in coin, the addition to the salary is quite considerable; if in wampum, it is still not inconsiderable.

With regard to the schoolhouse, we can be practically certain that no house was built by the city for the schoolmaster, although this had been contemplated as we saw, when Pietersen entered upon his work. The succeeding February the burgomasters in a petition to Stuyvesant state that it is their intention to "erect and to have built a suitable school [house]" "for the convenience of the inhabitants of this city." They therefore asked to be given a lot, this time on Brouwer [now Stone] Street," in width 30 feet along the street and in length one-half of the depth." The director general and council, however, "for various reasons" considered it "more convenient that the school [house] be erected on a part of the present graveyard."² We hear nothing further of the schoolhouse until after the English occupation, when (May 8, 1666) we read that "Casper Steynmets entering demands payment of a year's rent of his house, hired to the city as a city school."³ We shall later see (Chap. IX) that the first English occupation (1664-1673) effected little change in the school. We thus seem authorized, in the absence of other testimony, to suppose that the "free-house for the school and residence," to which

¹ Minutes of the Orphan Masters, II, 115-6.

² Council Minutes, Feb. 2, 1662 (N. Y. Col. MSS., Vol. X, pt. 1, pp. 30-40).

³ Rec. of N. A., VI, 4.

Pietersen referred in 1664 as a part of his salary, was hired by the city for him, in accordance with the custom begun for Hoboken in 1656 and continued (apparently) until after 1669.

Of Pietersen's character during the period under consideration we have little direct evidence. In our first acquaintance with him (1657) he is said by the classis to be "a worthy man."¹ We saw above that the Lords Directors promised Stuyvesant to inquire about Pietersen's "character, conduct, and abilities." In the commission they speak of "the good report which we have received about the person of Evert Pietersen," and refer to his "abilities and experiences in the aforesaid services," as well as to his "pious character and virtues." Other than this we have no testimony, explicit in words, as to his good character. But his long service through a stormy period extending to about 1686, and the evident tender regard felt for him in his old age by the church,² testify more abundantly to his character than could mere words.

That Evert Pietersen served in the city school continuously from his election to the end of the Dutch period (and for years afterwards) we need not doubt, although we have few records of him during that period. On October 11, 1664, a month after the English occupation, "Mr. Evert Pietersen, Schoolmaster of this city, represents, as his allowance from the Company is struck off, that Burgomasters and Schepens shall be pleased to continue him at the same allowance."³ Since the city records for the period under consideration are continuous, we may accept these references to the beginning and ending of his career as satisfactory proof of continuous service from about October 17, 1661, to September 9, 1664, when the English entered the city, and New Amsterdam became New York.

We have so far treated the school as if it necessarily had only one teacher. The Holland custom allowed second masters, and one would think that the size of New Amsterdam would have necessitated either several schools or several masters. There were, to be sure, private schools. But were there not assistant masters in the official school? Two references seem to suggest that there were. When, in 1653, Stuyvesant agreed to turn over the excise to the city, it was on condition that the city "support the two preachers, the schoolmasters, and secretary."⁴ The plural "schoolmasters" must be taken to mean something; but what could it mean better than that there were at least two masters in the official school? Again, in 1664, Stuyvesant passed a law requiring the public catechizing of the children on Wednesdays, in which these words occur: [We have deemed it necessary] "to recommend the present schoolmasters, and to command them, so as it is done by this, that they on Wednesday, before the beginning of the sermon, with the children entrusted to their care,

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 378.

² See p. 147.

³ Rec. of N. A., v, 137.

⁴ *Ibid.*, i, 123.

shall appear in the church, to examine, after the close of the sermon, each of them, his own scholars."¹ While this may contemplate all the schoolmasters in the city, both public and private, still the phraseology, taken in connection with the foregoing reference, may very well refer to several masters in the public school. Possibly, then, there were two or more masters in the New Amsterdam school from 1653 to the coming of the English.²

We have now traced the history of the elementary school in New Amsterdam from about April, 1638, to the English occupation (1664). No reason has appeared to assert a break in its continuous activity longer than the three months, in 1647. It may be well to tabulate the successive schoolmasters with the probable term of service of each. The dates that we have fixed upon are some of them definite and certain, while others are only probable, one or two indeed are hardly more than conjectures.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLMASTERS IN NEW AMSTERDAM.

ADAM ROELANTSEN from about April 1, 1638, to about April, 1642.

JAN STEVENSEN from about April, 1642, to September, 1648.

Several temporary teachers, including JAN CORNELISSEN, and possibly PETER VAN DER LINDE, from about September, 1648, to about June, 1650.

WILLEM VESTENSZ from about June, 1650, to March 23, 1655.

HARMANUS VAN HOBOKEN from March 23, 1655, to about October 17, 1661.

EVERT PIETERSEN from about October 17, 1661, to September 9, 1664 (and afterwards).

Of these, Adam Roelantsen is of known immoral character. The others, with the sole exception of Cornelissen (of whom we know nothing), seem to have met all the moral and religious requirements of a position almost as ecclesiastical as it was academic. These schoolmasters taught in their dwellings. Their pay varied, apparently increasing during the period to a maximum with Evert Pietersen.

¹ Dunabee, *op. cit.*, p. 30. The translation has been amended. The demand in the Great Remonstrance (1649) for two masters (see p. 60) at a time when New Amsterdam was small would accord very well with two or more masters at a later date, when the town was larger.

² The first reference might conceivably refer to Jan de la Montagne, whom we shall discuss in Chapter VI. The second has been interpreted to refer to Pietersen and Hoboken. But to expect Hoboken's pupils to come in a body from the Bouwery two miles and a half distant, is too much. The Latin master, Luyck, is out of the question, since the opening words of the act refer to the elementary curriculum. There is some reason for surmising that Jan Tibout, subsequently master at Flatbush (see p. 167), was Pietersen's assistant. See N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Coll., II, 70.

CHAPTER V.

THE SUPPORT AND CONTROL OF THE OFFICIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF NEW AMSTERDAM.

It is already sufficiently evident that the civic and ecclesiastical authorities had common interests in the Dutch schools. We have seen in a general way the working of both sets of authorities. The purpose of the present chapter is to trace in detail the respective share of each in the support and control of the official elementary school at New Amsterdam.

The authorities of the Reformed Dutch Church, from national synod down to local consistory, deemed the management of schools a proper question for their consideration. We have seen in Chapter II something of the action of the synods, as well as of secular authorities, which bear on the question at hand. The enactments there quoted agree in giving to classis or consistory the licensing of teachers, at least so far as to ascertain whether they possessed the necessary religious qualifications. These pronouncements likewise agree in placing upon the civil authorities the actual financial support of the schools. In the main, we may suppose that the ecclesiastical authority was greater in the parochial schools, though the acceptance of the proper confession of faith was, as we saw, expressly required of the Latin masters as well.

It is principally the Holland parochial system which we find in New Netherland, with both church and state appearing in a modified form. Especially does this hold in the case of the company's school on Manhattan (later the city school of New Amsterdam). Civic authority lay in the trading company, whose headquarters were in Amsterdam. The church, in New Amsterdam, the second factor in school control, was what we should now call a mission field; and this too looked to Amsterdam for its control.

In the early part of the seventeenth century, as we saw in Chapter III, the consistory of Amsterdam exercised ecclesiastical supervision over the religious servants of the East and West India Companies. This took place by the express approval of the Classis of Amsterdam. But by 1629 the classis had assumed more direct charge of these matters, and in that year was perfected a more definite understanding between the classis and the trading companies. The classis that year

reported the "Church Regulations, etc.," to the Synod of North Holland, stating "that the directors of both the East and West India Companies gave perfect satisfaction to the members in this particular."¹

In 1636 the classis appointed, apparently for the first time, its standing committee, "the Deputies," or *Deputati ad Res Indicas*. In accordance with their specific instructions, this committee reported (May 5, 1636) "regulations relating to East India and West India affairs, etc.," of which the second and sixth items, already given in Chapter III, refer to the examination of siecken-troosters and schoolmasters. Letters of instruction were likewise adopted by the classis for "candidates (ministers), comforters of the sick, and schoolmasters going to the Indies"; the letter for the last named we give in full, as follows:

June 7, 1636.

Instructions and Letter of Credential for Schoolmasters going to the East Indies or elsewhere.

Whereas it is well understood by the Honorable Directors of the N. N. Company, that nothing is more important for the well-being of men, of whatever station, than that they should be taken care of from the very beginning, by keeping them under the eye and supervision of the schoolmaster, and in the exercises of the school, that they derive from such instruction the means necessary for their support, in all the stations and callings of life: and

Inasmuch as, also, upon these exercises, both the glory of God and the salvation of men are not a little dependent; and such exercises are deemed expedient both for the welfare of their company, as well as for the individuals employed therein; and also that their ships, besides the other officers, may also be provided with schoolmasters; and

Inasmuch as the * * * by these, by the name of N. N. * * * has offered his services, in this capacity, to the committee on ecclesiastical affairs of the said company, and which committee is especially charged therewith by the Classis of Amsterdam; and the said classis having previously inquired as to this individual, and by examination have ascertained his fitness and experience for such a position; that on the report rendered by the said classis, and with the approbation and consent of the said Honorable Directors, he has been appointed schoolmaster, and sent in such capacity to N— N— with these specific instructions, to wit:

He is to instruct the youth, both on shipboard and on land, in reading, writing, ciphering, and arithmetic, with all zeal and diligence; he is also to implant the fundamental principles of the true Christian Religion and salvation, by means of catechizing; he is to teach them the customary forms of prayers, and also to accustom them to pray; he is to give heed to their manners, and bring these as far as possible to modesty and propriety; and to this end, he is to maintain good discipline and order, and further to do all that is required of a good, diligent, and faithful schoolmaster.

Inasmuch as N— N— is directed to conduct himself in this office according to these instructions, and he, on his part, has promised so to do, as well as to set a good example before youth and others: Therefore, these open letters, both credentials and instructions, are given him upon his sailing, to serve him as may be found necessary.

Thus done in our classical assembly held in Amsterdam, on * * * .

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 70. (Minutes of the Synod of N. Holland, 1620.)

² *Ibid.*, pp. 97-8.

While, in practice, only the Classis of Amsterdam was, after about 1629, concerned with the church affairs in New Netherland, in theory the classis had no unique place as we see in the following extract from the minutes of the Synod of North Holland of 1640.

The care of the churches in the East and West Indies does not belong to one particular church, or classis, or even to one synod; but it properly belongs to all the synods of the United Provinces, or to all the churches in general, of the Netherlands.¹

The first schoolmaster to be examined by the classis, under the regulations given above, was our old friend Adam Roelantsen, the minute of which was given on page 40. For the next 10 years the records of the classis, so far as yet published in America, contain no references to the schools of New Netherland. Complaints of lack of suitable schools at Brazil or Curaçao in 1638 and 1646² afford negative evidence that there was no lack in New Netherland, thus corroborating our previous discussions.

We have seen that Jan Stevensen left New Netherland in 1648. It may be interesting to exhibit in chronological order the joint working of the civic and ecclesiastical machinery in the effort to secure his successor.

(1) September 2, 1648. D^r Backerus writes from New Amsterdam to the Classis of Amsterdam:

It will also be very necessary for the reverend brethren to send over with such a preacher a good schoolmaster. He should not only know how to read, write and cipher, but should also be a man of pious life, and decent habits. He should have a good knowledge of the principal points of our faith, and set a holy example to the children.³

(2) September 11, 1648. Stuyvesant and the New Amsterdam consistory write to the classis asking for an experienced schoolmaster. (For the date, see Eccl. Rec., p. 261; for an abstract of the letter, see the 8th item below.)

(3) September 22, 1648. D^r Backerus writes again to the classis, urging his former request. (See the 8th item below.)

(4) (Date not known.) Stuyvesant writes to the Lords Directors requesting that they look out for a schoolmaster, and proposing a man living in Hollandem.⁴

(5) October 26, 1648. A temporary successor to Stevensen is chosen (as voorlezer and voorsinger) by the director and council. (Quoted on p. 62.)

(6) October 26, 1648. The deputies, in formal meeting assembled, hear the first letter of Backerus:

A letter was also read from Rev. John Backerus. Since it was also in the highest degree necessary that a visitor of the sick and a schoolmaster be sent to that place, the meeting resolved to communicate this writing to the classis.⁵

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 131.

² Eccl. Rec., pp. 114, 171, 173, 195, 196, 207.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

⁴ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 107.

⁵ Eccl. Rec., pp. 242-4.

(7) December 7, 1648. The Classis of Amsterdam also hear, in formal meeting assembled, the first letter of Backerus:

There was also read a letter from Rev. John Backerus. He also requests that the Reverend Assembly would be pleased, at the earliest opportunity, to see that another pastor be sent thither, and also a good experienced schoolmaster, whose services are very much needed at that place.¹

(8) December 28, 1648. The deputies hear the second letter of Backerus and the letter of the New Amsterdam Consistory:

A letter from Rev. John Backerus, pastor at Manhattans in New Netherland, dated Sept. 22d, 1648, was opened. In this he urged his former request. A letter was also read, accompanying the above, from the elders and deacons of the same church * * *. They also declare that they stand in great need of an experienced schoolmaster, since there was an increasing number of young persons, in order that they might be reared under better discipline. To this end they make mention of Samuel Bayart, bookkeeper and teacher of French and German at Bergen-op-Zoom, and of Daniel Samuels, also teacher of French and German at Haarlem; with the understanding that should either of these, or some one else of equal qualification, be induced to go thither, efforts would be made to provide a proper support for the same, in addition to the company's salary. Resolved, that we communicate the above correspondence to the next meeting of the Classis.²

(9) January 27, 1649. The Lords Directors answer Stuyvesant's letter of the fourth item above:

We shall also look out now for a good school teacher and gather information concerning the man living in Haarlem, whom you propose.³

(10) (Date uncertain.) The Lords Directors apply to the classis for a schoolmaster, suggesting three names.⁴

(11) April 13, 1649, by the deputies, in formal meeting assembled, "it was resolved to answer at the earliest opportunity" the letters to New Netherland, one from the pastor, one from the consistory.⁵

(12) April 26, 1649. The deputies write to D^r Backerus:

We shall take into serious consideration what has been so earnestly commended to us, both in your communication, and in that of the Rev. Consistory, viz, to search out an experienced schoolmaster as pastor. The prosperity of the church is in the highest degree dependent on the proper training of the tender youth.⁶

(13) July 28, 1649. The Great Remonstrance complains of the lack of a schoolhouse and of suitable masters.⁷

(14) August 9, 1649. The Synod of North Holland in session at Edam is officially informed of the vacancy:

"Besides, a capable schoolmaster is in the highest degree necessary there."⁸

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 246.

² *Ibid.*, p. 247.

³ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 107.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 265.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

⁷ See above, pp. 60, 62.

⁸ Eccl. Rec., p. 260. The Synod of South Holland the next year received the same report. Acta, etc., III, 215.

(15) August, 1649. Stuyvesant again writes to the Classis of Amsterdam:

Besides the foregoing, we must again trouble your reverence with a second request, which we have heretofore presented to you. We need a pious and diligent schoolmaster and precentor. A year has now passed since we were deprived of such help. By this our young people have gone backward, even to grow wild, *quae nihil agentis male agere discit*. In view of the fact that a good schoolmaster is not less needed here, than a good preacher, as we have above explained in detail to your Reverences and to the Hon. Directors, we rely upon your usual excellent facilities and pious zeal for securing the one, and a favorable decision in the other. We hope, that in a short time we shall have occasion to thank you for both.¹

(16) (Date not known.) William Vestensz appears before the deputies, and is accepted for recommendation to the Lords Directors.²

(17) (Date not known.) Vestensz is recommended to the Lords Directors and by them accepted.³

(18) January 10, 1650. The deputies write D^e Megapolensis in New Netherland:

The bearer of this, William Vestensz, of Haarlem, goes as comforter of the sick; and schoolmaster, at the request of the Hon. Director Stuyvesant, and the church of Manhattan, and with the approval of the Honorable Directors of the West India Company. The said Honorable Directors also mentioned two others, so as to secure one of them, but they have not appeared, and we do not know their residence, else we might have corresponded with them. William Vestensz is an excellent God-fearing man. We trust that he may be acceptable, and do good service.⁴

(19) January 31, 1650. The deputies in formal meeting hear the report on Vestensz:

The Rev. President Swalmius, and the clerk, reported in reference to their commission that they recommend to the Messrs. Directors of the West India Company, William Vestensz of Haarlem, for schoolmaster and visitor of the sick in New Netherland, and that he has been accepted by the above-named gentlemen, and will be sent at the earliest opportunity.⁵

(20) February 16, 1650. The Lords Directors write Stuyvesant regarding Vestensz:

At your request we have engaged a schoolmaster, who is to serve also as comforter of the sick. He is considered as an honest and pious man and will come over by the first chance.⁶

(21) (Date not given.) A committee of the States-General, moved by the Great Remonstrance, announce a "provisional order" for New Netherland, in which provision is made for "good schoolmasters."⁷

(22) March 7, 1650. "The Rev. Deputies reported to the Classis of Amsterdam that William Vestensz, a schoolmaster from Haarlem, has been sent thither."⁸

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 263.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 265, 268.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 268.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁵ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 119.

⁶ *Ibid.*, i, 359.

⁷ Eccl. Rec., p. 271.

(23) April 20, 1650. The Lords Directors again write to Stuyvesant:

The schoolmaster, for whom you asked, goes out with the ship: God grant, that he may confirm the good character, which he has borne here, and continue for a long time in the edification of the youths.¹

(24) August 6, 1650. Synod of North Holland in session at Alckmaer hears officially:

Sent to New Netherland—William Vestertsee of Haarlem, for siecken-trooster and schoolmaster.²

This list of 24 items is ample to show how the various officials cooperated to secure a schoolmaster at New Amsterdam. It is but just, however, to say that, so far as we know, no other schoolmaster called forth so much activity on the part of the officials. On the contrary, Hobocken and Pietersen, the two successors to Vestensz in the school at New Amsterdam, were secured apparently without the intervention of the classis, and in the case of Hobocken, even without its knowledge.³

The classis maintained an interest in the general welfare of its schoolmasters, not excluding concern for their temporal welfare. We have already seen (p. 57) how D^r Backerus asked the classis to intercede for Stevensen for his passage money. We have also seen how Vestensz wrote to them, when his compensation for work of sexton was, as he considered, wrongfully withheld, when ordinary salary payments were slow, and when he wished an increase of salary; and we note that his call was not unheeded.⁴

The part that the local church, through its consistory and church masters (*kerke meesters*), had in the control of the school under consideration seems to have been slight. As to the New Amsterdam church masters, exactly two references have been noted which connect them with the school. Both refer to the schoolhouse,⁵ so that we may conclude here that it was the duty of the church masters to see to the physical care of the church property, including the schoolhouse, if such there were belonging to the church.⁶ As no schoolhouse was ever owned by the New Amsterdam church (i. e., during the Dutch days), and as after 1653 the schoolhouse was provided exclusively by the municipality, the connection of the church wardens with the school, which was apparently never very active, ceased

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 122.

² Eccl. Rec., p. 278. The Synod of South Holland receives the same report a year later. Acta, etc., iii, 296.

³ In the case of Pietersen, we have two references to the Consistory of Amsterdam, where the context would naturally call for classis. Whether this is a mere slip of the pen, or whether it has more meaning, the writer can not say. The instances are found in Pietersen's commission (Patt, *op. cit.*, p. 18) and in the appointment of Hobocken to Stuyvesant's Bouwery (Dunahoe, *op. cit.*, p. 27).

⁴ Eccl. Rec., pp. 306, 323, 331, 333.

⁵ They have already been brought to the reader's attention on pp. 60, 62.

⁶ See p. 194 for a more evident instance at Flatbush.

entirely, so far as appears, some 10 years before the English occupation. It may be remarked that this connection of the church with the school through the church masters, was at all times more nominal than real, since the church masters were not chosen by the church, but by the civic authorities. No records appear prior to 1656, but after that time the burgomasters nominated a double number of church masters from whom the director general made a selection of the proper number satisfactory to himself.¹ There need be no doubt that some such plan obtained throughout the Dutch period. Even during the first English period (1664-1673) the town council elected the church masters, as did the town meeting at Flatbush.²

The consistory, possibly, was more closely associated with the school than were the church masters, but here again the actual connection appears not to have equalled what was anticipated by the builders of church polity. There is some divergency in practice; but the tendency in New Netherland, as in Holland, seems to have been for the civic authorities to take increasing control. This appeared even more distinctly at Flatbush. (See p. 175.) In New Amsterdam the overt control by the consistory at all times seems slight, disappearing entirely from the records some nine years before the English came. Before that time three records occur, as follows: When Stevensen was leaving in 1648, Stuyvesant, who was an elder in the local church, wrote to the classis "at the request of the joint consistory"³ for "a pious and diligent schoolmaster and precentor." When Vestensz offered his resignation to the council, January 26, 1655, the answer was that his petition would be "communicated to the consistory and ministers."⁴ Some two months later (Mar. 3) "the Noble Lords of the Supreme Council (i. e., Stuyvesant and his council), with the consent of the respected consistory of this city, appointed Harmanus van Hoboken as chorister and schoolmaster of this city."⁵ With this reference, the recorded connection of the consistory with the city school of New Amsterdam ends. When Hoboken left and Evert Pietersen was elected, although every other body that could possibly be mentioned (except the schepens) was explicitly connected in some way with Pietersen's coming, the consistory appear to have had no part in it. Here, as elsewhere, with the coming of a stronger local secular authority, the power and influence of the consistory waned.

Nothing has been said as to the part taken by the ministers in the control of the school. The Synod of Dqrt specifically placed upon them the visiting of "all schools, private as well as public." How

¹ Rec. of N. A., II, 50-1; VII, 126, 132, 142, 174-5, 237. The first instance, however, has no reference to burgomasters.

² *Ibid.*, VI, 118, 163, 145, 215.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 261.

⁴ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

much was actually done we can not say. Probably the ministers were more active and influential than would be inferred from our records, which come mainly from the civic side. Certainly they were, on the whole, the best educated men of the colony; and their interest in the public catechizing of the school children, which took place weekly in the church, would of itself be sufficient to keep them in close touch with the school, even if there were no visiting. There are several references which show that the ministers took a general interest in educational affairs, but few that point to any actual connection with the school.¹ The only reference that seems to imply certain participation in school control is that given just above, where Vestensz's resignation was by the director general and council "communicated to the consistory and ministers."

The discussion, as so far given, of local ecclesiastical control has taken no cognizance of the fact that the official schoolmaster was also *voorlezer* and *voorsanger* in the official church.² No pertinent fact, however, has been omitted, except the doubtful case of the selection of Pieter van der Linde to succeed Jan Stevensen as *voorsanger* and *voorlezer*, and this we have already discussed in the preceding chapter (p. 62). But as Van der Linde was elected by the director general and council without recorded reference to the consistory, we have either one additional instance of a schoolmaster selected with the (apparent) ignoring of the consistory; or the selection by the civic authorities of the exclusively church official of *voorlezer* and *voorsanger*. While the silence of the records is not proof that the consistory and minister did not in this instance express some wish or approval, we certainly seem authorized to conclude from the general discussion that only a slight share in the actual control of the school is to be accorded to the local church of New Amsterdam.

But if small actual control be allowed to the local church, there is no reason to doubt that the minister and consistory were interested especially in the religious teaching of the school; and that they stood ready to interfere by appropriate appeal if for any cause the proper religious instruction were not maintained. The nature of this interest and the general prominence within the community of the minister and church officials would give to them an influence probably quite commensurate with technical power of control in determining the actual conduct of school affairs.

The various secular or civic powers which had part in the control of the New Amsterdam school were the States-General of the United

¹ See *Eccl. Rec.*, pp. 236-7, 250, 265, 331, 335. *Pratt, op. cit.*, pp. 19, 21, 34, 35. In connection, we may refer to the formal opinion of the Classis of Drente (1613) that "the minister should visit the schools every 14 days and examine pupils." *Reitsma and Van Veen, op. cit.*, viii, 172.

² See Chapter XIV, where this relationship is discussed in connection with the general religious character of the New Netherland schools.

Netherlands, the Lords Directors of the West India Company, the director general and council in New Netherland, the nine men, the burgomasters and schepens of New Amsterdam, and the burgomasters of New Amsterdam. The functions of these several bodies have already been given in general terms. We shall now proceed to examine in turn their particular dealings with the school in question.

The charter of the West India Company made that corporation almost all powerful in the affairs of New Netherland; but the States-General, as we saw in the first chapter, not only retained a general oversight over the company's activity, but also had specific voice in the Assembly of the XIX. Two suggested and two actual interferences in New Netherland school affairs by the States-General demand our attention: First, at some time apparently between 1630 and 1635 there was proposed, no one knows by whom, a "charter of freedoms and exemptions" quite similar to that promulgated by the company June 7, 1629, but with the important exception that this was to be "granted by the High and Mighty Lords States-General, *ex plenitudine potestatis*." The twenty-eighth provision of this charter was almost identical with the twenty-seventh of the 1629 exemptions quoted in the first chapter. This has been quoted by writers on the subject as bearing on the schools of New Netherland, and particularly on the school at New Amsterdam. With regard to this it should be said that not the slightest proof is available that the States-General ever adopted these "freedoms and exemptions," and the presumption is that they did not adopt them. Moreover, while there are subsequently specific references to the "freedoms" of 1629, these references are of such nature as to make it improbable that the 1630-1635 "freedoms" were ever given binding force.¹ Furthermore, as for any bearing of this item on the school at New Amsterdam, it is sufficient to note that by number five of these proposed articles the "Island of Manhattes" is expressly exempt from the provisions of the document.

Second, the States-General, in 1638, reviewing the state of affairs in New Netherland and in Brazil, took note of the fact that in the latter place no order had been "taken for the establishment of schools for the education of the rising youth," and instructed "their deputies to the Assembly of the XIX" to assist in arranging for them. The concern for New Netherland, as expressed in the same paper, is "that the population, which had been commenced, is decreasing and appears to be neglected by the West India Company." This action of the States-General shows positively a disposition on the part of that body to insist upon proper schools within the company's territory, and, negatively, that the educational interests of New Netherland were at that time not neglected by the company.

¹ See N. Y. Col. Doc., I, 512, 150, 154, 251.

The most widely quoted connection of the States-General with the New Netherland schools concerns the question of a public-school tax. In 1638, Johan de Laet, one of the directors of the company, drew up certain "Articles and conditions" for the better colonization of New Netherland and on August 30 submitted them in behalf of the company to the States-General for their approbation. The eighth of these, widely quoted as "the first record of a public tax for school purposes," reads as follows:

Each householder and inhabitant shall bear such tax and public charge as shall hereafter be considered proper for the maintenance of clergymen, comforters of the sick, schoolmasters, and suchlike necessary officers; and the director and council there shall be written to touching the form hereof in order, on receiving further information hereupon, it be rendered the least onerous and vexatious.¹

But the fact is that the "Articles and conditions" were rejected by the States-General. The record is clear. They were "exhibited, 30th of August, 1638" and were immediately referred to a certain-named committee "to view and examine them and report."² On September 2 this committee reported, "which being taken into deliberation, their High Mightinesses have resolved and concluded to hereby declare that the aforesaid articles, drawn up by the Amsterdam Chamber, are, in their present form, not adapted to the service and promotion of the colonies of New Netherland."³ Thereupon the "Articles and conditions" were "again returned to Sieur Johan de Laet;" which ended them "in their present form." We may anticipate by saying that at no time in the history of New Amsterdam was any such tax levied.

The last known reference of the States-General to the schools of New Netherland was after the "Great Remonstrance" in 1649. The remonstrants had complained of the need of a schoolhouse, of the lack of a settled master, and of an inadequate teaching staff.⁴ After extended consideration by the States-General, a committee brought in a "provisional order respecting the government, preservation, and peopling of New Netherland." The sixth article of this specified that "the commonalty shall be also obliged to have the youth instructed by good schoolmasters."⁵ This "provisional order" was referred to the Amsterdam Chamber, which on April 11 returned it with various remarks, ignoring, however, the reference to schools; and this ended the matter. We may conclude, then, by saying that while the States-General were interested in New Netherland, and even in its school affairs, they did nothing which directly and in itself influenced any of the New Netherland schools.

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., 1, 112.

² *Ibid.*, p. 114.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁴ See above, pp. 60, 63.

⁵ N. Y. Col. Doc., 1, 159. The date seems uncertain, probably about the 1st of April, 1650.

If the States-General did little for the schools of Dutch America, it was quite otherwise with the next highest civil authority, the Lords Directors of the company. While these worked largely through their local representatives, the director general and council, it is none the less true that New Netherland affairs were directed, often in minutest detail, by the Lords Directors of the Amsterdam Chamber. The school affairs of New Amsterdam came particularly before them for consideration.

First, they paid the salaries of the New Amsterdam schoolmasters out of the company's general funds. We have already seen this in the estimate of colonial expenses of December 15, 1644, in which was the item "1 schoolmaster, procentor and sexton at fl. 30, 360."¹ We saw the custom further in the power of attorney given by Jan Stevensen to collect for him from the company some seven hundred and odd guilders "by balance and settlement of his account according to the book of monthly wages No. F folio 34 earned from their honors in Netherland."² Later when Stevensen was leaving and Stuyvesant had charged his account with the passage home, Dr. Backerus asked the classis "please to assist him with the directors, that he may be exempted from this hardship."³ When Pietersen was selected by the Lords Directors in 1661 they named his "salary of g. 36 per month, and g. 125 annually for his board."⁴ On October 11, 1664, a month after the English occupation—perhaps an empty pay day had rolled around—"Mr. Evert Pietersen, schoolmaster of this city" appearing before the city court, "represents as his allowance from the company is struck off, that burgo-masters and schepons shall be pleased to keep it at the same allowance."⁵

From some data yet to be discussed (see p. 86 ff) it appears possible that during 1654 the municipality paid part of the schoolmaster's salary. It is quite true that the city regularly furnished the master with a "free house for school and residence." With this modification and this possible temporary exception, it seems safe to assert that the company paid the salaries of the official elementary school at New Amsterdam.⁶

The "free house for school and residence" we have already discussed in connection with the several schoolmasters. There was found no evidence that the company ever supplied the schoolhouse. On the contrary, we noted uniformly the opinion that the people must furnish that. The only exception was the offer of Stuyvesant

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., 1, 155.

² N. Y. Col. MSS. II, 126.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 237.

⁴ Dunstabe, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁵ Rec. of N. A., v. 157.

⁶ A further apparent exception is discussed on p. 81.

in 1647 "to bear personally and in behalf of the company a reasonable proportion." As the schoolhouse was never built, this exception was more apparent than real. In connection with the support of the New Amsterdam school by the company it is proper to consider the so-called charter of freedoms and exemptions of 1640. One item of this provided that for the purpose of maintaining the Reformed religion "as it is at present preached and practiced by public authority in the United Netherlands," "the company shall provide and maintain good and suitable preachers, schoolmasters, and comforters of the sick.¹ This provision has been used from time to time in discussions relating to the New Netherland schools, particularly in relation to the New Amsterdam school. The company appears to bind itself to support ministers, schoolmasters, and comforters of the sick in the colonies. However, the document was drawn up for the purpose of promoting colonization by the founding of new colonies or settlements, and as again the company especially reserved the "Island Manhattes to itself" it seems unwarranted to apply these provisions to New Amsterdam. While we are not here concerned with its application to schools elsewhere, we may say, first, that there appears no certainty that the document was ever adopted;² second, that there is no instance where the company did help with a school off Manhattan until after a new "charter of freedoms and exemptions" was issued in 1650, in which the 1640 school provision had been dropped and the provision of 1629 (almost identical) put in instead.³ We may accordingly dismiss from any serious consideration this "charter" of 1640.

The control of the school by the Lords Directors was at times exercised directly and at times left to the director general and council. In general, however, the Lords Directors kept in close touch with everything. We saw above that the salary schedule of 1644 was drawn up in Holland. We noted also how Stevensen's passage money was charged in New Netherland to be finally settled in Holland. We saw how the Lords Directors were informed by Stuyvesant of the need of a schoolmaster in 1648, how names were suggested by him to them and by them referred to the classis, how upon the recommendation of the classis, Vestensz was engaged by the Lords Directors and sent to New Amsterdam. Vestensz, it is true, was given up and Hobocken was elected by the director and council. But in the case of Pietersen, the Lords Directors specify exact details: "We have engaged," they said, "on your honor's recommendation

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., 1, 123.

² O'Callaghan (History of New Netherland, 1, 216) and Brodhead (op. cit., 1, 511), however, accept it. But see the apparent postponement of its adoption in N. Y. Col. Doc., 1, 118, and subsequent passages apparently ignoring its binding effect, *ibid.*, pp. 120, 124, 261, 262.

³ N. Y. Col. Doc., 1, 201.

and that of the magistrates of the city of New Amsterdam, Mr. Evert Pietersen as schoolmaster and clerk upon a salary of g. 36 per month and g. 125 annually for his board.¹ It is typical of their general management that when Curtius, the Latin master, wished board money in addition to his salary, Stuyvesant refers the request to the Lords Directors with the words: "Your repeated instructions do not allow us to raise anybody's salary without your knowledge."²

That the Lords Directors should concern themselves with so small a matter as the school books indicates their attention even to the minutest affairs of the colony. They sent the books over to the director general to be sold to the pupils. On one such occasion he was told: "After the school books and stationery to be used for the education of the youths, stated in the inclosed invoice, you will please to look yourself."³ When Pietersen was sent over the Lords Directors gave these explicit directions to Stuyvesant:

And whereas he solicited to be supplied with some books and stationery, which would be of service to him in that station, so did we resolve to send you a sufficient quantity of these articles, as your honor may see from the invoice. Your honor ought not to place all these at his disposal at once, but from time to time, when he may be in want of these, when his account ought directly to be charged with its amount; so, too, he must be charged with all such books of which he may be in want as a consolider of the sick, which he might have obtained from your honor, which afterwards, might be reimbursed to him, whenever he, ceasing to serve in that capacity, might return these; all this must be valued at the invoice price.⁴

We conclude from the foregoing that the Lords Directors paid the master's salary from the company's treasury;⁵ that, in the main, they controlled the school either directly by their own action or mediately through the director general and council; and that even the small details passed before their eyes for approval.

In discussing the part played by the director general and council in the support and control of the New Amsterdam school, we are distinguishing this body on the one hand from their superiors, the Lords Directors; and on the other, from their inferiors, the bodies of lesser local control, the nine men, the burgomasters, and the New Amsterdam city court ("burgomasters and schepens"). The only director general of whose school relationship we have record is the autocratic Peter Stuyvesant, "our Grand Duke of Muscovy," as one of the remonstrating nine men called him. His own opinion of his relation to the council may be inferred from certain of his words,

¹ Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 28. For the part played by the director general and council in this, see next page.

² N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 445. See also Chapter VI below for the management of the Latin school.

³ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 429.

⁴ Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁵ The sources of income to the company were various. It was a trading company, and accordingly made gain in that manner. It levied duties on exports and imports, collected excise on liquors; in fact, it did almost everything but levy a direct property or poll tax.

apropos of an adverse vote: "I condescend to acquiesce in the majority of votes."¹ Generally, therefore, when we say "director general and council," we really mean Stuyvesant, whose will practically was law.

The discussion already given has made it clear that with respect to the Lords Directors, the director general and council served merely as their agents, acting always for them, and only with so much power as prudence prompted the Lords Directors to confer in order to secure efficient management in so remote a situation. When the Lords Directors did not directly choose a teacher, the director general and council exercised the right. This they did in two or three instances, which we have already discussed, Hobocken, Cornelissen, and (if he were schoolmaster) Van der Linde. Of these Hobocken is the only certain case.

An interesting inquiry, however, arises in connection with Evert Pietersen's election. The commission of Pietersen² as sent by the Lords Directors to Stuyvesant, when read in its entirety, fairly rings with the final and supreme authority of the Lords Directors. Yet, for all that, the burgomasters evidently considered that the director general and council must in some way approve before the appointment could become final or at least effective, as we see from the following resolution of the burgomasters apropos of Stuyvesant's demand for a schoolhouse and dwelling for Pietersen:

As soon as Master Evert Pietersen has been appointed schoolmaster, etc., by the director general and council and the burgomasters have been notified of it, they will dispose of the matter.³

It does not seem necessary, however, to find in this anything difficult of adjustment with what has been said above. Quite possibly the burgomasters were not fully informed of the situation, or they may have expected Hobocken to fill out the quarter. Doubtless, too, Stuyvesant, as a true autocrat, had long since accustomed the city officials to consider his approval as necessary to give validity and effectiveness to any public measure.

Instances where the salary question came before the director general and council have been seen in the question of Stevensen's passage money, in the case of Vestensz's request for increased salary as told us by D^r Megapolensis and in the fixing of Hobocken's salary when he was elected to succeed Vestensz.

Small matters of only local concern, the director general and council managed wholly or shared with bodies of local control. They evidently fixed for Hobocken the rates of tuition as well as his salary: "Said schoolmaster shall communicate to burgomasters and schepens,

¹ *Fact. op. cit.*, p. 22.

² *Ibid.*, p. 18.

³ *Minutes of the Orphan Masters*, II, 97.

what, he is allowed for each child per quarter, pursuant to instructions from the director general and council."¹ The "instructions" here referred to are almost certainly similar to those which we saw issued to Evert Pietersen.²

The Dutch seem to have been partial to such detailed tables of instructions. Several in Holland³ at the same period are available. At least eight are found in the Flatbush records;⁴ another relates to a Brooklyn master; and a number have come down to us from the school of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York City.⁵

The "instructions and rules for Schoolmaster Evert Pietersen" were "drawn up by the burgomasters of this city with the advice of the director general and council." This "advice" of the director general and council eight years after the municipal powers had been granted to the city shows how loath Stuyvesant was to give up his immediate control. But the city increased its share in the management of its affairs. In the case of Hoboken, Stuyvesant appears to have issued the instructions without even communicating with the city authorities. With Pietersen we may suppose that Stuyvesant told the burgomasters only in general what was to be done, although he probably passed finally upon their draft.

During the last year of the Dutch régime the director general and council passed (March 17, 1664) a civil ordinance regulating the public catechizing of the school children.⁶ Just why this act on the part of the civil authorities was considered necessary is not clear. But we see in such an act on the part of the director general and council not only their direct participation in local school affairs, but also a very interesting instance of the close connection that existed between church and state.

In everything the director general and council appear as the faithful agents of the Lords' Directors. They struggled to keep all control in the company's hand and to keep down all expenses. Stuyvesant, however—it is but just to say—deserves special mention for his individual interest in education. No appeal for better educational facilities ever met refusal from him.⁷

Of the nine men, or tribunes, we know so little that it hardly seems necessary to mention them in this connection, especially as every reference to them save one has already been utilized in other connections. In 1647 the council referred to the tribunes the building of a school: Stuyvesant wrote them about it, but so far as is known

¹ Rec. of N. A., II, 39.

² See p. 67.

³ Beemink, *op. cit.*, p. 118 ff.; Douma, *op. cit.*, p. 92-3.

⁴ Of dates 1660, 1663, 1665, 1670, 1680, 1681, 1682, 1773. See Chapters VII and XII.

⁵ Eccl. Rec., pp. 2237 ff., 2340 ff., 2374 ff., 2619 ff., 2636-7, 2638 f., 4290 ff.

⁶ O'Callaghan, *Laws of New Netherland*, p. 421.

⁷ See Pratt, *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 23-4; N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 107, 122, 126, 292-3; Eccl. Rec., pp. 347, 368.

nothing was done. The "Great Remonstrance" of 1649 was the work of the nine men. They complained of the misappropriation of the funds collected by public subscription for a schoolhouse and of the irregular manner in which the school was kept, and expressed opinion that two masters should be employed. We are not able to say that anything was effected for the school by their complaints. In 1654 Stuyvesant told the burgomasters and schepens that he had "repeatedly reminded the former nine men * * * of the absolute necessity to devise, as customary in other countries and especially in the Fatherland, some means to provide revenue" for the general expenses, including the school; but we have no evidence that the nine men ever did anything with regard to Stuyvesant's reminders, or that they ever really accomplished anything for the school.

Quite otherwise, however, was it with the burgomasters. For about four years after the granting of municipal powers to New Amsterdam in 1653, these appear to have met, as a rule, conjointly, with the schepens. For this period the city support and control is in the hands of this joint body. After March, 1657, so far as appears, the burgomasters alone are concerned with the elementary school. As between the two bodies, then, it is not a question of contemporaneous conflicting or contrasted powers of support and control, but a question of the separation about 1657 of the more purely administrative from the other functions of the city court. In other words, the city control of the elementary school is but one continuous story, the first chapters of which are found in the minutes of the joint body, while the last chapters are found in the administrative minutes of the burgomasters alone.

Beginning in November, 1653, and lasting for a full year, the city court was in continual dispute with the director general and council on the question of the source and proper expenditure of the city's finances. As the salary of "one precentor being at the same time schoolmaster" is one of the elements in the dispute, it becomes necessary for us to enter somewhat into the details of the discussion in order to decide whether during this period the city of New Amsterdam or the West India Company supported the schoolmaster. Especially must we make this examination since the question of local support of the New Amsterdam school has been much beclouded by reckless assertions.

The New Amsterdam city government was organized February 2, 1653. The powers granted, however, were small. Later in the year the burgomasters and schepens "asked the community to provide means for paying the public expenses and keeping in repair the works; and were answered, "if the honorable director general will allow the excise to be paid to the treasury of the city and for the

city's benefit, they would willingly contribute.' Accordingly, on November 11, "some of the most influential burghers and inhabitants of this city having been lawfully summoned," "the burgomasters and schepens declare that they have obtained the consent of the honorable director general to have henceforth the excise on wine and beer paid into the office of the burgomasters and schepens, for the benefit of the city," and "the magistrates ask the community whether they will submit to such ordinances and taxes as the magistrates may consider proper and necessary for the government of this city." Thereupon the burghers and inhabitants "all answered 'yes' and promised to obey the honorable magistrates in everything, as good inhabitants are in duty bound to do, confirming it with their signatures."¹

A little later the burgomasters and schepens applied formally to Stuyvesant for the excise. He replied, again orally, granting their petition for "the excise of the beer and wines consumed here (except what is exported)" "provided that their worships of the court will support the two preachers, the schoolmasters, and secretary." These salaries amounted to 3,200 g. annually, which was more than the usual income from the excise. The burgomasters and schepens seeing this, "unanimously resolved to go in a body to the director general and demand in conformity with his promise the grant of the entire excise as received at the company's counting house." This effort to get the *entire* excise failed. Stuyvesant had meant all the time only the tavern-keepers' excise, but not the citizens' excise as well. The following week the burgomasters and schepens presented a petition to Stuyvesant, asking for a formal transfer of the excise. Stuyvesant's reply was substantially the restatement of the conditions above given. On the one hand, "the common (i. e., the tavern keepers') excise on wine and beer consumed within this city," on the other, "the maintenance of the public works in the city and the subsistence of the ecclesiastical officers."² Upon receipt of this the city advertised the excise. But a month later we find them writing to the Lords Directors in Amsterdam, asking for powers "not so extremely limited;" saying besides that "the revenue from said excise" amounted "to no more than one-third" of the annual pay roll, whereas "the maintenance of the city works and other wants of the city" of themselves would require all the revenue; and asking in view thereof that the excise might be granted "without any limitation" and that they might furthermore be "authorized to levy some new imposts and other small fees," and besides might have "the farming of the ferry from this place to Breuckelen."³

Before hearing from the Lords Directors on this request the burgomasters and schepens petitioned the director general and council for

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., iv, p. 220.

² *Ibid.*, p. 221.

³ Rec. of N. A., i, 124.

petition, to "impose provisionally for the benefit of this city"¹ certain duties on imports and exports and a certain schedule of excise duties additional to those already granted. In reply (February 23, 1654) the director-general and council consented to the "proposed citizens' excise" on the same terms as "the tavern keepers' excise" previously allowed, but declined to allow the duties on imports and exports, because they concerned "the country at large and not any particular city or place."²

During this time the ministers and the schoolmasters were dependent on the city government for their pay. The classis received a letter (May 11, 1654) from Vestensz complaining of "slow payments."³ On June 1 the ministers petitioned for their "half year's allowance," and the director general and council ordered the burgomasters and schepens "to furnish the accrued half year's salary out of the receipts according to promise."⁴ In the meanwhile the Lords Directors wrote (May 18, 1654), declining to excuse the city government from the salaries, but allowing them to "lay any new small excise or impost with the consent of the commonalty" unless the director general and council should "have any reasons to the contrary."⁵

Apparently Stuyvesant's order of June 1, that the salaries be paid, was not obeyed, for it was repeated on June 8, and again more emphatically on August 3.⁶ In answer to the last demand, the burgomasters and schepens replied that of the 16,000 guilders expended in military defence, which was a part of Stuyvesant's demand, the share of New Amsterdam was 3,000 guilders; and to meet this they requested permission "to lay a tax on real estate." Accompanying this petition was an account of the expenditure of the excise. This showing was not "acceptable" to Stuyvesant, since it included, "for instance, a certain amount of money paid" to Francis le Blue. (This Blue was sent to Holland as the city's agent to plead with the Lords Directors for more power.) While "for decency's sake" the director general and council passed these "over in silence," still "induced by those and other reasons" they resolved (August 13) to take back, after the current year, the excise into their own management.⁷

This communication the burgomasters and schepens resolved to ignore, relying upon the previous order of the Lords Directors (May 18); and they accordingly wrote Stuyvesant, August 24, on behalf of this city of New Amsterdam, offering to pay "for the ecclesiastical establishment, the salaries of one of the preachers, one procenter who is to be schoolmaster at the same time, one beadle."⁸ But Stuyvesant was determined. "The accounts submitted [show] that the

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 247.

² *JM.*, p. 242.

³ *Ecol. Rec.*, p. 121.

⁴ *Rec. of N. A.*, I, 205.

⁵ *JM.*, p. 219.

⁶ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 271, 282-3.

⁷ *JM.*, p. 254.

⁸ *JM.*, p. 260.

revenue from the excise was not employed * * * in paying the minister's salary * * *. As burgomasters and schepens do not fulfill their promise * * * the director general and council are compelled to let the said excise to the highest bidder * * * and to employ the proceeds in promptly providing for the support of the clergy. By these plans the burgomasters and schepens will be excused and delivered from carrying out their offer, to support at their expense, one clergyman, one schoolmaster, and one beadle."¹

With this action of September 16 the matter rested until November 23, when there appeared the handbills of the director general and council announcing the public auction of the excise. Then the burgomasters and schepens again protested, quoting the order of the Lords Directors; but Stuyvesant considering that this had been already "sufficiently answered" made no reply.² Six months later (May 26, 1655) the Lords Directors wrote to the city court accepting Stuyvesant's view of the situation, saying that they had "resolved to have the collection of this (excise) money made again by the financial officer of the company there."³

With this the quarrel ended. It seems fairly certain that up to September 16 not all of the salaries due the clergymen had been paid, and quite possibly no part of the city's revenue had gone in that direction. As the schoolmaster was part of the "ecclesiastical establishment," it seems reasonably certain that he likewise had been partly or wholly deprived of his salary. What had taken place up to September 16 remains thus partly in doubt. What took place during the rest of the year is wholly unknown. With the year 1655 it seems clear that the company itself reassumed the duty of providing the salaries. Whether the past-due salaries—if such there were—were then paid, can not now be said.

What revenues the city had after this controversy and what expenditures it was responsible for, may be gathered from the reply made by the burgomasters and schepens to the last-quoted letter of the Lords Directors.

We have, moreover, already burdened the commonalty with one stiver in the guilder [5 per cent] on the cattle slaughtered in this city besides the burgher excise on wine and beer [Stuyvesant had taken back the tavern-keepers' excise], the income from which by no means covers the repair and establishments of the city, much less what is most urgent, the repairs and erection of the city walls * * *; the repair of the city hall, watch houses, the building of schools, the construction of the canal, and other similar matters.⁴

That the city government accepted the responsibility of providing a schoolhouse appears in the letter above given, where "the building of schools" is apparently included among the things "most urgent."

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc. xiv, 202.

² *Ibid.*, p. 205-6.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

⁴ Rec. of N. A., II, 217.

That, however, nothing was done before November 4, 1656, seems evident from the following court minute:

1656, November 7.

To the Honorable Lords Burgomasters and Schepens of the City of New Amsterdam: Harmen van Hobocken, schoolmaster of this city, respectfully requests that your honors would be pleased to grant him the hall and the side room for the use of the school and as a dwelling, inasmuch as he, the petitioner, does not know how to manage for the proper accommodation of the children during winter, for they much require a place adapted for fire and to be warmed, for which their present tenement is wholly unfit. He, the petitioner, burthened with a wife and children, is greatly in need of a dwelling for them, and his wife is expected from hour to hour to be confined, so that he anticipates great inconvenience, not knowing how to manage for the accommodation of the school children; and if your honors can not find any, he, the petitioner, requests your honors to be pleased to allow him the rent of the back room which Geurt Coerten at present occupies, which he, the petitioner, would freely accept for the present, as he is unable to pay so heavy a rent as a whole house amounts to. He therefore applies to your honors, expecting hereupon your honors' favorable endorsement.

Was subscribed,

Your honors' servant,

HARM. VAN HOBOKEN.

Dated 4 Nov.; 1656.

Endorsement.

Whereas the city hall of this city, the hall and the little room whereof the petitioner now requests for a school and dwelling, are not at present in repair, and are, moreover, required for other purposes the same can not be allowed him; but in order that the youth, who are here quite numerous, may have the means of instruction as far as possible and as the circumstances of the city permit, the petitioner, for want of other lodgings, is allowed to rent the said house for a school, for which one hundred guilders shall be paid him yearly on account of the city for the present and until further order. Done in court this 4th of November, 1656. At Amsterdam in New Netherland.¹

We can well sympathize with Master Hobocken. In the winters of New Amsterdam the school children would indeed "much require a place adapted for fire and to be warmed." To see winter approaching in a "tenement wholly unfit" for so necessary a purpose was of itself enough to make the poor man seek "proper accommodation." It pleases us to see that the worthy burgomasters and schepens did not turn an entirely deaf ear, and that the circumstances of the city did permit its schoolmaster to have a "whole house." Apparently, the "back room" occupied by Guert Coerten contained the only and much-desired "place adapted for fire." With that room, in addition to what he already had, every need could be met, and the church records duly report the baptism of a son to Master Hobocken on November 12, 1656.

This appropriation by the local authorities for the rent of a school is quite in line with the uniform division of school support. It was the duty of the people to furnish school quarters and of the company to provide the master's salary. With this act appropriating rent for the

¹ Rep. of N. A., II, 219-220.

schoolhouse, the burgomasters and schepens as a joint body disappear from the elementary school records. In a few months the burgomasters began to meet separately, and to their records we now go as the direct continuation of the present account.

The first reference found in the burgomasters' minutes is difficult of interpretation, because on the face it appears to contradict flatly the conclusion tentatively reached above that the schoolmaster's salary came only from the company. An administrative minute of January 16, 1660, reads as follows:

Mr. Hermen van Hooocke requests by petition, that he may receive an allowance from the city, as he is behind hand with the building of the school, and for divers other reasons set forth in the petition: of which petition is apostilled: Petitioner is allowed to receive his current year's salary, which shall be paid to him at a more convenient season on an order of the burgomasters on the treasurer, and his allowance henceforth is abolished.¹

It must be admitted that if it agreed with other references, both preceding and succeeding, to understand that the "allowance" herein "abolished" was Hoboken's ordinary salary paid by the burgomasters from their treasury, the minute quoted would apparently afford substantiating evidence of such a customary procedure. But our tentative conclusion as to the source of the salary is directly opposed to this. What then shall we say as to this minute? Must we modify our previous opinion? Might it not be that, although all the preceding evidence has pointed in the one direction, nevertheless the city had, in the three or four years between the preceding references and this, again undertaken to pay the salaries which Stuyvesant resumed in September, 1654. The objection to this interpretation is that there is no reference other than the one under consideration which even looks in that direction, while others contradict it. We have already seen some of the evidence. When Evert Pietersen was elected, the Lords Directors specifically fixed Pietersen's salary. This would hardly have been done if the salary was to come from another treasury than their own. Of the free schoolhouse to be furnished by the city the Lords Directors properly said nothing. Again, after the English had come, Pietersen told the burgomasters and schepens that his "allowance from the company" was "struck off." If he had been receiving his salary from the men he was then addressing, he would hardly have chosen these exact words. And in a subsequent petition (September 19, 1665) to the reorganized city court he said "he was heretofore paid his wages by the honorable company."²

In the face of such direct statements, fitting, as they do, with so much of indirect evidence, we seem compelled to reexamine the minute under consideration and ask whether it can not receive an

¹ Rec. of N. A., vii, 244.

² *Ibid.*, v, 204.

interpretation which shall agree with other pertinent evidence and at the same time do no violence to its own words. And may we not find the key to the solution in the annual appropriation of 100 guilders for a schoolhouse, first made in November of 1656? While this was not a *salary* in the strict sense, it was an *allowance* "paid him yearly on account of the city." The payment of this allowance may have been slow (the "convenient season" suggests as much), so that Hoboken may have asked for what was already promised with possibly an increase. The answer of the burgomasters, as it seems to the writer, can easily mean that they were willing to continue the 100 guilders rent allowance for the year 1660, but for no longer. This suggested interpretation of the minute while possibly not the one that would ordinarily present itself upon a first reading, nevertheless seems the only one that fits the other known facts. So far, then, it still seems probable that the schoolmaster's salary in the proper sense came from the company.

In the administrative minutes, quoted on pages 67 and 84, we saw it clearly understood between the director general and council, on the one hand, and the burgomasters on the other, that the latter should provide "a proper dwelling and schoolhouse." The only question in mind then was when such a house would be needed. It appeared from a minute a few days later¹ that the burgomasters decided to proceed immediately with the erection. But evidently something stopped them, for some months later (February 2, 1662) we find them addressing a petition to the director general and council stating that they wished to erect "a suitable school (house), for which is required a suitable and well-situated lot." Then follow the request for a lot on Brouwer Street 30 by 15 feet and the declination of Stuyvesant on the ground that it was "more convenient that the school (house) be erected on a part of the present graveyard."² As to the merits of the several possible locations for a good schoolhouse we can of course say nothing. The lot on Brouwer Street may have been "well-situated;" but that a "suitable school (house)," even for those early times, could be built on a lot only 30 by 15 feet seems inexplicable. If Stuyvesant had objected to the proposed lot on account of its size, we could better approve his action. Whether his refusal to grant the petition of the burgomasters stopped their plans for building can not be said; but, as previously pointed out, the evidence is to the effect that the house was never built.

That the burgomasters controlled the internal affairs of the school (subject to the "advice" of the director general and council) has been sufficiently shown in connection with the "instructions and rules for schoolmaster Evert Pieterse."³ There is nothing to be added

¹ Minutes of the Orphan Masters, etc., II, 103.
² N. Y. Col. MSS., vol. 10, part 1, pp. 30-40.

³ See pp. 67, 85.

to the discussion there given. It thus appears, in conclusion of this and the preceding item, that the school in New Amsterdam was looked upon as the city school; its master was "the schoolmaster of this city," and should therefore properly receive his maintenance from the city, and that this was, "customary in other countries and especially in the Fatherland;"¹ that, however, for lack of sufficient revenue the city could not provide the necessary salary, so that the company had to resume the support of the master. The city did, nevertheless, furnish a schoolhouse and dwelling for the master and made the regulations under which he taught.

The question of support would not be complete without reference to the question as to whether tuition was charged or whether the salary of the master was his sole remuneration.

In the case of Pietersen, we saw from his instructions (p. 68) that "besides his yearly salary," he was "allowed to demand and receive from every pupil quarterly" tuition graduated according to the studies taken; but "the poor and needy, who asked to be taught for God's sake, he shall teach for nothing." Such an explicit statement is lacking in the case of the other masters, but there is no evidence which could deny the prevalence of the custom. The reference already given in the case of Hoboken, as to "what he is allowed for each child per quarter pursuant to instructions from the general and council" can only refer, it appears, to tuition charges similar to Pietersen's. This is corroborated by the universal custom in Holland and by the unvarying practice in the outlying Dutch villages, as will later appear. With this corroboration, with the specific instances quoted, with the absolute lack of any contradictory evidence, it seems perfectly safe to conclude that the regulations in the case of Pietersen were customary at New Amsterdam. Each child paid quarterly 30, 50, or 60 stivers tuition, according to the studies taken, only the "poor and needy" were exempt, and this as a charity.

A brief summary may help to bind together the disconnected discussions of this extended chapter. The elementary school of New Amsterdam was the joint concern of church and state. The church entered as a copartner in the school in the fact that, among the Dutch, it was the universally accepted duty of the schoolmaster to teach religion through the catechism and other church formularies. As theological divergence was the worst of all errors, and as the influence of the school was now recognized as transcendently great, it had become the peculiar duty of the church to safeguard the chair of instruction. Accordingly, the Classis of Amsterdam—in special cases, the local minister and consistory—examined the prospective New Amsterdam masters as to their fitness, especially for their reli-

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., liv, 262.

gious duties. A like supervision, the church exercised—in theory at least—over the actual teaching of the school.

The civil authorities conceived their interests and responsibilities in a manner strikingly similar to what is common in America to-day. They chose the masters—frequently upon ecclesiastical recommendation—paid their salaries, furnished the schoolhouse, and gave the directions under which the masters taught. In the division of civic function, the States-General exercised only a broad oversight, serving more as a court of final appeal than as an executive or legislative agency. The Lords Directors from the general treasury of the company furnished the money for the salaries, directed the general affairs of the school, and besides held themselves free to control even its minutiae. The director general and council acted only as the agents of the company, but exercised much power in the service of their lords. The city authorities, but for decaying finances and an autocratic director, would have furnished a sufficient support and the sole control of the city school. As it was, their financial support extended (apparently) only to furnishing the schoolhouse, while the control was always subject to Stuyvesant's "advice." In spite, however, of any thwarting of purpose, enough was done by the secular authorities to present a remarkable anticipation of the American public school.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LATIN SCHOOLS OF NEW AMSTERDAM.

In seeking the earliest suggestion for a Latin school at New Amsterdam some have followed Brodhead, who says that "an academy was contemplated" in 1650.¹ This idea seems to have arisen from a misconception of Van Tienhoven's reply to the "Great Remonstrance." As ordinarily translated this part of the reply reads, "It is true there is no Latin school or academy, but if the commonalty desire it, they can furnish the means and attempt it."² The word "academic" of the original, however, should be translated "university." Evidently from this reply and so far as appears from the Remonstrance,³ no one can conclude that either a Latin school or a university in New Amsterdam was contemplated at that time.

The first certain reference to a Latin school appears to be in a hitherto unsuspected place. A mistranslation had concealed the meaning. The passage which we give below, correctly translated, is from a letter of the Lords Directors to Stuyvesant, of date April 4; 1652:

We also agree with your proposition to establish there a trivial (*triviale*) school and believe a beginning might be made with one usher (*hypodidasculum*) who could be engaged at a yearly salary of 200 to 250 guilders. We recommend for this position Jan de la Montagne, whom we have provisionally appointed to it; and you may use the building of the city tavern if you find it suitable.

Since we have practically no other knowledge of this school, the question as to what kind of school it was turns upon the meaning of the word "trivial." The student of the history of education will, of course, immediately connect the word "trivial," as here used,

¹ *Op. cit.*, I, 318.

² Narratives of New Netherland, p. 362.

³ See extracts, pp. 60, 62.

⁴ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 169. The translation here given is O'Callaghan's except that we have put "trivial (*triviale*)" in the place of "public," and "usher" in place of "schoolmaster." The word *hypodidasculus* was a common term to denote a subordinate master in a Latin school. Thus in 1541 at the refounding of the Canterbury Grammar School there were provided a head master (*Archididascus*) and a "*Hypodidasculus sive secundarius Informator*." The latter must be "*Latine doctus*" and must, "*sub Archididasculo*," teach the boys the elements of the Latin grammar (see page 458 of Leach, *Educational Charters*, Cambridge, 1911). Similarly of the Rotherborne (Latin) Grammar School in 1550, we read "*de uno Magistro seu Pedagogo et uno subpedagogo sive Hypodidasculo*" (*ib.*, p. 480). Other similar instances are found in the same work, pages 508 (Westminster, 1560), 506, 508, 512. The latest instance noted is in the published "Charter and Statutes of the College of William and Mary in Virginia. In Latin and English" (Williamsburg, 1736), where (pages 87, 91) the assistant in the (Latin) Grammar School is called an usher in English and *Hypodidasculus* in Latin. The word *hypodidasculus* is variously spelled, as appears above.

The Lords Directors in the letter quoted above seem to think that an usher would suffice as a "beginning." Later, if the school grew, a rector might be sent.

with the "trivium," which together with the "quadrivium" made up the *seven liberal arts* of the Middle Ages. The trivium consisted of grammar, rhetoric, and logic. Grammar at this time, when all learning was in Latin, included those elementary studies of the school which were designed to give a mastery of that language for the sake of subsequent study. Schools in which such language study was given were called sometimes grammar schools, sometimes trivial schools.

In England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and in the early English colonies of America, the "grammar school" was conducted in the Latin tongue (at least in theory), and was designed to give a practical mastery of the Latin language with some knowledge of the Greek. At the present time in America the expression "grammar school" usually means a school above the primary school and below the high school, in which no language other than English is found, and the grammar of that, even, need not be stressed. As the term grammar school has thus, in America, so widely departed from its original meaning; so in certain parts of Europe, in Austria for example, has the expression "trivial school" come to mean not a Latin grammar school, but the ordinary elementary vernacular school.

If, then, the "trivial school" has *anywhere* gone the way of the "grammar school" in America, the interpretation of the passage at hand becomes a matter of nicer study. Before we can say what Stuyvesant and the Lords Directors intended, we must ascertain the current meaning of the expression "trivial school" in Holland at that time. An exhaustive study of original sources alone could answer our question definitely and finally.

We shall present a number of independent references in the endeavor to fix the meaning of the word. (a) In a dictionary of middle age Latin¹ under the word trivium we read, *Triviales dicuntur qui docent, vel qui student in Trivio, sicut Quadriviales, qui in Quadrivio.* (They are called "triviales" who either teach or study the *trivium*, and similarly with "quadriviales" and the *quadrivium*.) This reference does nothing more than tend to corroborate what is undisputed, that the name of the trivial school is derived from the trivium. (b) Foster Watson quotes the title of a book by one John Stockwood, which indicates something of the curriculum of the trivial school of England in the early seventeenth century: *Disputatiuncularum Grammaticalium libellus ad pueros in scholis trivialibus exercuenda ingenia primum excogitatus*, 1607.² The Latin title and the use of the disputation show that "trivial school" was still for Stock-

¹ See p. 211 below for a similar change in meaning of "trivial school" in America.

² *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis. Editio nova.* Basiliae, MDCCLXII.

³ *The English Grammar Schools to 1660*, p. 96. Watson elsewhere (p. xiii of *Beginnings of Modern School Subjects*, London, 1909) quotes a 1663 writer who calls Eton, Winchester, and Westminster "trivial schools."

wood fairly close to its original meaning. (c) Bishop Hall (1574-1656) thus uses the word in English:

Whose deep seen skill
Hath three times construed either Flaccus o'er,
'And thrice rehearsed them in his trivial floor.'

The reference to construing Horace shows unmistakably that the bishop's idea of a trivial school included Latin. (d) The Synod of Dort (1619) presented to the States General a petition that "some general rules for the government" of the "trivial or inferior schools" might be drawn up in order that a "uniform method of teaching be established, especially in the principles of grammar, logic, and rhetoric."² Here we have the three studies of the old trivium still holding sway. (e) The particular Synod of South Holland meeting in Dort, 1627, discussed whether it was advisable that the elements of Hebrew be taught in the trivial schools (*in scholis trivialibus fundamenta Hebraicae linguac*).³ Evidently no one would think of putting Hebrew into anything less than a Latin grammar school. (f) In 1634 the same synod discussed the inquiry of a *rector scholae trivialis* as to whether the pupils should, as a school exercise, present comedies.⁴ Here two things indicate a Latin school, the use of the word *rector* and the reference to the presentation of the classic comedies, as of Terence, for example. (g) In the minutes of the same synod from 1634 to 1637 are three other references to *rector scholae trivialis*, and one to *rectoren in triviale schoolen*.⁵ (h) At Utrecht from a very early date was a city school called the St. Jerome School. During the seventeenth century it was of the gymnasium type, being sometimes called the "Jerome Gymnasium." It had eight classes, and, as was common with the schools of the kind, forbade the pupils to "speak Dutch."⁶ In the instructions issued by the common council this school is in 1634 referred to as "the aforesaid trivial school called the Jeroma (Hieronimi) School," and again in 1640 as "the trivial or Jeroma (Hieronimi) School."⁷ Two clear cases in which "trivial school" was equivalent to "gymnasium." (i) Douma, writing of Holland in the seventeenth century, speaks of "the triviale or Latin schools (*de triviale or Latynsche scholen*), which were found in nearly all of the cities" of Holland, saying: "These schools were not always higher (*boven*) than the ordinary elementary school, but for the most part stood on the same level as (*naast*) the

¹ *ibid.* IV, 1, 173. (Quoted in Century Dictionary under *Trivial*.)
² *ibid.*, History of the Reformation, III, 326. The Dutch original says "de triviale schoolen," quoted from Wilten's *Kerkelijk Plakod boek* (I, 146) by Woltjer, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
³ *Acta*, etc., I, 220.
⁴ *Acta*, etc., II, 32.
⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 65, 97, 132.
⁶ Van Flensburg, *op. cit.*, VII, 370, 381, 383.
⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 268, 378.

latter * * *. The pupils were often admitted in their eighth year." He refers to *Leges Scholæ Leovardiensis* (1638, reprinted 1701) as typical. In these we have: "On the whole no pupils were admitted who did not know how to read; declining and conjugating are the chief subjects, and then come explanations of passages from Latin and Greek authors."¹ So far everything seems to point to the use of the word trivial to indicate a Latin school.²

That in Holland no change had come in the signification of the word even as late as the middle of the eighteenth century seems to be indicated in the following extract from a letter read in the Classis of Amsterdam in 1751. It tells of the education of an applicant for ordination to the ministry.

"He in order to have him study Latin and Greek, had placed him in the trivial school at Utrecht, with the co-rector there, until the time that he should publicly graduate. Subsequently he was placed at the house of Rev. Peter Wynstok at Harderwyk, in September, 1736."³

These references seem to show clearly that the seventeenth century school was a Latin school, probably attended not only by boys in their teens, as in our present American Latin schools, but quite as likely by boys from 8 years of age and upward. This, then, is what we should naturally and normally understand to be the school contemplated by Stuyvesant and the Lords Directors in 1652.

Let us now examine the general situation for confirmation or contradiction. Even a casual reading of the letter of the directors, as given above, makes it clear that some new kind of school had been recommended by Stuyvesant and accepted by the Lords Directors. It was yet to be "established," and "a beginning might be made with one schoolmaster." Clearly the elementary school of which Vestensz had charge was not a *triviale school*, else some such word as "other" or "second" would have been used in connection with the proposed school.

Thus since the original trivial school of the Middle Ages was undoubtedly conducted in Latin exclusively for instruction in grammar, etc., since all the accessible contemporary records indicate substantially a continuance of the same instruction, since the eighteenth century reference explicitly asserts that Latin was then taught in the Utrecht trivial school, and since the only pertinent document is otherwise unintelligible, we seem not only authorized, but compelled, with the present lights before us, to conclude that this 1652 school in New Amsterdam was an elementary Latin school designed probably to

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 94, 95.

² Other references pointing in the same direction are found in Boddinck, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 37, 38, 93; *Monumenta Germaniæ Pedagogica*, vol. 2, pp. 116, 374, 377, 381, 383, 621; *ibid.*, vol. 38, pp. 68, 241; *ibid.*, vol. 41, pp. 24-6. Reitsma and Van Veen, *op. cit.*, vii, 237-238.

³ *Ecol. Rec.*, p. 2162. This is almost certainly the Jerome School above referred to.

teach the rudiments of that language to the boys of the more aristocratically conditioned of the New Amsterdam settlers.

Of the subsequent history of the school thus provided we know next to nothing. That it was actually established, we presume from the following council minute of date December 9, 1652:

On the petition of Jan Monjoer de la Montagne, director general and council order the receiver general, Cornelis van Tienhoven, to pay the petitioner three or four months wages.¹

Should any object that "three or four months" is not enough to bridge over the gap between April 4th (the date of the letter authorizing the school) and December 9th (the date of the minute), the answer appears easy. The letter might take a month or two, or even more to arrive. Another month might be required to put the school into operation. The indefiniteness of "three or four months wages" sounds as if the authorities did not care to keep exactly abreast of their accounts. In short, in view of what has gone before, and in the absence of any other known reason why the younger Montagne should receive wages, the coincidences are so great as practically to compel belief that the school was begun and that it did continue for at least "three or four months." How much longer the school continued can not be stated. As Montagne left for Holland in the summer of 1654, we have no difficulty in concluding that the school did not last longer than two years, at the most.²

That the "city tavern" housed this school may well be true, though there is no evidence other than the letter quoted. Later, this building became the stadhuis or city hall. There is good reason to suppose that in 1652-53, it was not used as a tavern, but had become a public storehouse for old lumber and a lodging house for chance unfortunates.³ Certainly the evidence does not warrant the slur sometimes cast that New Amsterdam schools were kept in taphouses.

The establishment of the next Latin school was due to the persistence of one of the ministers, Domine Drisius, who—as the Lords Directors wrote to Stuyvesant (1658)—"has repeatedly expressed to us his opinion that he thought it advisable to establish there a Latin school."⁴ The Lords Directors further said they had "no objection to this project * * * but you must not fail to inform us how such an institution can be managed to the best advantage of the community and kept up with the least expense to the company." (The Lords Directors always expected Stuyvesant to report on details and keep down expenses.)

Domine Drisius, as we may well believe, also stirred up the city fathers. At any rate, on September 19 of the same year, the burgo-

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., v. 95.

² Baker's History of Harlem, p. 780.

³ See Rec. of N. A., I, 140, 219, 220-2, 305.

⁴ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 419.

masters and schepens petitioned the Lords Directors in behalf of the proposed school: "The burghers and inhabitants are inclined to have their children instructed in the useful languages, the chief of which is the Latin tongue." The nearest such school is "at Boston, in New England, a great distance from here." The petitioners further state their belief that if a suitable master be sent, "many of the neighboring places would send their children hither to be instructed." They hoped that the school thus established "increasing from year to year" might "finally attain to an academy [university], whereby this place arriving at great splendor, your honors shall have the reward and praise next to God the Lord." They close by saying, "on your honors sending us a schoolmaster we shall endeavor to have constructed a suitable place or school."¹ This last clause fits well with the practice before seen of the city's furnishing the school-building. The Lords Directors wrote, February 15, 1659, that "the arguments brought forward * * * have induced us to decide" that "a fit and honest man" shall be sent "to instruct the children in the elements and foundations of the [Latin] language," care being taken that he writes a good hand, to teach the children calligraphy."²

The following extract from the minutes of the Amsterdam Chamber shows in detail the selection of the rector for the school, his salary, the custom of furnishing the books, the "gratuity" and how it was profitably invested, and permission to give private instructions. The reference to the garden or orchard is probably in view of the fact that Dr. Curtius was a physician, and needed a herbarium.

Thursday, the 10th of April, 1659.

Before the board appeared Alexander Carolus Curtius, late professor in Lithuania, mentioned in former minutes, who offered his services. After a vote had been taken he was engaged as Latin schoolmaster in New Netherland at a yearly salary of 500 fl., of which one-quarter shall be paid to him in advance, that he may procure what books he requires. The board further grants him a gratuity of 100 fl., which the company will lay out in available merchandise to be used by him upon his arrival in New Netherland, where a piece of land convenient for a garden or orchard shall be allotted to him by the director general. He shall also be allowed to give private instructions, as far as this can be done without prejudice to duties for which he is engaged.³

The new master sailed in the *Bever* on April 25, but "the books required by the schoolmaster now coming over for the instruction of the young people in Latin could not be procured in the short time before the sailing of these ships. They will be sent by the next opportunity."⁴

Curtius arrived, opened his school, and afterwards appeared before the burgomasters on July 4. He was "informed that 200 fl. are allowed him as a yearly present from the city; an order on the treasurer is also handed him for fl. 50, over and above." From this distance the court seems generous; but Curtius was not easily pleased.

¹ Rec. of N. A., III, 15-6.

² N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 430.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 437.

"He thankfully accepts, but requests as he has but few scholars as yet that his salary may be somewhat increased, as the beginning entails great expense, saying whenever he gets 25 to 30 children to the school he shall serve for less salary."¹

We note then that the city authorities gave a part of the salary, not quite half as much as the company. Curtius was evidently interested in the financial aspect of his position. Just six weeks later Stuyvesant writes to Holland that "Curtius complains of his salary." He asks "whether a reasonable sum may not be granted to him for board money." Stuyvesant bears cordial testimony to Curtius's success; "as to his services and diligence we must truly testify that his industry is astonishing and the progress of the young people remarkable." Stuyvesant further asks "whether it is not possible to receive by somebody's recommendation and intervention from the Botanical Garden at Leyden some medicinal seeds and plants."²

The Lords Directors promised to send "the medicinal seeds," and the following April (1660) they were sent. Their purposes are sufficiently explained in the following extract:

As we are told that Rector Curtius practices medicine there, and therefore asked to have a herbarium sent to him, we have been willing to provide him with one herewith. You will hand it to him with the understanding that it shall not cease to be property of the company.³

From January to September we find the Domine Rector Alexander Carolus Curtius engaged in a suit at law about the purchase price of a hog. Neither party to the suit had been present at the sale, each acting through an agent. On January 13 the case was called: "Defendant Alexander in default. Plaintiff demands benefit of the default." The court overruled. "Daniel Tourneur appearing, declares to have sold a hog for Capt. Jacob to Alexander Carolus Curtius for five beavers—two beavers down and the remaining three at the end of the month."⁴ At the next session, January 20: "Defendant offers an exception as not being amenable before this court, but before the director general and council." The court overruled. The domine's agent, Jan Schryver, then testifies that the hog was purchased for "two beavers and two blankets." The court orders "both sides to summon their witnesses against the next court to confront them with each other."⁵

It is three weeks before the next entry. Curtius appears with his witnesses. Schryver repeats his testimony, "offering to confirm the same on oath." "Capt. Jacob is ordered to summon Daniel Tourneur at the next court day."⁶ A week later both sides are present. "Daniel Tourneau declares that after many words of

¹ Rec. of N. A., vii, 223-4.

² N. Y. Col. Rec., xiv, 446.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 462.

⁴ Rec. of N. A., vii, 98-9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

praising and bidding the hog was sold to Dom^e Rector for five beavers, saying that Capt. Jacob would not sell that hog for less than five beavers, which was told to the rector; to which the rector answered—saying, in God's name he had but two beavers and he must wait for the other three, to which Capt. Jacob would hardly agree; finally, through the mediation of Joannes van der Meulen, he let himself be persuaded, offering to confirm the same on oath. Jan Schyver declares that Dom^e Rector bought the hog for two blankets and two beavers; offering also to confirm the same on oath. The court gave parties eight days respite to recollect themselves, and if they have any proof to bring it also in." After this Curtius seems to have avoided the issue, and apparently the case was allowed to "rock along." On June 1, and again on August 24, the defendant was "in default." But on the latter date both witnesses were present and both offered to "confirm their declaration by oath." For some reason not made clear the court tendered the oath to Daniel Tourneur, who having taken the same, "the defendant was condemned to pay the plaintiff the five beavers, which he promised for the hog in question." Apparently we have in this legal proceeding some trace of the old compurgation. One wonders why that other witness was not allowed to swear. Possibly he "backed down" at the last moment. On the 7th of September appears the closing entry. Curtius acknowledged the judgment, "saying for this time he submits to the same."²

That Curtius was "out for the almighty dollar," even at that early day, has already been made evident. We noted that when an out and out present of 250 guilders was given him, he asked that it be made larger. We saw six weeks later his request to Stuyvesant and the directors for an increased salary from the company. Not only did he ask for more salary from his school, but he practiced medicine on the side; and besides, in the judgment of the court, tried to cheat at a hog trade. And even more, he objected to paying the excise, claiming that "whereas professors, preachers, and rectors are exempt from excise in Holland," he should be exempt here. He further claimed that "the director general has granted him free excise." But in this matter again he lost; "the court decided that the D^e Rector shall pay the excise."³

Nor was this all. During the continuance of the suit about the hog, it came to the ears of the burgomasters "that the rector of his own pleasure takes one beaver [eight guilders] per quarter from each boy, which is contrary to the order" "that he should take six guilders per quarter school money for each boy." The burgomasters thereupon gave him "warning and notice not to take any more than what is fixed upon by the honorable director general and burgomas-

¹ Rep. of N. A., 711, 122.

² *Ibid.*, p. 201.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

ters, or through neglect thereof burgomasters will retain his yearly stipend which the rector receives from this city."¹ But this threat did not stop the practice. Some six months later he was brought before the burgomasters again on the same charge. This time he defended himself, saying that "at the beginning of school the parents of his pupils came to him urging him to teach the children well, which he promised to do and has done more than usual, but he must also have more than was allowed, for which they have promised him one beaver."² What the court this time decided, we do not know, but he was soon after compelled to give up his place.

In this connection the question of the rector's income from the school naturally arises. The first year, exclusive of tuition, he received 850 guilders from the company and the city together. Of this, however, only 700 guilders continued to succeeding years. His tuition can hardly be estimated directly with any certainty; but a court record of July 12, 1661, affords an indirect basis of approximation. On the day named he asked the burgomasters and schepens whether the city would "contribute to him 600 guilders a year in beavers on condition of [his] receiving no contribution from the youth."³ He had already been receiving 200 guilders from the city, so that he could hardly have been getting more than 400 guilders in tuition fees, else he would not offer for 600 guilders. If we add 400 guilders tuition money to the salary as given above, we have some 1,250 guilders as the maximum income from the school.⁴ That this is considerably more than the elementary master received need not surprise us. The rector of a Latin school was on a distinctly higher plane, much more nearly equal to the position of the clergyman.

This tuition income enables us to approximate the number of pupils in average attendance. The school, we may believe, was in session four quarters. This would mean an average income from tuition fees of 100 guilders per quarter, which at the legal rate of tuition fees would have meant a paying average of some 17 pupils. Evidently his expressed hope of 25 or 30 pupils was never realized. Aegidius Luyck, who succeeded Curtius, had at one time an enrollment of 20, with 10 or 12 more expected. We may conclude that 20 or 25 is probably as high a figure as Curtius's enrollment ever attained.

Concerning the success which attended the efforts of Dr. Curtius, we are compelled to chronicle an apparent decline during his term of service. At first all went well. Shortly after the school was

¹ Rec. of N. A., vii, 257.

² Minutes of the Orphan Masters, etc.; II, 76.

³ Rec. of N. A., III, 344.

⁴ In this discussion nothing has been said of the vexed question of two kinds of currency, provincial and Holland.

begun, Stuyvesant wrote: "As to his services and diligence, we must truly testify that his industry is astonishing and the progress of the young people remarkable." Curtius himself told the burgomasters that he had "done more than usual." His fame seems to have spread to the South River (Delaware), for the vice-director there wrote (Mar. 15, 1660) to Stuyvesant: "I kindly request that your honor will permit me, when an opportunity is offered, to visit the Manhattans in May or June. I intend to bring my two oldest boys to school."¹ But this early success was not maintained. The burgomasters were informed that D^r Curtius "does not keep strict discipline over the boys in his school, who fight among themselves and tear the clothes from each other's bodies, which he should prevent or punish." His reply, it must be confessed, belongs to the universal brotherhood of teachers: "Concerning the discipline he says his hands are bound, as some people do not wish to have their children punished, and he requests that the burgomasters would make a rule or law for the school."²

The career of Curtius in New Amsterdam ended a few months after this appearance before the burgomasters. The Lords Directors took the matter into their own hands and dismissed him, whether for incompetence or on account of his contumacy to the burgomasters does not appear. That he did not leave of his own accord seems evident from Stuyvesant's letter: "What Alexander Carolus Curtius, the rector or Latin schoolmaster, dismissed by your honors, has remonstrated and requested of us on his departure, your honors can deduce from his annexed petition."³ If only we had the records of the West India Company and could see this petition, our curiosity as to what he remonstrated might be satisfied; but as matters now are this is the last known of D^r Curtius. His term of service extended, apparently, for just two years, from July, 1659, to July, 1661.

We may call attention to the fact that this Latin school was controlled and supported in much the same way as was the elementary school of New Amsterdam. The company paid the salary for the most part, while the burgomasters supplemented this and furnished the schoolhouse.⁴ Tuition was charged at rates "fixed upon by the honorable director general and burgomasters." In general, the school was looked upon as a city school, and as such was regulated by the burgomasters of the city.

¹ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 24. Vice Director Beekman could not have wished to move his boys from Evert Pietersen's elementary school in order to place them under Hoboken. Pietersen was admittedly the better man.

² Administrative Minutes, Feb. 25, 1661. (Minutes of the Orphan Masters, II, 76.)

³ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁴ We saw that the city promised to "endeavor to have constructed a suitable place or school." That it did so appears from Curtius's statement to the burgomasters, when his discipline was under review, that "it is also necessary that his school (house) should be enlarged."

After the dismissal of Curtius the Latin school lapsed for nearly a year. In February of 1662, Domine Aegidius Luyck, "S. S. Ministerii Candidatus," aged about 21, sailed from New Amster, "called for the private instruction of the director general's children."¹ He proved very acceptable to Stuyvesant on account of his "good method of inculcating the first principles of the Latin and Greek languages, as in writing, arithmetic, catechizing, and *honorum mortem praxis*."² The success of the young ministerial student becoming known, plans were made to employ "him in the *Rectoratum* of this city," the place previously occupied by Curtius. The director general and council recommended the scheme to the Lords Directors, and the burgomasters likewise wrote requesting that it be carried out. Relying on the basis of the precedent set by the Lords Directors in the case of Curtius, and influenced by the appeals now made, Stuyvesant "deemed it proper," in D^e Luyck's own words, "to employ me for this end, promising that he would advise and recommend to the Lords Directors that a salary might be allowed me." Accordingly in May, 1662, the provisionally appointed rector took up the work of the New Amsterdam Latin School laid down by Curtius some 10 months before. Stuyvesant said of Luyck's efforts, they "far excel the instructions of the late rector, Alexander Carolus Curtius, as will be testified by the ministers of the holy word of God and other competent judges."³

The question of salary was to be determined when the Lords Directors should announce their pleasure.⁴ "With this looking forward I remained satisfied," says Luyck, "returned to my school, and exerted every nerve so that the number of my pupils was increased to twenty, among whom were two from Virginia and two from Fort Orange, and ten or twelve more from the two aforesaid places were expected, while others were intending to board with me."⁴

When the Lords Directors neglected to make known their decision, Luyck petitioned to the director general and council, July 30, 1663, for a salary. Stuyvesant favored the request, but for some reason the council declined to act, still referring Luyck to the Lords Directors. The young domine turned in distress to his noble patron, from whom he received a most characteristic reply: "My advice on the request of the Rev. Aegidius Luyck is that I condescend to acquiesce in the majority of votes." He was nevertheless of opinion "that the instruction of the youth with well-regulated schools is not less serviceable or less required than even church service," and closed the letter by telling Luyck that "he ought to enjoy the quality and salary which

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., II, 400, xii, 361; Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

² Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 33-4.

⁴ *Ibid.* The date of beginning is fixed by a statement of Stuyvesant's made August 9, 1663, that the school had then been in operation "during five quarters of a year."

the Lords Directors granted to the first Latin master, Alexander Carolus Curtius."¹ Shortly after this Luyck received letters "from his father and mother, showing that the proposal of the director general should be answered, and that the transactions of the director general in this case were approved." He thereupon renewed "his humble request that it may please your honors to appoint and confirm the supplicant, either absolutely or provisionally, in the solicited *Rectorate*, with the ordinary salary." If they were not willing to do this, he asked permission "to go with the vessels now lying ready to sail on a short trip, under God's guidance, to the Fatherland, to solicit there in person—the desired appointment with the salary annexed to it. As the common proverb says, 'No better messenger than the man himself.'"²

A petition on the same day from the burgomasters "to the noble, great, and respected director general and council in New Netherland" that the latter should grant D^r Luyck "such a salary as your honors in their wisdom and discretion shall deem proper," is too opportune to be accidental. The two petitions accomplished the desired end. The action of the council and the accompanying action of the burgomasters were as follows:

The director general and council are, with the supplicants, of the opinion that the continuation and encouragement of the Latin school is necessary—and, as it is customary in our Fatherland, that such persons by the cities which make use of them are engaged, so are the supplicants authorized by this, to allow such a salary to the aforesaid Rev. Luyck as they shall deem reasonable—of which salary director general and council provisionally upon the approbation of the noble directors shall pay the half. 16th August, 1663.

Nota.—In virtue of this authorization the burgomasters agreed with the Rev. Aegidius Luyck that he shall receive annually in seewant (wampum) at 8*l.* for a *st.*, a thousand *gl.*, of which the company shall pay the half.³

The salary here voted to Luyck is not quite what Curtius had received. Seewant money or wampum at this time had only half the value of coin, so the "thousand *gl.*" thus voted was only 500 guilders, Hollands. Curtius, we saw, received 500 guilders, Hollands, from the company and 200 guilders from the city. It seems probable that this latter was reckoned in wampum. If so, Luyck's 500 guilders, Hollands, is to be compared with Curtius' 600 guilders of the same basis. It is to be noted, moreover, that this salary was voted provisionally upon ratification of the Lords Directors. But since the company's share of Luyck's salary, as promised by Stuyvesant, was only 250 guilders—just half what Curtius had received from that source—we need not doubt that the Lords Directors approved; and it is quite possible that they authorized an appropriation more nearly equal to that of Curtius. That Luyck charged

¹ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 32-34.

² *Ibid.*, p. 34.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

tuition we could have concluded from the general custom, even if we had no explicit statement to that effect.

Few subsequent records of Luyck's work in the Latin school remain. He was married "the second day of Christmas," 1663, to Judith van Isendoorn. Domine Selyns, on the occasion, wrote two poems, the title of one of which shows Luyck's continued service in the Latin school: "Bridal torch for Rev. Aegidius Luyck, rector of the Latin school at New Amsterdam, and Judith Van Isendoorn, lighted shortly after the Esopus murder committed at Wiltwyck, in New Netherland, by the Indians, in the year 1663."¹ In February of the succeeding year Luyck contributed 200 florins to the defense of the city. Pietersen contributed 100, while Stuyvesant contributed 1,000. At the taking of New Amsterdam by the English in September of 1664 Luyck was present and apparently furnished aid in defense of the city.² A month later he took the oath of allegiance to the English.³ In May, 1665, he left with Stuyvesant for the Fatherland.⁴ On October 22, 1665, he signs a statement as "Aegidius Luyck, late rector of the Latin school in New Amsterdam."⁵ It seems clear that Luyck continued at the head of the Latin school until the English occupation. Whether he continued after that, as did Pietersen we can not say. Since there is no petition on his part for a salary from the city, as there is in the case of Pietersen, the probabilities would seem to be against it. At any rate his teaching career in America came to an end not later than May of 1665, for at that time he departed for Holland. Some, indeed, have said that he maintained his school continuously until the second English occupation in 1674, but the evidence against this is conclusive. After Luyck's return to Holland, he resumed his study for the ministry, and was in September of 1666 "received as recommended" for ordination by the Classis of Amsterdam.⁶ About a year later (August, 1667) he expressed to the classis his intention of returning to New York, and asked permission to be ordained "in that land if opportunity offered."⁷ He did subsequently come to New York, but probably not until after June 5, 1670, for at that time we find our old friend, Evert Pietersen, reading the sermons when D^r Drisius was not well enough to preach.⁸ Since D^r Luyck served in 1671-72 as a supply for D^r Drisius, we can then feel sure that Pietersen would not have acted in this capacity had Luyck been in the city at the time.

In March of 1671 we learn that "Domine Luyck by reason of y^e weakness of Domine Drisius now several tymes hath taught y^e

¹ For both poems and English translations, see Murphy's Anthology, p. 137.

² N. Y. Col. Doc., II, 469.

³ *Ibid.*, III, 76.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 470-1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 469.

⁶ Eccl. Rec., p. 582.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 589.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 610.

word of God, with good satisfaction to this Court and y^e Inhabitants of this City;" and it was "agreed upon that from henceforth on Sabbath days y^e W^ord of God should be taught in y^e forenoon by Domine Drisius and in y^e afternoone by y^e said Domine Luyck."¹

During this time he is referred to as "Aegidius Luyck, Merchant," and he is stated to have owned "one-sixteenth part of the ship Good Fame of New York."² After a year of service as assistant to D^r Drisius, the court allowed him "by way of gratuity—the sum of 400 guilders seewant."³ A reference in September, 1672, shows his continued stay in the city.⁴ In 1673, when the Dutch retook New York, he was nominated as schepen of the city, but was chosen by Governor Colve, as burgomaster.⁵ In this capacity he served on several important commissions, and at the same time acted as captain in the militia.⁶ During this brief rule of the Dutch there was compiled "a valuation of the best and most affluent inhabitants of this city," 62 names in all. The average wealth of these was 8,400 guilders, Luyck was assessed at 5,000 guilders, and Pietersen at 2,000. The median of list was between 4,000 and 5,000.⁷ Whether Luyck attained his position of "affluence" by inheritance, by marriage, from his Latin school, or by his merchandise, we can not say. We will not suggest that he used improperly his positions as "commissary of provisions" and "receiver of confiscated property;" though at a much later date the coincidence of wealth and two such positions in the case of a whilom schoolmaster, might lead to such suspicions.

When the English came the second time, "Mynheer Domine, burgomaster and captain," got into trouble over the oath of allegiance; and apparently his property was in turn confiscated.⁸ He left New York in May,⁹ 1676, and his name no more appears in the records.

As to the school itself thus conducted by Curtius and Luyck there is little to add. Internally it was most probably as exact a reproduction of the schools in the Fatherland as conditions in New Netherland would allow. The textbooks used may be assumed with some probability from the following list sent by the East India Company some 10 years before (1653) to a similar school in one of their eastern possessions:

¹ Rec. of N. A., vi, 292.

² Second Annual Report of the State Historian of N. Y., p. 313.

³ Rec. of N. A., vi, 365.

⁴ Second Annual Report of State Historian of N. Y., p. 361.

⁵ Rec. of N. A., vi, 390, 398.

⁶ N. Y. Col. Doc., II, 602, 625, 631, 638, 644, 670, 685.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 669-700.

⁸ Third Annual Report of the State Historian of N. Y., pp. 283, 35, 286, 344, 383, 385, 396-397, 401, 404, 412, 430-431.

⁹ Eccl. Rec., p. 686.

2 Calepini dictionaria octo linguarum; 12 Florilegia Langii; 12 Apophthegmata et Similia Lycosthenis; 12 Progymnasmata Antonii; 20 Proœdiæ Smetii; 20 Thesauri poetici; 12 Psalterii Buchananii.¹

The support and control of this school was much the same as of the New Amsterdam elementary school, the main difference being that no ecclesiastical body is mentioned so much as once in connection with the selection or certification of either Latin master. Another difference was that while the city seemed not to give the elementary master any stipend other than house rent, in the case of both Curtius and Luyck, the burgomasters furnished a good portion of the salary.

It is pleasing to see in the records references to the "renown and glory" which should come to the city from the possession of "well-regulated" schools. Stuyvesant considered these "not less serviceable or less required than even church service." The authorities had high hopes for their Latin school; but a hostile nation intervened before the city could reach "the great splendor" of seeing the Latin school "attain to an university."

¹ Acta der Part. Synoden van Zuid-Holland, III, 374. From a footnote on the page noted we present the following:

The first book on the list had originally been published in 1502 at Reggio. The edition here used was probably of Paris (1600) or of Lyons (1634). The eight languages were Latin, Hebrew, Greek, French, Italian, Spanish, and English. The full title of the second was Joseph Langius, *Anthologia seu florilegium locorum communium*. The third on the list was Cow Lycosthenes, *Apophthegmata ex probatis Græcis Latinæque linguæ scriptoribus, Cudoni*, 1610 (for a description, see Foster Watson, *English Grammar Schools*, p. 425-426). The next was published in Leiden in 1626 and at Amsterdam in 1642. Of the fifth and sixth nothing can be added. The full title of the last was George Buchanan, *Paraphrasis Psalmorum Davids poetica*. First edition Antwerp, 1582.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLMASTERS OF NEW NETHERLAND.

Reserving for the moment the discussion of the formal private schools, attention may be called to two known cases of private tutors. One of these, Aegidius Luyck, has already been discussed at length in the preceding chapter, where it was pointed out that he was "called for the private instruction of the director general's children," and that he taught them "the first principles of the Latin and Greek languages, writing, arithmetic, catechizing, and *honorum morum praxis*."

The second tutor, Jacques Cortelyou, is perhaps a more important personage than Aegidius Luyck. He was the first settler and early patron of the village of New Utrecht and the founder of the well-known Cortelyou family of this State. Cortelyou came over to America about 1652, apparently in order to serve as "tutor to the son of the Hon. Mr. Werckhoven." Unfortunately we know nothing of his teaching career other than the bare facts above stated; but his contemporaries have left numerous comments upon the man himself. Dr. van Zuuren, of Long Island, for instance, submitted a disputed salary case to Cortelyou when he was "the justice of New Utrecht," remarking in connection that "he, although not of our religion, is a man of good understanding, especially in philosophy and in the mathematics of Descartes."¹ Dankers and Sluyter, those eccentric religious enthusiasts, say of him "he had studied philosophy in his youth, and spoke Latin and good French. He was a mathematician and sworn land surveyor. He had also formerly learned several sciences, and had some knowledge of medicine. The worst of it was he was a good Cartesian and not a good Christian, regulating himself and all externals by reason and justice only."² Many evidently even in more favored times have had tutors less learned and less capable than had Van Werckhoven in this Jacques Cortelyou.

The fact that dame schools were common in Holland at the time of American colonization should lead us to expect their presence in New Netherland, and they may have been here, but no case has appeared during the Dutch period, and very few among the Dutch during the English régime.³ If Stuyvesant included dame schools under his regulations governing private schools, later to be discussed, we might

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 718.

² Long Island Hist. Soc. Pub., I, 128.

³ See pp. 173, 187, 189.

say that the silence of the records indicates that no dame taught school in New Amsterdam. However, it seems somewhat doubtful that the authorities would be as strict with an old woman teaching in her kitchen—such was the custom with school dames—as with a more pretentious school. This consideration and the fragmentary character of the council records forbid one's placing much reliance upon the argument from silence. A confession of discreet ignorance seems the wisest course. The only assertion to be made is that, if there were dame schools in New Netherland, no trace of them has come down to us.

If we know nothing of school dames in New Netherland, it is quite otherwise with private schoolmasters. There is no probability that all who taught privately have left traces in the records; but enough is known of a few to add an interesting if short chapter to the history of Dutch education in America.¹ The first certain reference is of date 1649, when "the worthy Adriaen Jansen van Ipendam, at present schoolmaster here on the island of Manhattan," executed a legal paper before the official notary.² Since there is no evidence tending to connect this Van Ipendam with the official school on Manhattan, we infer that he was a private master, and suppose that he was one of the schoolmasters mentioned by Tienhoven in his rejoinder to the Remonstrance (about 1649-1650): "The other schoolmasters keep school in hired houses, so that the youth, considering the circumstances of the country, are not in want of schools."³ Beyond this we have found nothing regarding Ipendam's school keeping on Manhattan. In 1651 he had a school in Beverwyck (Albany), where his further career will be treated.⁴

David Provoost, sr., was a prominent citizen of New Amsterdam, where he lived from about 1641 to about 1656. He died in the last-named year, apparently on Long Island. Quite possibly Provoost taught for many years on Manhattan, and likely enough was also one of Tienhoven's masters who kept school in "hired houses." The baptism records of the New Amsterdam Church give the names of children of "M^r David Provoost" baptized in 1645 and 1646.⁵ The title "M^r" under the circumstances almost certainly means that he was teaching as early as 1645. Our first explicit reference to his school, however, is in a council minute of February 12, 1652, when the heretical Anna Smits was directed by the director general and council

¹ A good résumé of the private schoolmasters of New Netherland, trustworthy on the whole, is found in Pratt's *Annals*, pp. 51-55. Valentine's discussion in the *Corporation Manual* of 1861s, unfortunately, not reliable.

² N. Y. Col. MSS., III, 60.

³ *Narratives of New Netherland*, p. 302. The translation here used is Mr. Van Laer's amending of Prof. Jameson's.

⁴ See p. 120.

⁵ N. Y. Gen. and Bjo. Soc. Coll., II, 19, 20.

to "appear on the following Wednesday at the school of David Provoost, where the nine men usually met."¹

Two years later Provoost brought suit against Joost Carelsen for school money, the record of which we give in full in order that the reader may for himself correct an error of O'Callaghan's in including Carelsen among the private schoolmasters of New Amsterdam.²

City Hall, Monday, August 24, 1654.

David Provoost, plff., v/s. Joost Carelsen, deft., demands payment of fl. 8 for school money. Deft. confesses the debt, but says that Michael Poulisen deducted the same from his rent and he thought all along that it had been paid. Parties being heard, deft. is condemned to pay plff.³

City Hall, Monday, August 31, 1654.

Joost Carelsen, plff., v/s. Mary d'Karman, deft., demands payment of fl. 8, which he is condemned to pay D. Provoost and which is deducted from his rent. Deft. says she paid plff. his rent in full according to receipt, and that she paid D. Provoost 8 gl. school money herself in the presence of plff. The court orders that parties shall appear before the board on the next court day, with D. Provoost, senior, in order to be heard on the premises.⁴

It is quite evident from this that Joost Carelsen was a patron (delinquent at that), and not a schoolmaster. As no other reference connects Carelsen with the schoolroom, we must conclude that O'Callaghan read carelessly the records of the case in court.

It may be asked whether the 8 fl., for which Provoost sued, represented a year's tuition for one child. This is not asserted in the records, and the probabilities are against it. Reducing this to the same basis as Pietersen's tuition schedule, fl. 8 a year would mean only 40 stivers a quarter, which is less than the average rate allowed to Pietersen, who had besides a fixed salary that probably furnished much the larger part of his remuneration. Furthermore, at Albany in 1660, we find Van Ipendam charging "two beavers (i. e., 16 fl.) for one year's school money." We can not agree then that we have in the "8 fl. for school money" any information as to the rate of tuition charged by Provoost. We may note in concluding with Provoost that his general standing in the community speaks rather well for the position of private master.

In the council minutes of September 2, 1652, we find:

On the petition of Hans Steyn, soliciting permission to teach school—granted.⁵

There was a Hans Steen, a corporal, condemned in 1639 for improper conduct "to ride three hours on the wooden horse and do duty as a soldier during fourteen days." Another Hans Steyn in 1638 was a midshipman. Probably neither of these was the teacher. Apparently the man to whom the license was issued continued to live in

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 156.

² Rec. of N. A., i, 220.

³ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁴ Register of New Netherland, p. 130.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 234-5.

New Amsterdam until about 1666.¹ We know nothing else of his teaching.

Andries Hudde held many offices in New Netherland during nearly the whole Dutch occupation. His request for license is interesting on account of the answer returned.

Andries Hudde appeared before the director general and council and solicited a license to keep school, received for answer that the council shall ask upon his proposal the opinion of the minister and the consistory. Done in New Amsterdam, 31 December, 1654.²

Just why the opinion of the minister and consistory should be asked is not clear. If the ministers only had been named, we could easily suppose that they had been appealed to as expert judges of educational qualifications. But the opinion of the consistory in this regard could add nothing. When we take into account the ecclesiastical hatred of heretical teachers common in Holland, and Stuyvesant's fanatical zeal against heretical sects, we are inclined to wonder whether suspicion may not have rested on Hudde's orthodoxy. Some such question as this seems the most probable consideration which could prompt the director general and council to ask the opinion of the minister and consistory. That Hudde should have wished to teach is strange considering his many business concerns. Whether his request was granted we can not say, as this is the only known thing connecting him also with school keeping.

The basis on which the name of Frans Claessen is included among the private masters has not hitherto been presented to the reading public. The record is interesting not only historically but also as showing that even a Dutch schoolmaster had a very human side.

On Monday, June 26, 1656, Jan Vinje, who lived apparently next door to Claessen, brought suit against his neighbor for damage to his growing garden, saying that he "found last Saturday, deft.'s son with three or four other school boys among his peas and corn," where "they did much damage * * * by their footprints." He further stated that he had spoken to Claessen about the matter; but that the latter proved "obstinate" and gave him "much abusive talk." Claessen told the court that he was "ignorant that his son and school mates had been in pltf. corn, or had done any damage there." He further stated that Vinje had "beat his son with a stick black and blue." Vinje thereupon proved by two witnesses "that he found deft.'s son and boys among the peas and hunted them away." After hearing this the court appointed two neighbors to inspect and assess the damage.³ When the parties were summoned to hear the decision of the arbitrators, Vinje added to his former grievance the further

¹ N. Y. Gen. and Ho. Soc. Coll., II, 32, 52, 55, 64, 75.

² Rec. of N. A., II, 122.

³ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

complaint that Claessen's "hens and pigs still daily run among his corn;" and he asked authority to kill them if they were not kept out. We are not told what the arbitrators had to say, but Claessen was evidently by this time much excited. He declared that the children had not taken or injured anything to the value of a pea's pod;" that "his son had already been beaten therefor by pltf., so that he came home black and blue;" "that many other children, when they came out of school, were in there;" and finally closed by denying "that his hens or pigs run in pltf.'s land or corn." Vinje then acknowledged "to have struck deft.'s son at the time. He could not catch any other but him." The court having heard both decided, "since pltf. acknowledges to have beaten and punished deft.'s son, that he has destroyed his right;" and accordingly dismissed the suit with an order "that deft. shall keep his hens and pigs out of the corn."¹

That Frans Claessen was the master of these "school boys" is evident from two distinct references to them as his boys. Vinje found "deft's son and boys among corn and peas,"² and the arbitrators refer to the damage done to the corn "by Frans Jansen's boys."³ Valentine says: "In 1660 Frans Claessen kept a private school in this city. He died in 1662."⁴ The second date is wrong. So far as appears the data given above in the court case include all that is known of his school keeping. But on the 26th of September, 1657, there was baptized in New Amsterdam a child of "Mr. Frans Claszeen" and "Immetje Direks."⁵ The title "Mr." fixes the father as the schoolmaster under consideration. Four years later (Oct. 26) appears in court records a reference to "Immetje Direks, widow of Frans Claessen."⁶ It is thus clear that the "Mr. Frans Claessen" who was teaching in 1656 had died before October 26, 1660.

In connection with the next private master, Jacobus van Corlaer, we have a very clear statement of the requirement that one must obtain consent from the director general and council before undertaking to teach school in New Amsterdam.

Corlaer had been in the colony since 1633.⁷ Our first information connecting him with the schoolroom is of February 19, 1658; when Stuyvesant's police officer "was directed to proceed to the house of Jacobus van Corlaer, who for some time past has undertaken to keep a school in this city * * * and to order the same to cease

¹ Rec. of N. A., II, p. 137.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 134. He seems to have been called indifferently Frans Claessen and Frans Janssen. See *ibid.*, p. 126.

⁴ Corporation Manual, 1863, p. 346.

⁵ Coll. of N. Y. Gen. and Blo. Soc., II, 47.

⁶ Rec. of N. A., III, 236.

⁷ Narratives of New Netherland, p. 203, note.

holding school, until he has asked for and obtained the consent in proper form.¹ When Corlaer was thus compelled to close school, his patrons becoming "greatly interested thereby" petitioned the burgomasters and schepens that he might be "allowed again to keep school; inasmuch as their children forget what the above named Jacob van Corlaer had to their great satisfaction previously taught them in reading, writing, and ciphering, which was much more than any other person, no one excepted."²

Probably it was bad tactics for the patrons to appeal from the action of the high and mighty director general and council to the less high or mighty burgomasters and schepens. The latter could do nothing but intercede with the former. They first spoke "verbally thereon;" but their "honors were not pleased to allow it, for reasons thereunto moving" them. Whereupon the worthy burgomasters and schepens in a formal address "to the right honorable director general and councillors of New Netherland" represented "with all respect that some burghers and inhabitants" of the city had petitioned them in the matter, and "they therefore, in consequence of the humble supplication of the burghers and inhabitants aforesaid, again request that your honors may be pleased to permit the above-named Corlaer again to keep school."² But Corlaer himself had not yet asked for consent in proper form; clearly he was stiff-necked and needed further disciplining. Moreover, those "burghers and inhabitants" who had been so ignorant or perverse as to direct their petition to the wrong body needed to be instructed, while the burgomasters and schepens needed to distinguish more clearly the confines of their prerogatives. To meet this situation a suitable reply sufficiently terse, sufficiently autocratic, was drafted in Stuyvesant's own style:

It was decreed: To keep a school and appoint a schoolmaster depends absolutely from the *jus patronatus*, in virtue whereof the director general and council have for good reasons forbidden it to Jacobus van Corlaer, who arrogated the same to himself without their order; and they persist in their resolution and interdict.¹

This not only made clear to the burgomasters and schepens their impotence in the matter, but also brought Van Corlaer to a proper state of submission. Before the next meeting of the council he presented his petition; but, alas, he had already gone too far in his perverseness. "For weighty reasons the director general and council decree: Nihil."³ Whether "the weighty reasons" included more than that Corlaer had "presumed to take such on himself without their order," we can not say. The record tells us nothing more. Apparently, Corlaer's teaching career was finally ended, however much he and his patrons may have objected to Stuyvesant's

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 412.

² Rec. of N. A., II, 348.

³ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 412.

act. But we are thereby the gainers, in getting so clear and distinct a statement of the law governing the licensing of private masters.

Of Jan Lubbertsen our knowledge is small indeed, being little more than is contained in the council minutes of August 13, 1658.

August 13, 1658, Tuesday.—Received the petition of Jan Lubberts, requesting consent to open a school for instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic.

It was answered:

The request is granted, provided he behave himself as such a person ought to behave.¹

Lubberts married the following June; and between December 29, 1660, and August 25, 1683, the baptisms of eight children are recorded.

It is worth while to note that Lubberts, as well as Corlaer, taught exactly the three R's. Also that the director general and council expected good behavior of schoolmasters.

The career of Jan Juriansen Becker was so checkered that we venture to present in formal outline those events of his life which took place within the year 1660, when he was licensed.

January 14. Jan Juriansen Becker at New Amstel reads the sermon on Sundays. (Cal. Dutch MSS., p. 340.)

April 1. He is indicted for selling liquor to Indians. (*Ibid.*, p. 209.)

April 9. Various persons testify in Becker's behalf that brandy is openly sold throughout the South River. (*Ibid.*)

April 12. Becker makes his defense. (*Ibid.*)

April 20. Jan Juriansen Becker, for selling liquor to the Indians, is fined 500 guilders, degraded from his office as clerk of the church, banished from the South River, and required to pay costs of the case. (*Ibid.*, p. 210.)

May 3. Becker petitions for pardon. (*Ibid.*)

May 3. His fine is remitted. (*Ibid.*)

August 19. He presents the following petition to the director general and council:

To the Right Honorable, the Valiant Director General, and the Honorable Council of New Netherland:

Jan Juriansen Becker, with due reverence, humbly shows, that owing to recent changes of fortune, he, the petitioner, not knowing what else to do, has engaged in the business of a tapster, in which he has invested nearly all his real and personal property for himself and his family, therefore, the petitioner applies to your honors, humbly beseeching and praying that your honors may please to look with compassion upon your petitioner (being a former employee of the company) and employ him as a clerk in the service of the company, either at the Esopus, here, or elsewhere, wherever your honors may think it advisable; or, in case your honors for the present can not employ him in the service, that the petitioner may then be permitted to keep school, to teach the youth reading, writing, etc., upon which he awaits a favorable decision.

Your Honors' willing servant,
(was signed) J. Becker.

Done at Amsterdam
in New Netherland,
this day, 15 August, 1660.

Voted to make this apostil:

Fiat schoolkeeping. Done at Fort Amsterdam in New Netherland.

Date as above.²

August 31. Becker is fined thirty guilders because "he entertained people [in his tap house] after nine o'clock, and tapped during the sermon"; also ten guilders "for having behaved offensively to the officer."¹

September 7. "On the petition of Jan Juriansen Becker endorsed: The court persist in the judgment by them pronounced."²

This closed his career so far as we know it, in New Amsterdam. Ten years later we learn that "Jan Jeurians Becker had a Graunt to keep y^e Dutch school at Albany for y^e teaching of youth to read and to wryte y^e which was allowed of and Confirmed" by Governor Nichols (1664-8). We may then suppose that he moved to Albany soon after 1660 and began to teach. That he was successful in his teaching we know, because Governor Lovelace "thought fit that y^e said Jan Jurians Becker who is esteened very capable that way shall be y^e allowed schoolmaster for y^e instructing of y^e youth at Albany and partes adjacent he followed y^e said Imployment Constantly & diligently and that no other be admitted to interrupt him."³

In the case of Johannes van Gelder, as with Steyn and Lubberts, we have only his license to bear witness to his teaching:

To the Noble, Great and Respected, the Director General and Council in New Netherland:

Shows reverently, Johannes van Gelder, a citizen and inhabitant of this city, how that he, your petitioner, being tolerably well acquainted with reading and writing, it has happened that several of the principal inhabitants of this city have advised and likewise encouraged him to open a public school, and consequently have induced the petitioner, who looks out for a living in an honorable way, to adopt their advice, in the hope that he shall execute this task to their satisfaction who shall make use of his service. But as this is not allowed, except upon permission previously obtained, so he addresses himself to your hon^{rs}, requesting their permission for this work, viz., keeping a public school, which doing, etc.

Your Honors' subject and servant,
Johannes van Gelder.

The apostell was.
Fiat quod petitur
21 September, 1662.⁴

The expression "public school," as used in this petition, can mean nothing more than a school open to the public. With Van Gelder ends our list of private masters at New Amsterdam. Whether there were private masters elsewhere in New Netherland we can not say. Certainly there were few, if any.

The principal things to be noted in this connection are, first, the number of private masters in addition to those of the official school. That there were several of these in 1649 must be inferred from Tienhoven's statement about the masters teaching "in hired houses." We may therefore suppose that there were more in the following decade, when the town had doubled in size. Unfortunately we have

¹ Rec. of N. A., III, p. 183.
² *Ibid.*, p. 208.

³ Munsell's Annals of Albany, IV, 15.
⁴ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

no means of knowing how long any of these private masters taught; so that we can judge but little as to how many teachers were in the city at any one time. Of the nine names considered in this chapter, four certainly taught for a greater or less length of time. Of the five remaining names, Andreas Hudde may never have taught; since we have no record of "the opinion of the minister and consistory," which was asked on his application. Jan Juriaensen Becker quite possibly never taught in Manhattan. Of Steyn, Lubbersten, and Van Gelder we have no reason to doubt that they taught, although we have no evidence of the actual fact. Probably, then, at least seven of these named men conducted private schools in New Amsterdam for a greater or less length of time; and quite probably there were also other private masters, whose connection with the schoolroom is now lost. All in all, it appears that more instruction was given by private masters than by the official school.

Second, we note that the director general and council required that their permission be first obtained before anyone could teach in New Amsterdam. Whether this was as strictly enforced all the time as it was in the case of Van Corlaer, we can not say.

It is an enlightening commentary on the inadequacy of our records that in no instance do the record of licensing and the known fact of teaching concur; that is, of those known to have been licensed we do not know that they taught, and of those known to have taught we do not know that they were licensed. But this need not make us conclude that the requirement in Van Corlaer's case was exceptional. Van Ilpendam and Provoost quite possibly began to teach under Kieft's administration; when such matters were probably not considered. In the case of Frans Claessen, we must conclude that the record of his licensing has been lost. It is to be remarked that while the city government was by Holland custom quite competent to grant licenses, the burgomasters and schepens of New Amsterdam were not allowed any participation in the matter. That belonged exclusively to the "right honorable director general and council."¹

¹ But note the case of Carel de Beauvois, p. 124.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SCHOOLS OF THE DUTCH VILLAGES OF NEW NETHERLAND.

The Dutch villages chartered during the Dutch period were, as heretofore stated, Beverwyck (Albany), Breuckelen (Brooklyn), Midwood (Flatbush), Amersfoort (Flatlands), New Amstel (New Castle, Del.), New Haerlem (Harlem), Wiltwyck (Kingston), Bergen, Boswyck (Bushwick), and New Utrecht. For our present purposes we may add Stuyvesant's Bouwery, although this was never chartered.¹

Beverwyck (Albany) may be said to have been founded about 1630 by Kiliaen Van Rensselaer, whose patroonship included a considerable body of land in the neighborhood. Rensselaerwyck, the colony, grew but slowly; Beverwyck, the village, which in 1643 was "composed of about one hundred persons," in 1646 had no more than ten houses.² We have seen above that in the case of these patroonships, the "patroons and colonists" were to endeavor as quickly as possible to find some means whereby they might support a minister and a schoolmaster, and "for the first" they should procure a comforter of the sick. The early records of this colony are fairly adequate and give proof that no comforter of the sick was ever sent to it. It was 1642 before a minister was brought over, and 1648 before we hear definitely of a schoolmaster. He, it appears, kept no more than a private school. Evidently this item of the "freedoms," granted in 1629, could be disregarded with impunity.

The first known reference to a school is found in a letter of the patroon to his agent, Areñt van Curler, March 16, 1643, in which a temporary church is under consideration. "This," Van Rensselaer says, "could be made ready quickly, about 26 feet wide and 60 feet long, but the location must remain as directed. * * *. Next to the house of Dr. Megapolensis would not be unsuitable, and later it could be used as a school."³ To this Van Curler replied (16 June, 1643): "As for the church * * * that which I intend to build this summer in the pine grove will be 34 feet long by 19 feet wide. It will be large enough for the first three or four years to preach in, and can afterwards always serve for the residence of the sexton, or for a school."⁴

¹ The facts of general history that may be needed in this chapter will, for the most part, be taken from Brodhead's *New York*, and without further acknowledgment.

² O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland*, I, 300.

³ Van Rensselaer-Dowler MSS., pp. 002-3.

⁴ O'Callaghan, *New Netherland*, I, 450.

While patroon and colonists appear to have been slow in school matters, this correspondence shows that Van Rensselaer nevertheless felt responsible for providing a schoolhouse along with the other necessary public buildings. In this connection we may point out two instances where the duties of vooplezer and schoolmaster were not always united. When, in 1632, instructions were issued by Kiliaen Van Rensselaer for the government of his colonial court, Brandt Peelen was "authorized to read aloud some chapters from the Holy Scriptures, for which purpose a Bible is herewith sent * * * as well as a *huys postille schulteti* (Abraham Schultetus, Huys Postillen), in which every Sunday throughout the year has its special lesson and exposition of God's word."¹ This Brandt Peelen was specifically engaged as a farmer for Van Rensselaer, and there seems not the slightest doubt that he gave to his farm his entire time. Certainly he did not teach school.² At a later date (1653) Antony de Hooges was for a while voorlezer during the time he was secretary of the colony. It seems practically certain that he was not schoolmaster.³

The first certain reference to a schoolmaster in the colony is of date April 30, 1648, when Evert Nolden was permitted by resolution of the court to establish himself as a schoolmaster. Some three years later he was prosecuted for having crushed Adriaen Dirchsz' nose with a pair of fire tongs. Beyond these facts we can say little of him. He seems to have left the colony in 1660.⁴ The data available indicate that Nolden was a private master.

The first definitely-known action of the authorities looking to the establishment of a public school was taken September 9, 1650, when the inhabitants petitioned the council of the colony for a competent schoolmaster. In response the council appointed Arent van Curler and Goossen Gerritz trustees of a fund to be raised for the building of a school. Not long afterwards Adriaen Jansz van Ilpendam came up from New Amsterdam, where he had been a private master, and took charge of the public school. On November 23, 1651, the court, upon his petition, granted him 50 florins toward the payment of his house rent.⁵

There is a difficulty in the records about the school in Beverwyck at this time. Van Ilpendam, who began in 1651, was still teaching in 1657⁶ and apparently in 1660. But in 1652, when D^e Schaats was brought over as minister, it was stipulated that he should "pay

¹ Van Rensselaer-Bowier MSS., p. 206.

² *Ibid.*. See index under *Peelen, Brandt*.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 825.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 838. Nolden was later at Kingston. See p. 218n.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 843. The suggested identification in this reference of Adriaen Jansz van Ilpendam with Adriaen Jansz Croon is now believed by Mr. Van Laer to be incorrect.

attention to the office of schoolmaster for old and young."¹ Does "pay attention to the office of schoolmaster" mean that the domine was to teach school? This seems the natural, if not the necessary, interpretation and all the writers have thus accepted the words. But certain difficulties attend this idea. No other minister in charge of a church in New Netherland is known to have taught the parochial school. The contrary rule would seem—save possibly in the case under discussion—to have held without exception. The Holland custom and even church ruling were against the minister's serving as schoolmaster.² Furthermore, why should this most unusual duty be forced thus uniquely upon the domine when the town had a schoolmaster to whom the town made official contribution? And still further why does the contract add the words "for old and young?" Are we asked to suppose that the old attended the parochial school? In view of these difficulties, it might be safer to doubt that D^r. Schaats was ever the master of the village school. Perhaps he was to be spiritual schoolmaster. To give the whole record, however, we must add that D^r. Schaats wrote in 1657: "There is no prelector nor precentor here, which duties I have had to fill."³ This seems to mean that at the Sunday church meeting the minister was himself to perform those parts of the service which usually fell to the voorlezer: and this would fit with the filling of this office by De Hooges in 1653, as above noted. But, on the other hand, D^r. Schaats may intend by precentor to include also schoolmaster. So that he may be telling us that he had to teach the parish school. Under the circumstances an entirely satisfactory conclusion seems impossible.

On September 1, 1660, Van Ipendam brought suits against two of his patrons for unpaid tuition, demanding in the one case "payment of ten and a half beaver and two shillings for school money;" in the other, "payment of two beavers for one year's school money." In each case "the defendant acknowledges the debt," and was condemned to pay the master, "and this within six weeks."⁴ We may accept the valuation of the beaver at 8 guilders Hollands, so that tuition in Van Ipendam's school seems to have been 16 guilders a year or 4 guilders a quarter. There is, of course, no reason for saying that the same rates held for all grades of pupils. Since these rates are a good deal larger than those allowed to Pietersen at New Amsterdam in 1661, it is an easy inference that Van Ipendam had to make up in tuition fees for a small guaranteed salary. How long after 1660 Van Ipendam remained at Beverwyck, and whether he was the only master, we can not say. For many years he was a notary

¹ O'Callaghan, *History of N. N.*, II, p. 517.

² *Acta van part. syns van Zuid-Holland*, I, 491.

³ *Ecl. Rec.*, p. 386.

⁴ *Pratt, op. cit.*, p. 16.

public. It is said that he committed suicide in 1686, at about the age of 67.¹

It seems possible that Jans Juriaens Becker came to Albany about 1663 and opened a school. When he began to teach is not clear,² but probably he was teaching there at the time of the English occupation. We read in his license, issued by Governor Lovelace in 1670, that "Jans Jeurians Becker had a Graunt to keep y^e Dutch school at Albany for the teaching of youth to read & to wryte, y^e which was allowed of and confirmed to him by my predecessor, Coll. Richard Nichols."³ These words would seem, not certainly, but probably, to imply that Nichols found Becker in possession of a "graunt to keep y^e Dutch school at Albany," and that he "allowed and confirmed" this "graunt" to Becker. As Nichols immediately followed the Dutch rule, this reasoning, if admitted, would fix Becker in charge of "y^e Dutch school at Albany" at the time of the surrender.

It is probable that the schoolmaster was on the regular pay roll of the town before the end of the Dutch régime. Article five of the terms of surrender of the town of Albany to the English (October 10, 1664), stipulated "that the salary to the Preacher, Clarke, Secretary, and Boade (messenger) shall be continued and paid as formerly till further order."⁴ While these are English terms, and are accordingly not certainly descriptive of the Dutch practice, a later document makes it quite possible that under the title of "clarke," reference is had to a voorlezer and schoolmaster. In 1671, in a report to Governor Lovelace, the statement was made that—

The Charge yearely of ye Towne of Albany to the Offic^r is—

To y ^e Minst ^r	125 Beav ^r at 130 y ^e Beav ^r
To y ^e Secreta ^r	600 guild ^r Seaw ^t
To y ^e Boade	300 guild ^r Seaw ^t
To y ^e Reader	400 guild ^r Seaw ^t

Here are named the same four officers as in the articles of surrender, except that "clarke" of 1664 appears as "reader" in 1671. "Reader" and "clarke" were both contemporaneous renderings of the Dutch voorlezer. The former was rather the translation of the term; while the latter was the name of an analogous officer in the English church. There is then no reason to doubt that the "clarke" in 1664 was the voorlezer in the Dutch church. The salary of 400 guilders given to him in 1671 is identical with that paid for the combined services of schoolmaster and voorlezer at Bushwyck in 1662, at New Haerlem in 1670, and at Flatbush in 1676.⁵ The pro-

¹ Pearson's Early Records of Albany, p. 7n.

² But see Pratt, p. 62.

³ Munsell's Annals of Albany, iv, 15.

⁴ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 559.

⁵ Executive Council Minutes, i, 83.

⁶ See pages 128, 160, 170. The salary here named is greater by 100 guilders than that paid at Flatbush same time (1671) for both services (see p. 168).

sumption of like salary, like service is so strong, especially when taken in connection with the almost universal custom of combining the two offices, that it seems hardly possible to doubt that the "reader" or "clarke" at Beverwyck was also the schoolmaster, who thus was on the payroll of that town during the closing years of the Dutch régime as well as afterwards.¹

Breuckelen (Brooklyn) had been settled but a very few years when in 1646 it was granted a charter. Its growth was, however, slow. It was 1655 before there was a church organization and regular preaching services. In 1660, the town consisted of 31 householders and 134 people. It is 1661 before we hear of a school. On July 4 of that year the Breuckelen Court reported to the director general and council that they found it necessary that a court messenger be "occasionally employed in the village of Breuckelen and all around where he may be needed, as well to serve summons, as also to conduct the service of the church, and to sing on Sundays; to take charge of the school, dig graves, etc., ring the bell, and perform whatever else may be required." They had found "a suitable person * * * one Carl van Beauvois, to whom they have hereby appropriated the sum of fl. 150, besides free dwelling;" but they were "apprehensive that the said C. v. Beauvois would not and can not do the work for the sum aforesaid, and the petitioners are not able to promise him any more." They accordingly "with all humble and proper reference" requested of the "honorable, wise, prudent, and most discreet gentlemen," "the right honorable director general and council" "to be pleased to lend them a helping hand."

In answer to such a request so politely urged, the director general and council agreed to "pay fifty guilders in wampum, annually, for the support for the *voorsanger* and schoolmaster in the village of Breuckelen."²

According to Stiles,³ two days after the answer of Stuyvesant the church drew up the regulations governing De Beauvois in the discharge of his duties as *voorlezer*, schoolmaster, and sexton. He was to set forth "on the psalm board" the psalms to be sung before the session. "After the first ringing of the bell," he should "place the stools and benches in the church or meeting house in order, and read a chapter out of the Holy Scriptures and the twelve articles of the Christian belief." (It was in virtue of this *reading before* the sermon that such an officer was called the "*voorlezer*.") Immediately on the third ringing of the bell he should "begin to sing the designated psalm." (Because he *led* in the *singing* he was called the "*voorsanger*.") "He shall properly, diligently, and industriously attend the school, instil in the minds of the young the fear

¹ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 31 (a very different translation in N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, pp. 202-3). The two hundred guilders, probably all in wampum, would be 100 guilders in coin or \$40.

² History of Brooklyn, I, 428.

of the Lord, and set them a good example; to open the school with prayer and close with a psalm, also to exercise the scholars in the questions in the 'groat regulen' of the reverend, pious, and learned father Dr. Johannes Megapolensis, minister of the Gospel in Amsterdam in New Netherland."¹

It is interesting to note that the consistory was to assist in the support of the schoolmaster. "The said precentor in addition to the salary allowed by the governor and council of New Netherland and the magistrates of Brooklyn, will be furnished by the consistory with house rent and entertainment or provisions."²

Of the master here employed, we read that "there appeared before the New Amsterdam court" some two years previously, "requesting his small burgher-right, Carel Beauvois of Leiden, intending to keep school."³ Quite possibly he taught privately in New Amsterdam during the two years intervening between his appearance at the court and his position at Brooklyn.

It seems probable that De Beauvois was the first schoolmaster in Brooklyn. Four years before there was none, for in 1657 the ministers at New Amsterdam, writing to the classis about "the condition of the church in our Province," stated, "that so far as we know, not one of all these places, Dutch or English, has a schoolmaster, except the Manhattans, Beverwyck, and now also Fort Casimer on the South River."⁴ The difficulty of securing capable teachers was one reason for the paucity of schools. The same letter said, "There are few qualified persons here or can or will teach." The necessary means, too, were lacking, "the people having come half naked and poor from Holland." While full data is lacking, it seems, on the whole, probable that this school of De Beauvois was the beginning of formal school keeping in Brooklyn.

It is interesting to note how many offices this one man filled—court messenger, voorlezer, voorsanger, schoolmaster, and sexton. Of these, only the duties of court messenger could interfere with school keeping—unless it were digging graves. Probably the interferences of both kinds would be very few, for courts and burials were alike infrequent. It is said, though on what documentary evidence is not stated, that De Beauvois continued to teach at Brooklyn until 1669.⁵

Midwoud (Flatbush) was first formally settled about 1652. It seems to have grown more rapidly than some of the other Dutch

¹ This reference to the catechism of Dr. Megapolensis is the more interesting because five years before the Classis of Amsterdam had deemed it "inadvisable to permit the printing, much more the introduction of the same for the instruction of youth;" and had gone so far in their objection as to appeal to the Lords Directors in the matter. The making of individual catechisms would, it was feared, introduce "use disputes, schisms, and all manners of confusion." *Ecol. Rec.*, pp. 347, 349-350, 351-2.

² *Stiles, op. cit.*, i, 429.

³ *Rec. of N. A.*, vii, 223.

⁴ *Ecol. Rec.*, p. 398.

⁵ *Stiles, op. cit.*, i, 118.

villages on Long Island, being chartered just two years after settlement (1654). In 1655, when plans for laying out the village were adopted, it was "provided that 5 or 6 lots be secured for public buildings, such as for the sheriff, the minister, the secretary, schoolmaster, village tavern, and public courthouse."¹ Some three years later a plan was proposed by the town court and approved by the director general and council of setting aside 25 morgans (50 acres) of land to be rented out, the income to be "employed to repair the church and keep it in a decent order," while the rent from a like amount was to be used for the "maintenance of a school, church services, etc."²

So far as is known these preparations for a school brought no result until 1659. On January 27 of that year the deacon's book at Flatbush records the item: "Given to Jan Stryker for the school 3 gl. 4 st."³ That the school was in actual operation is evident from the next reference on May 21 of the same year: "For a bucket for the school. 1 gl. 5 st."⁴ Who the teacher was, when he began to teach, under what management—these are questions that our present data do not allow us to answer. The Jan Stryker here mentioned was one of the church masters. The management of the school was probably the same as that which appears in the first known contract. On June 9, 1660, "the schout and schepens, with the cooperation of minister and consistory" engaged the "person of Reynier Bastiaensen van Giesen" to act as "process server for the schepens' court," "also to serve the church in leading the singing and in reading, to arrange the seats, to ring the bell, and furthermore to hold school, to dig graves and to look after everything else that is needful thereto." They "raised therefore the sum of 200 guilders yearly,"⁵ of which sum the court promises 150 guilders yearly and 50 guilders for the church service."⁶

This contract is similar to the Brooklyn agreement with De Beauvois. The pay is the same, and the duties are practically identical. While the Flatbush people did not petition Stuyvesant for aid in making up the original salary, as did Brooklyn, nevertheless we find them the next spring (March 29, 1661), presenting a petition to the

¹ O'Callaghan, *Laws of New Netherland*, p. 109. In the Flatbush town records (100:6) is what purports to be a copy, made in 1870, of a patent given to the village, as follows:

"The director general and council of Netherland to all those who shall see or hear these presents, greeting: Know that we, for the advancement and maintenance of divine worship and the support of the church, school, and school service in the town of Midwoud, on Long Island, to the said town and the inhabitants thereof who are already there or shall come later, have allowed, granted, and given . . . four lots of land in the year 1661, in addition to the other lands laid out for the aforesaid purpose. . . ."

If there be no error in this date of 1661, the town was laid out earlier than has been generally supposed; and Stuyvesant or the original settlers deserve considerable credit for their early interest in the welfare of church and school.

² *Ibid.*, op. cit., pp. 27-28.

³ *Loc. cit.*, 1, 96^b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1, 96^b.

⁵ Probably in seawant; if so, at the rate of two for one, this would be equal to \$40.

⁶ Flatbush town records, 103: 24j.

director general and council, begging assistance on a church debt of 190 florins, of which 32 florins is for "our schoolmaster Reinier." The response was favorable to the extent of "one-half of the above amount," "when the treasury has sufficient funds."¹

The "cooperation" which the minister and consistory gave to the schout and schepens seems to have amounted practically to a copartnership. The church paid one-fourth of the salary and the court three-fourths. The wording of this financial clause seems slightly ambiguous, but the church did pay its pro rata of 50 guilders annually, as the deacon's accounts show.² It were much to be desired that we knew more about how the court got the 150 guilders which it was to give. The school lands as yet brought in no revenue (as will presently appear). A town levy was regularly made for the ordinary village expenses.³ In these villages the excise usually brought considerable income. Probably, then, these two sources supplied the town's part of the schoolmaster's salary. The 200 guilders was not the whole income of Van Giesen. While no mention is made of tuition fees, there is every probability that each child paid these according to the scale which was later explicitly fixed in the contract of Van Giesen's successor.

It is a distinct pleasure to read in the deacons' accounts (p. 101⁴): "1661, 1st of January. Given to M^r Reinier for a New Year's present, 12 guilders."

This appears, sad to relate, to be the unique case of just this kind of appreciation found in the annals of the American Dutch schools. In fact, it is even probable that Van Giesen himself later had trouble in collecting his salary. The records show that the deacons continued to send him small sums for more than a year after he had gone to another place.⁴

During the latter part of 1663 the town built a schoolhouse. The items "expended on the school in the town" as found in the deacons' book (p. 102⁵) amount to 173 guilders and 2 stivers. Such a sum seems rather too small to represent the entire cost of a dwelling for the schoolmaster; but we have no other information concerning the matter. This interesting note appears on the page giving the account of the expenditure: "These above-mentioned sums shall be paid back to the poor fund from the first receipts of the school property." The money in the hands of the deacons was for church expenses proper not for building a schoolhouse. To provide this was an obligation resting on the secular authorities.

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 409.

² *Loc. cit.*, pp. 101 ff. Public collections at the Sunday services formed the principal source of income.

³ O'Callaghan, *Laws of New Netherland*, p. 184.

⁴ Flatbush deacons' accounts, I, 102f. It should, however, be said that there is a discrepancy in the total sum paid to the total amount apparently due. If we calculate Van Giesen's salary from the date of his contract to the date of his successor's contract, this sum falls below what was actually paid him (excluding the New Year's present). Several possible explanations present themselves, but we do not seem to have the data for a satisfactory decision.

The reference to the "first receipts of the school property" is apropos of a lease but recently effected by the church masters, as follows:

The 13th of August in the year 1663.

By Jan Stryker and Jan Snedeker there was leased to Jan Buys the school land with its dependencies and equity for the six next ensuing years and he is to give for the first year two hundred guilders, at Christmas, in good strong seawant, and for the next five ensuing years two hundred and forty guilders. Furthermore it is stipulated that Jan Buys with his neighbors shall plant and improve the land, manure the old land and make good fences and keep them in repairs, and at the expiration of the aforesaid years deliver up the land in good conditions.¹

There seems no reason to doubt that Van Giesen remained until his successor was secured (Oct. 26, 1663). He then went as schoolmaster to Bergen, where his further career will be followed. It is worthy of remark that the name of Van Giesen does not appear on Dr. Strong's list of Flatbush schoolmasters.² So far as the opinion of the writer goes, however, Dr. Strong's list of early schoolmasters at Flatbush was made so carelessly as to deserve no serious consideration. He puts as the first master, Adriaen Hegeman, and ascribes to him the period from 1659 to 1671. No evidence has yet appeared which would tend to connect this Hegeman with the Flatbush school at all; and ample evidence places several other masters in the period assigned to him by Dr. Strong.

Pelgrom Clocq, previously of New Amsterdam, succeeded Van Giesen on October 26, 1663. His contract gives us a little more information than does that of M^r Reinier, though in the main the two are identical. The compensation is the same in both cases. The court and church duties are expressed in identical words. There is the same "coöperation of minister and consistory" with schout and schepens. Clocq pledges himself "to care for and fulfill his duties as an honorable man should." He is "to hold school and to receive therefor for the A B C's, 2 guilders; for spelling 2 guilders 10; for reading, 3 guilders; for writing, 5 guilders each quarter year." He is engaged "for one year and the engagement to be released on either side each year."³

This Clocq had been for quite a while previously a notary in New Amsterdam. He had not always met with commendation for the manner in which he had discharged his duties. In 1661, on account of gross carelessness—if not worse—in drawing papers, he was commanded "not to draw up during six weeks from date any instruments appertaining to the subaltern court of this city."⁴ Later (Apr. 8, 1664), while he was engaged as schoolmaster at Midwood, one Jacob Vis appeared before the court in New Amsterdam and

¹ Flatbush town records, 106:282.

² Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 109-110.

³ Flatbush town records, 103:145.

⁴ Records of N. A., III, 349. Later for a worse case he was fined. *Ibid.*, p. 417.

demanding "attachment against Pelgrom Clocq and imprisonment of his person, whenever found here, complaining that he is slandered by him in the highest degree. Burgomasters and schepens granted the request."¹ Apparently Clocq took care not to be found in New Amsterdam, for he finished out his year in Flatbush.² The end of his year carries the account beyond the close of the Dutch period.

In this little village of Flatbush, numbering at this time probably about 40 families (54 some 10 years later),³ we have possibly the best picture of the Dutch village in America. Nearly all the inhabitants were of Dutch stock, or at least spoke the Dutch language.⁴ All attended the Dutch church, and all by legal requirement contributed to its expenses,⁵ though probably not all were members.⁶ The minister was Dr. Theodorus Polhemus, who had previously served in Brazil. The officers of the town were a schout and three schepens.⁷ These court officers were chosen by the director general and council from a double number nominated by the outgoing officers.⁸ Besides the officers of the court there were the two church masters and the consistory of the church. The former were also selected by the director general and council from a double nomination made by the court.⁹ The latter elected their own successors. The consistory, which in small places included pastor, elders, and deacons, took an active interest in the school, "cooperating" with the court throughout this period and long into the next (certainly until 1682, probably until 1711, and possibly longer). The church masters rented out the land belonging to church and school, and cared for the church and school buildings. The close interweaving of church and state is evident from all that has been said. It was made closer by the fact that often the same men held office under both. Of the 11 signatures to Van Giesen's contract, 6 are made by three men, each of the three signed thus in a dual capacity. Jan Snedeker and Jan Stryker each appear to have held at one time the three offices of schepen, church master, and member of the consistory.

From what has been said, it is evident that there was in this Dutch village no democracy so far as governing went. But probably it

¹ Records of N. A., v. 47.

² He received his salary for exactly one year. See Flatbush deacons' accounts, I, 102^B; and Flatbush town records, 106 : 252.

³ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., IV, 97.

⁴ In 1698, after a full generation of English rule, out of 66 families only 4 were English. *Ibid.*, II, 89.

⁵ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 379.

⁶ In Brooklyn, for example, in 1660, there were 134 persons in 31 families, but only 24 church members, *Ecol. Rec.*, p. 488.

⁷ O'Callaghan, *Laws of N. N.*, pp. 390-391.

⁸ No specific reference can be adduced to show this procedure for Flatbush; but its probability is sufficiently established from the custom with other villages. Cf. *New Haarlem*, p. 131.

⁹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xvi, 520.

approached more nearly an equality of actual life conditions with greater unity of interests than do our present-day American villages.

Amersfoort, now called Flatlands, though chartered at the same time with Midwoud (Flatbush), was of slower growth. In 1663 the former was just building a church, falling in this respect about five years behind the latter. In 1675 the number of families in the one was exactly two-thirds of the number in the other. So far no reference to a school here during the Dutch period has been found. If the organization of a school followed the building of a church by as much in Flatlands as it did in Flatbush, it was not until after the English occupation that the town had a school. On the other hand, what was done at Bergen, for instance, and the accidental character of our knowledge of the first school¹ in that village, must prevent any certain conclusion that Amersfoort was slow in organizing its school.

New Castle, Del., called by the Dutch New Amstel, owes its origin to an effort on the part of the city of Amsterdam to promote the colonization of New Netherland. The city bought the South (Delaware) River region and began in 1656-57 the settlement of the new colony. The terms offered to prospective settlers were liberal. As first proposed the terms were somewhat more explicit than was the form finally adopted. In the first draft the city was to erect "about the market, or in a more convenient place, a building suitable for divine service: item a house for a school, which can likewise be occupied by the person what will hereafter be sexton, psalmsetter, and schoolmaster." It should also "provisionally provide and pay the salary of a minister and schoolmaster."² The second draft said nothing of a house, but provided "that the city of Amsterdam shall send thither a proper person for schoolmaster, who shall also read the Holy Scriptures and set the psalms." The city should also "provisionally and until further opportunity provide the salary of said schoolmaster."³

The minister was not to be sent over until a certain greater population was attained. We notice here that three offices were united in one, voorlezer, voorsanger, and schoolmaster. "The commissioners of the affairs of the new colony" arranged through the classis for "a schoolmaster, who will also visit the sick, and publicly read God's word and sing the psalms,"⁴ thus adding the office of siecken-trooster to the three previously named. If only the position of sexton had been added, as the first draft stipulated, the list would have been complete. Possibly this office went without saying.

The classis in discharge of the duty imposed "sought out, for this purpose, a worthy man named Evert, Pietersen." They examined

¹ See p. 137. ² N. Y. Col. Doc., I, p. 620. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 631. ⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 378.

him "in all the above-named particulars," with the result that he was considered "properly qualified."¹ Pietersen was elected for four years, the term of service to exclude the time spent in passage, both going and returning.² His salary was "forty guilders per month."³ He arrived at the South River April 25, 1657, and shortly afterwards began his work.⁴ On August 12 he wrote back to Amsterdam: "I am engaged in keeping school, with twenty-five children in it; but I have no paper nor pens for the use of the children, nor slates and pencils." "I must also respectfully request you to go with my wife to Van Beeck, and ask him to get the one hundred and fifty guilders of my already earned wages * * * This will assist her in making provision for the winter, by buying meats, bacon, turf, and wood."⁵ Our schoolmaster felt the isolation of so distant a post. In the same letter he begs his friend, "write me also of the war between the Swedes and Danes, and send a part of the Gazettes, that I may have something else to read." It may be noted that this letter gives the earliest known reference to the use of slates in America.⁶

The probabilities are that Pietersen served this school continuously until the fall of 1660, when he returned to Amsterdam, leaving the work, apparently, to his son Arent. The formal transfer of the position from father to son seems, however, not to have been made until the spring of 1661.⁷

Just one month after Pietersen received his last salary payment for work at the South River, "Arent Evertsen, comforter of the sick, etc.," received 50 guilders. On the 22d of the following October he received 100 guilders,⁸ again as "comforter of the sick, etc." One might doubt whether these references would do no more than show that the son succeeded to the ecclesiastical duties of the father. But, fortunately, a more specific reference is available. On December 10/20, 1664, "the worthy Arent Evers Molenaar, late schoolmaster, precentor, and comforter of the sick at New Amstel," conveyed to one Couseau "the monthly salary and board wages due him from the

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 378.

² O'Callaghan, Laws of N. N., p. 272.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 402.

⁴ N. Y. Col. Doc., II, 17.

⁵ Eccl. Rec., p. 402. From April 25 to August 10 is three and a half months which at "forty guilders per month" would exactly make one hundred and fifty guilders. Evidently Pietersen received board money in addition to his salary.

⁶ See p. 223.

⁷ See N. Y. Col. Doc., II, 179-182; Pratt, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19.

This family affords an excellent illustration of the Dutch system of names. Evert Pietersen's son Arent was not called Arent Pietersen, as would now be done, but "Arent Evertsen," that is, Arent the son of Evert; just as the father was Evert the son of Pieter. Thus Pietersen, in the letter above referred to, speaks of "my son Arent Evertsen, a miller," and of "my son Jan Evertsen." Frequently a man's occupation was added to his name, from which practice many surnames in time arose. The word "miller" as seen above is Molenaar; and this older son is generally referred to thereafter as "Arent Evertsen Molenaar," even after his occupation had come to be that of school keeping. After the English came, surnames became frequent, Pietersen and his sons adopted Keteltas then as their family name.

⁸ N. Y. Col. Doc., II, 181. The same records, however, show that back salary was paid to Pietersen after his resignation.

worshipful burgomaster of the city of Amsterdam in Europe."¹ As this was soon after the English occupation (hence the doubly expressed date, Dec. 10/20), it is to be inferred that Molenaer remained a schoolmaster until the colony passed from the control of the Dutch.

The record of New Amstel in education is thus in many respects the best among the Dutch villages. A schoolmaster sailed with the first colonists and began his school shortly after they landed. The salary of this master came from the public funds and was possibly the largest given to any elementary master in New Netherland. The school continued without interruption—so we may suppose—until a hostile nation changed the government. As this colony was the only one in New Netherland not under private or semiprivate auspices, it may with propriety be taken as the one which most fairly represents the general attitude of the Dutch people toward education.

New Haarlem affords a good illustration of the procedure of the Dutch in settling a village. The director general and council in 1658 announced "a new village or settlement at the end of the island" of Manhattan. In order to encourage "lovers of agriculture," each settler was to "receive by lot in full ownership 18, 20, to 24 morgen² of arable land; 6 to 8 morgen of meadows." "When the aforesaid village has 20 to 25 families, the director general and council will favor it with an Inferior Court of Justice; and for that purpose a double number is to be nominated out of the most discrete and proper persons for the first time by the inhabitants and afterwards by the magistrates and presented annually to the director general and council; to elect a single number therefrom." When the village should be ready for the court it was also to be "accommodated with a good, pious, orthodox minister, toward whose maintenance the director general and council promise to pay half the salary, the other half to be supplied by the inhabitants in the best and easiest manner, with the advice of the magistrates of the aforesaid village, at the most convenient time."³ It is disappointing to note that no mention is made of a school.⁴

Two years later the required number of families were reported, and Stuyvesant authorized the Inferior Court of Justice to consist of three commissaries,⁵ before whom should be brought all questions arising in the said village between master and servant, neighbor and neighbor,

¹ Minutes of the Orphan Masters, II, 4.

² One morgen is about 2 acres.

³ Riker's (revised) New Harlem, p. 170.

⁴ The town and church records of this village are no longer available; but Riker had access to them in the preparation of the history of New Harlem, and quoting from them so freely that the loss of the records is in great degree made good by his book. We shall, in treating the New Harlem school, both here and in Chapter XI, use Riker's evident quotations as so much primary material. Such statements of his as do not certainly appear to be based specifically on the original records will be treated as secondary-source material.

⁵ One of these was Daniel Tourneur who disputed with Curtius about the hog sale.

buyer and seller, "and other such like; also all criminal actions consisting of misdeeds, threats, fighting, or wounding." "Any party feeling himself aggrieved may appeal to the director general and council" "from all judgments exceeding fifty guilders."¹

By the close of 1661 there were 32 male adults in the village, of whom it is said that 11 were French, 4 Walloon, 7 Dutch, 4 Danish, 3 Swedish, and 3 German,² truly a multinational population for so small a town. A word about the degree of illiteracy of these men may not be amiss. As to 12 of them, no data have been found. Of the remaining 20, 12 write their signatures, while 8 made their marks. If the 12 for whom there are no data preserved the same proportion there is an illiteracy of 40 per cent, which, as will later appear, is higher than is found at Albany and Flatbush.³ Even if it be supposed that all the 12 unknown wrote their names, which is not probable, there would still be an illiteracy of 25 per cent.

Riker thinks that Michael Ziperus was the first schoolmaster at New Haerlem, though no certain proof is given.⁴ The suggestion has, however, much probability. This Dr Ziperus came to New Netherland in 1659, "in the hope of there securing a call in one place or another."⁵ About a year later he seems to have been called to officiate as minister at New Haerlem, so far as was permitted to one who had not been ordained. He had some years before been connected with "the school at Alckmaer," where "for many wicked acts, such as obtaining articles from stores in the name of the rector, and taking them to pawnshops," he was "publicly chastised before all the scholars as an example." Afterwards he was for some time at Curaçao and preached there, but was "sent away."⁶ Coming to the newly settled town which stood in need of both minister and schoolmaster, and himself compelled to make a living, he naturally sought to fill these positions. But, if his ecclesiastical critics are further to be credited, "he behaved most shamefully here, drinking, cheating, forging other people's writings, so that he was forbidden not only to preach, but even to keep school."⁷ This last statement seems to corroborate the supposition that he did teach in the school at New Haerlem.

Riker supposes that Willem de la Montagne, brother of Jan de la Montagne, master of the 1652 "trivial school" at New Amsterdam, succeeded Ziperus early in 1663; but offers no documentary proof,⁸ and apparently feels that his supposition is hardly more than suggestion. The records of December of that year, however, afford some definite information. The inhabitants of the little village "having

¹ Riker, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-7.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 18-23.

³ See pp. 197, 204.

⁴ Riker's *New Haerlem*, p. 189.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 177-8.

⁶ *Eccles. Rec.*, p. 514. Letter of the classis to Dr Dristus, Dec. 15, 1661.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 535. Dr Dristus to the classis, Aug. 5, 1664.

⁸ Riker, *op. cit.*, pp. 189, 278.

seen from Sabbath day to Sabbath day the small and insignificant success of the public gatherings, and believing confidently that everything relating to the public worship may be brought in better training and all be more properly ordered by the services of a salaried voorlezer and schoolmaster, to read God's word and edifying sermons, keep school, catechize and visit the sick," sought "to persuade Jan de la Montagne, a resident of the said place, to undertake such services provisionally for the least possible salary." Montagne, whom we have met before as the rector of the trivial school, was inclined to consider the request; but the people "perceiving their present inability and incapacity to give in the aforesaid case a full and proper salary, and not having been able to collect for his support more than 24 schepels of grain,"¹ applied on December 25 to the director general and council requesting that they "in their usual noble discretion" would "contribute something towards a decent salary." The appeal was not in vain. On January 10, 1664, the director general and council decided to "accept and appoint thereto the proposed person, Johannes la Montagne, junior; and in order that he may attend to these offices with greater diligence, to him shall be paid annually on account of the company the sum of fifty guilders."² Montagne accepted the work under these conditions and served satisfactorily until October 23, 1670.³ During this whole time he acted also as secretary to the village court. It is of interest here to note that a school was provided before the church was fully and independently organized, and before the church building had been erected.

What is now called Kingston was at first Esopus and later Wiltwyck. In the fifties a good many families moved into that general region. A letter to the classis reported in 1657 that "they held Sunday meetings, and then one of the other of them reads from the Postilla."⁴ In 1658 Stuyvesant, on account of dangers from the Indians, persuaded the "sixty or seventy Christians" living scattered about to make a stockade village for protection. About this time the Lords Directors appointed Andries Van der Sluys voorlezer, but Stuyvesant held up the appointment. Accordingly, Van der Sluys wrote Stuyvesant (Sept. 28, 1658) to learn what should be done. "I need the position very much," Van der Sluys wrote, "the inhabitants here would like to keep me in the office, to proclaim the Lord's gospel according to my ability and catechize the children and teach them reading and writing; but because the honorable general has spoken to them about a preacher, therefore they dare not and can not engage me for several years."⁵ There is no record of Stuyvesant's reply; but a reference in the Kingston records (Feb. 12, 1664) to Van der

¹ About 18 bushels.

² Riker, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 338. The Postilla was a book of sermons and prepared lessons.

⁵ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 91.

Sluys as the former "voorlezer"¹ makes it reasonably probable that he did undertake the work at least temporarily.

The next man to be considered in connection with this school is Jacob Joosten, later to be met at Albany and Flatbush. Whatever uncertainty may attach to Van der Sluys's connection with the school, there can be none as to Joosten's. The fifth marriage record (1662) in the Kingston church records is as follows:

Jacob Joosten, j. m. [bachelor] of Raagh on the Moesel in Duystant, precentor and schoolmaster here, and Arriaentjen Verscheur, of Welpe, in Gelderland, widow of Marckes Leendersen, resid. at Fort Orange. Married at Fort Orange. Banns published in Wiltwyck: first, 6 Aug.; second, 13 Aug.; third, 20 Aug.²

Joosten had been at Wiltwyck at D^r Blom's first communion service, December 25, 1660;³ it accordingly was an easy inference that his service as master had begun not later than this first communion. Some six months later, when the village court was organized, Joosten was, at the first meeting (July 12, 1661), appointed messenger for the court and church at an annual salary of 200 guilders seawant, the appointment subject to Stuyvesant's approval.⁴ The conjunction of court and church duties in this one office, especially as interpreted by the subsequent marriage record, is almost proof that he was at this time also schoolmaster.

The charter of Wiltwyck, given May 16, 1661, contains the first distinctly educational provision noted in these village charters. The court was empowered to adopt, subject to approval by the director general and council, "orders, respecting public roads, inclosure of lands, gardens, or orchards, and further, what might concern the country and agriculture; so, too, relative to the building of churches, schools, and other similar public works, as well as the means from which, and in what manner, these shall be regulated."⁵ One of the Wiltwyck laws promulgated by Stuyvesant at the time of granting the charter contains an interesting commentary on the times: "No one to propose a religious dispute under a penalty of three days in jail on bread and water."⁶

The source of the 200 guilders salary paid to Jacob Joosten as messenger of the court and church is probably indicated in a report made in 1662 of the village income, which (adapted) reads in part as follows:

From 525 morgens at fl. 2.10 st. per morgen	fl. 1,312. 10
The house lots, not paying land tax	136
The excise on wine and beer, farmed out	669. 5. 6
The revenue is altogether	2,117. 16. 6 ⁷

¹ Holland Society Year Book, 1887, p. 180.

² R. R. Hoos, Baptism and Marriage Register of the Old Dutch Church of Kingston, p. 500.

³ John C. Hoos, The First Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of Kingston, p. 2.

⁴ Schoonmaker's History of Kingston, p. 27.

⁵ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 198.

⁶ Schoonmaker, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁷ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 239.

On April 25, 1664, the court complained that the requirement that the director general and council approve its ordinances worked hardly, "as during the winter season no news can be obtained from here for 4 or 5 months;" it therefore prayed that its ordinances might without previous executive approval be provisionally enforced concerning, among other things, "the building of churches, schools, and such other public works and the finding and raising the means thereto required." The petition further asked, "as it has been found that the schoolmaster is making rather absurd demands for school money from the children, which compels many people to keep their children at home, that your honorable worship will grant him a fair salary."¹

The response to this request is not known. Probably Joosten had found the 200 guilders insufficient salary and had sought to raise the tuition fees. It appears that he continued for some time afterwards to hold the school. Pratt quotes a secondary authority to the effect that Joosten taught from the fall of 1660 to 1665, when he was dismissed for disobedience.² So far satisfactory verification has not appeared.³

An instance of the interest of the West India Company in the village appears in the fact that when Domines Blom and Selyns were coming over to New Netherland in 1660, the Lord Directors wrote Stuyvesant: "To carry on the service some books are sent over, which your honors will hand to them, besides the small psalters, prayers, and catechisms to be distributed and used as proper under the community in each respective place for teaching."⁴ Whether this means that the Lord Directors furnished the initial supply of books for the use of the minister both for public service and private teaching; or whether the school children used these "small psalters, prayers, and catechisms," is not very clear. The latter view seems more probable.

Stuyvesant's Bowery, the country seat of the director general, was situated within the present city of New York, about where the church of St. Marks-in-the-Bowery is now. The well-known New York street, the Bowery, derives its name from the name applied to the little village which sprung up around Stuyvesant's farm or bowery. The interest of the gruff old governor in his bowery extended both to church and school. When in 1660 an effort was being made to collect an adequate salary for D^r Selyns, who was to preach principally at Brooklyn, Stuyvesant offered "to pay to the company two hundred and fifty guilders yearly towards the salary of the said Domine Selyns on condition that the Domine shall preach

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 369-370.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

³ That Joosten remained in Wiltwyck seems indicated in the following facts: in 1662 he participated in a land drawing (N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 230); in 1663 a daughter was baptized in the Wiltwyck church (Hoes, *op. cit.*, p. 3); and in 1665 he was appointed guardian at Wiltwyck of a child left an orphan there (Holland Society yearbook, 1897, p. 124).

⁴ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 156.

at his Honor's bouwery on Manhattan Island on Sunday evenings."¹ There is extant a long letter from D^r Selyns about his new work, telling us among other things that "the Bouwery is a place of relaxation and pleasure whither people go from Manhattan for the evening service. There are there forty negroes * * * besides the household families. There is here as yet no consistory * * * at least one deacon if not an elder ought to be chosen."²

The coming of Evert Pietersen to the New Amsterdam school and the consequent displacement of Hoboeken gave Stuyvesant an opportunity of providing his bouwery with a schoolmaster. A council minute of October 27, 1661, recites that Hoboeken sought to be employed again in one or another manner in the company's service, and he was accordingly made a petty officer in the company's troops, and allowed "ten guilders per month, and g. 175 for board," about half of what he had previously received from the New Amsterdam school. The minute further states that "whereas the aforesaid Harman is a person of irreproachable life and conduct, so shall he be employed on the bouwery for the director general as schoolmaster and voorlezer, with the condition that the director general, whenever his service might be wanted for the company as soldier, shall replace him by another expert person."³

Whether we are to conclude that Hoboeken's new appointment under the company was purely a sinecure, or whether Stuyvesant detailed an officer of the company to act as schoolmaster on his private place, or whether some more favorable explanation is to be sought, does not now appear. But surely the terms of the appointment appear odd.

That the school continued under Hoboeken's care until as late as April 28, 1663, appears probable from an acknowledgment before a notary of that date, in which there is a reference to "Master Harmen van Hoboeken as deacon at the bouwery of the Hon'ble Petrus Stuyvesant."⁴ The use of the appellation "master" (three times repeated in the document), undoubtedly refers to Hoboeken's service as a schoolmaster, and probably to contemporaneous service. Several later references showed his continued presence in the colony. He was either witness at the baptism of children or himself had children baptized in 1663 (Dec. 16), 1664, 1666, and 1668.⁵ In the first and last of these he has the "M:" prefixed to his name, which would indicate that he was still teaching. We may then easily suppose that he continued with Stuyvesant until the surrender, and possibly for several years thereafter.

One wonders whether the children of those 40 negroes attended Hoboeken's school. Some have supposed that they did. We may

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 479.

⁴ Minutes of the Orphan Masters, II, 44.

² Eccl. Rec., pp. 469-480.

⁵ N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Coll., II, 71, 73, 83, 91.

³ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

be fairly sure that Stuyvesant's children did not attend, since it was about this time that Aegidius Luyck was brought over as a private master. But, however it may have been as to Hoboken's pupils, it speaks well for the Dutch in general and for Stuyvesant in particular that so small a place should have a regular school.

Bergen, though now a part of New Jersey, was at the time of settlement included within New Netherland. It was laid out in 1660 by Jacques Cortelyou. For the sake of protection the settlers were required to concentrate their dwellings. About 30 families moved in during the first year. On September 5, 1661, a court was granted in which occurs the identical provision relating to churches and schools that we saw in the Wiltwyck charter.

Jan Tibout was made court messenger apparently at the organization of the court.¹ Since this service was frequently joined with the office of schoolmaster, and since Jan Tibout afterwards taught for many years at Flatbush, Harlem, and Bushwyck, it would seem on the face of it quite possible that he was the first master at Bergen. As, however, there is no known corroboration, the suggestion must remain as a mere possibility. However it may be as to Tibout, we know that some time before the expiration of the first year of corporate village life, one of the schepens had appeared before the director general and council requesting in behalf of the community that "We might have a precentor, who could also keep school for the instruction and education of our young children." Their honors favored the plan, possibly helping with the salary, and proposed "one Engelbert Steenhuisen as a suitable person." The schout and schepens "repeated this proposition * * * to the community, which resolved to employ him not only as a precentor, but also this was expressly stipulated—to keep school. The said Steenhuisen accepted this * * * for which he was allowed a salary of 250 guilders in wampum² annually and some other enrolments besides the school fees, considered fair and proper."

Were it not that a dispute soon arose over the right of the village to tax the schoolmaster, we should not have learned even of the existence of the school during those early days. It seems that about 15 months after the school had been in operation, certain soldiers were quartered on the town. Each family was to maintain one. Steenhuisen, the schoolmaster, declined to receive one, whereat the "majority of the community" complained, feeling that since Steenhuisen was the "owner of a house and lot and of a double bouwery in the jurisdiction of the village" he should pay his part. "This," in the words of the plaintiffs in the suit, "has aggrieved the said Englebert Steenhuisen so much that he has resigned his

¹ Winfield's Hudson County, p. 88.

² Worth then about 125 guilders in coin, or 50 dollars.

office, asserting that a schoolmaster should be exempt from all village taxes and burden, as it is customary, he says everywhere in Christendom." The schout and schepens demurred to this plea, thinking that it might be valid, "when the precentor has only the school lot, but not when a schoolmaster owns a lot and double bouwery." The plaintiffs further urged that Steenhuysen was obligated "also to select himself and provide a fit and convenient place to keep school in", which, they said, "he has failed to do until this day, pretending the community must designate and provide such a place fit for a schoolhouse". Lastly the petitioners were of the opinion that Steenhuysen could "not resign his office, without giving a notice of six months of intention to do so." The director general and council were, therefore, called upon to settle these questions. All parties being "summoned before the council and heard, the parties were made to agree after divers debates and it was arranged that Englebert Steenhuysen should duly serve the rest of his term according to contract."¹ Whether he was required to quarter the soldier in his house or furnish the schoolhouse the records do not state. At this point ends our knowledge of the Bergen school during the Dutch period.

The town of Boswyck, or Bushwick, is now a part of Brooklyn. Stuyvesant himself in 1660 selected the site for the village, at the request of several French families, who wished to settle in that general region. A year later, when the town contained 23 families, there was established a court consisting of three schepens. Adriaen Hegeman was to act as schout for this as well as for the other Dutch towns on Long Island. In the same year the church was organized.²

On December 28, 1662, "the schepens of Boswyck came before the council and represented that they required in their village a suitable person to act as voorleser and schoolmaster to teach the children." Boudewyn Manout from Crimpen on the Leck had been proposed as such a person. They had made an agreement with him that he should act as voorleser and also keep a school for the "instruction of the children." For these services he was to "receive a year salary of four hundred florins in wampum and free lodgings." They asked that the director general and council approve their action and that the company "contribute something towards the salary every year." By vote, the director general and council approved "the engagement and contract made with said Boudewyn Manout, on condition that the same be first examined by the reverend clergy of this city and declared fit for the performance of the said duties." It was further agreed to pay "on behalf of

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 318-9.

² Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church in America (4th ed.), p. 48.

the company twenty-five florins, heavy money * * * to said Boudewyn, to make the payment of the salary more easy."¹

Unfortunately, the Dutch records of this town are only partially available, so that little can be added to this meager account. Manout remained for a full year, and apparently till the English occupation.² Two things are worthy of note, the smallness of the place and the promptness with which they established a school. The 23 families of 1661 had increased by 1675 to only 36 families. The school was arranged before the village had entered the second year of its corporate existence.

New Utrecht, another Long Island village, was surveyed and laid out in 1657 by Jacques Cortelyou. It did not prosper, having only 12 houses in the beginning of its fourth year, when a charter was granted. For many years it was smaller than Amersfoort and about the size of Boswick. No deacon or elder was elected for the church until 1677.³ Nothing has been found to indicate whether it had a school during the Dutch period. As other small towns had applied to the director general and council for help with their schools, the absence of any such petition from New Utrecht may indicate that there was no effort to organize a school. But one can not be sure either that no such petition was made or that an inference therefrom of no school would be proper.

This ends the list of Dutch towns and villages, 11 chartered towns (including New Amsterdam) and one not chartered (Stuyvesant's Bouwery village). Of these all but two, Amersfoort and New Utrecht, are known to have had schools during the Dutch rule. Whether or no these two had schools then can not now be said. The *argumentum e silentio* must be allowed some weight, but it does not give certainty.

Below appear in one conspectus the facts regarding these villages: the date of settlement, the date of charter, the date of the first public school, and the population at the time of the organization of this school. Many of the data are confessedly uncertain.

New Amsterdam. Settled 1625; governed from the first directly by director general and council; chartered 1652; first known public school, 1638; population at that time, possibly about 400.

Beverwyck (Albany). Settled finally about 1630; governed by local court from 1632;⁴ chartered by Stuyvesant, 1652; first public school, 1650 or 1651; population in 1643, about 100. (Grew rapidly after 1650.)

Breuckelen. Date of settlement can hardly be assigned; chartered, 1646; first public school, 1661; population (1660), 31 householders, 134 people.

¹ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 519.

² Bushwick town record book (1660-1824) *passim*.

³ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 93.

Van Rensselaer-Bowler MSS., p. 298

Midwoud (Flatbush). Settled about 1652; chartered, 1654; first known public school, 1659; population at that time possibly slightly larger than Brooklyn.¹

Amersfoort. Settled apparently in the forties; chartered in 1654; no school known until after the English occupation; population small, in 1657 consisting apparently of 17 families,² in 1675 of 36 families.³

New Amstel. Settled, chartered, provided with a public school all at one time (1656-7); population, about 200.

New Haerlem. Settlement begun, 1658; chartered 1660; first school possibly by 1660, certainly by 1661; population (1661), 32 male adults; remained for years about the same.

Wiltwyck. Settled (as a village), 1658; chartered, 1661; first public school probably in 1658, almost certainly, 1660; certainly by 1662; population difficult to estimate; Dr. Blom's membership increased in three years (1660-3) from 16 to 60.⁴ If proportion of members to families was same at Breuckelen, this would mean an increase from 21 to some 77 families.

Bergen. Settled, 1660; chartered, 1661; first public school, possibly 1661, certainly by 1662; population (1660): "about thirty families," in (1662) apparently 38 families.⁵

Boswyck. Site selected, 1660; chartered, 1661; first public school, 1662-63; population, in 1661, 23 families, in 1675, 36 families.

New Utrecht. Laid out, 1657; chartered, 1661; no school known to have been organized during the Dutch period; population in 1661, "twelve houses," in 1675, 29 families.⁶

Stuyvesant's Bouwery. Private country seat of Peter Stuyvesant, bought in the late forties; never chartered; first known school (whether public or private not clear), 1661; population (1660), "forty negroes" * * * besides the household families.⁷

The schools organized in the chartered villages were all of one type. The schoolmaster was also voorlezer and sexton (except for a time at Beverwyck), and was besides court messenger or town clerk (except at New Amstel). The master received a salary and tuition fees. While it is not expressly so stated, except at New Amsterdam, we may believe that "the poor and needy who ask to be taught for God's sake" were taught "for nothing." While there were no rich, there were, however, few poor in the villages. Besides the salary, a free dwelling for the master seems to have been well nigh universal. The source of the salary varied. At Midwoud the rent from certain "school lots" in time furnished the whole. In early days there and at other places throughout the period quite likely town rates or subscriptions, more or less compulsory, were arranged. The town court, if the village were autonomous, felt itself mainly responsible. No instance of a specific school levy has appeared during the Dutch period, though several cases presented themselves where apparently the schoolmaster received part of a general levy (or compulsory subscription). Quite likely a town

¹ Compare N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 379 f. with *ibid.*, ii, 596.

² N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 378 f. Compare also *ibid.*, ii, 596.

³ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., iv, 100.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 534.

⁵ N. Y. Col. Doc., xlii, 232-3.

⁶ Doc. Hist. N. Y., iv, 102-3.

⁷ Eccl. Rec., p. 488.

excise was generally utilized in making up the total village revenue. In three cases the company, through the director general and council, assisted the village with the salary of the schoolmaster.

Control seems to have been exercised in the autonomous villages jointly by church and local court. At New Amstel we may believe that the city of Amsterdam, which furnished the salary, also directed the affairs of the school. At that place only (excluding New Amsterdam), and that only in the case of Pietersen, did the classis examine and certificate the master. At Boswyck the master was examined by the ministers of New Amsterdam, as a prerequisite to receiving the company's bounty. Where no money was received from the company, no sort of control or interference was exercised by the central authorities.

On the whole it appears a just generalization to say that the Dutch village in New Netherland reproduced as nearly as could be the parish school of the mother country. The village school of New Netherland was an elementary school, open alike to girls and boys, and giving instruction in reading, writing, and religion.¹ Tuition was charged, the master receiving in addition a salary from the public. Master and school were alike under the joint control of the local magistracy and church.

¹ These statements as to coeducation and as to the curriculum are discussed in Chapter XIV.

CHAPTER IX.

THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOL, 1664-1674.¹

The New Amsterdam city school was continued throughout the first English occupation unchanged, except in respect to the salary and its source. Paucity of records forbids a full treatment; the principal information chiefly concerns Evert Pietersen and his effort to secure a salary from the city.

The English took possession on September 8, 1664.² The terms of capitulation were designed to make the transfer as easy as possible. All public houses should continue for the uses of which they had hitherto existed. The Dutch were to "enjoy the liberty of their consciences in Divine worship and church discipline." "All inferior civil officers and magistrates" were to continue in office "till the customary time of new election."³ The English governor, Richard Nichols (1664-1668), evidently felt it his duty to make the English yoke as light as possible to the conquered Dutch. So that by the terms of surrender and by subsequent governmental policy the Dutch life continued much as before. Their church was subsidized, and was in many respects the established religion of the city. We shall see that the same was substantially true of the school.

On October 11, 1664, one month after surrender, "Mr. Evert Pietersen, schoolmaster of this city" came before the city court, asking, "as his allowance from the company is shut off, that burgo-masters & schepens shall be pleased to keep him at the same allowance." The worthy court answered: "Petitioner shall have to be patient for the space of eight days, when his petition shall be disposed of."⁴ At the next weekly session of the court, Pietersen attended in order to learn the result of his petition; but was told "to wait still a day or two."⁵ Pietersen, however, was not ruined in pocket by the failure of the court to vote him a salary, as a contemporary tax list shows. Certain soldiers were to be quartered on the city by assessment of the burghers and inhabitants. There were 254 names in all on the rate list. The highest assessment was 4 florins, paid by Hon. Petrus Stuyvesant and each of 12 others. Fifty-two

¹ The title of this chapter is slightly inexact. When the English took New Amsterdam (1664), they changed its name to New York. When the Dutch regained the city (1673), they chose for it the name of New Orange. The chapter title ignores the use of the name New Orange during 1673-74.

² Eccl. Rec., p. 351.

³ Rec. of N. A., v, 137.

⁴ N. Y. Col. Doc., II, 250-3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

names on the list were exempted entirely. "Mr. Evert Pieterzen," residing on Brewer Street, and Ægidius Luyck, on Winckel Street, were each assessed 1 florin. The average rate was about 1½ florins, while the median was one florin.¹ Evidently the schoolmasters were about of medium wealth and income.

Over six months after Pietersen's first salary petition had gone in, he appeared before the court (April 25, 1665) to know what had been done; "whereupon he was informed that it with other petitions was shown and delivered to the Hon. Governor Nichols, who has postponed the matter until his return."² More patience was required. But Pietersen was equal to the demand. This time he waited for five months when (September 19, 1665) "Mr. Evert Pietersen, schoolmaster and precentor of this city" presented a petition, "requesting that he may have some proper fixed salarium, as he was heretofore paid his wages by the Hon^{ble}. Company, and has been continued in his employment from that time to the present." He was told that an order was shortly to be made "relative to the salary of the ministers of this city, under which the precentorship also comes;" and that proper order would then be made on his petition.³

A year had now passed since the English came. The school had been continued as the official city school with the former Dutch master as the "schoolmaster and precentor of this city." The Dutch church was now recognized as an official church; its ministers and voorsanger were now promised grants from the government. But patience was yet necessary. This time Pietersen waited five other months, until the ministers had been granted their salary; then he appeared before the court (February 20, 1666), reminded the magistrates of their promise of "the 19th of 7th last," and requested that a "suitable allowance be granted to him." "The w. court having heard the petition decree absolutely that he shall receive some satisfaction from his service. But whereas the city treasury is at present so low, that the said daily expenses can scarcely be met, the petitioner is requested to wait yet a while."⁴

A year and a half gone and nothing but promises yet. But Pietersen was not the only sufferer. "Att a Court held at New York" May 8, 1666, "Casper Steinmets entering demands payment of a year's rent of his house hired to the city as a city school, due on the first of this month; amounting to the sum of fl. 260." And again the same old response: "Petitioner is requested to wait yet a while, as there is at present no money in the chest."⁵

In this bill for rent we see the continuance of the custom begun with Hobocken in 1656 of renting at the expense of the city a building for the city school. Several times before have we met the

¹ Rec. of N. A., v, 221-3. ² *Ibid.*, p. 231. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 234. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 340. ⁵ *Ibid.*, vi, 4.

expression "the schoolmaster of this city," but, so far as the writer has noted, this is the first use of the expression "city school."

It was almost two years before Pietersen again brought up the salary question. Of course, there is always the uncertainty as to the fullness of the records, but the records for this period are apparently complete. On the "28th of April A" 1668 * * * Mr. Evert Pieters appearing, requests the W. Court to allow him something for the service performed by him as precentor to this date and also for the future. The W. Court promise to speak hereof to the Hon^{ble} Governor."¹ Speaking to the governor apparently did no good. Finances were at low ebb. The arrangements made about the salaries of the ministers, previously mentioned, were far from satisfactory. Dr. Samuel Megapolensis wrote a friend in 1668 that the manner in which these were collected was "unpleasant and degrading, and altogether unusual in our Dutch nation. They go around from house to house to collect the salary."²

Four years after his first appearance Pietersen came again before the court (Feb. 16, 1668-9, delivered an account of his earned salary, and requested payment for the past "and further allowance for his future services: If not, he says he will leave." The worm had turned at last. The patience of even Mr. Evert Pietersen was exhausted. We hope the "Mayor's Court" was duly impressed, and we should like to record that they did something. But no action was not to be expected of this body. Perhaps resolving was all they could do; at any rate, they "resolved to speak to the Governor hereupon."³ What the governor did we can not say. But Pietersen did not, at all events, leave town. On the contrary, on June 16, 1669, he got married.⁴ Perhaps it was anticipation of increased need for a salary that had made him speak so insistently to the court. The school, moreover, was continued, for the next year (Apr. 20, 1670) Casper Steinmets again appeared in court asking for "payment of fl. 100 seawant balance due for rent of the city school." From Steinmets' preceding request we learn that this annual rent was due on May 1. We should judge, then, that the school had continued to May 1, 1669, at the least. We may add that the treasurer was "ordered to pay Steinmets out of the first incoming monies."⁵

That Pietersen continued in the schoolroom even to the end of the period is made probable from the baptismal records of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York, on the pages of which "Mr. Evert Pieterszen Keteltas"⁶ or "Mr. Evert Keteltas" appears as witness during each of the years from 1667 to 1674, with the single

¹ Rec. of N. A., vi, 124.

² Eccl. Rec., p. 566.

³ Rec. of N. A., vi, 168.

⁴ With the coming of the English, surnames became more common among the Dutch.

⁵ N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Col., I, 33.

⁶ Rec. of N. A., vi, 221.

(probably accidental) exception of 1672.¹ This use of a title customary with the schoolmasters is hardly to be accounted for on any other supposition than that Pietersen was serving continuously in the schoolroom during the time. This supposition finds apparent corroboration in a letter written in 1670 by the New York church to the classis: "On account of the continued incapacity of Domine Drisius * * * the usual prayers, and the word of God and a sermon are read by the chorister Evert Pieterse."² Further corroboration appears in a minute of the consistory:

December 16, 1686. In consequence of the advanced age of Evert Pieterse, Abraham De La Noy was appointed to act as Clerk, Chorister and Visitor of the Sick.³

If, now, Pietersen continued to serve as voorsanger (chorister) during the whole period, as these two records would indicate, it is a fair inference—since the offices were closely linked—that he continued also to serve as schoolmaster. The mutual corroboration of this consideration and that derived from the title "Mr." makes it all but certain that Pietersen did in fact fill the office of parochial schoolmaster during the whole period from 1664 to 1674.

One wonders whether Pietersen ever finally secured his promised salary. Unfortunately, the records do not tell us definitely. The following minute may throw light upon the question:

Att a Mayors Court held att New York the 17th day of January 1679 * * *
Upon the compl^t of Mr. Evert Pieters, that he cannot receive the money fl. 350 due unto him from Stoffel van Laer upon an assignment from the Late Mr. Mayor; The Court ordered that the s^d van Laer should make pain^t of the s^d assignm^t within the space of eight days.⁴

Why the "Late Mr. Mayor" had assigned an order of fl. 350 to "Mr. Evert Pieters" save on account of his teaching does not appear. Of course, the transaction may have been merely one of private business between the two men; but the more one thinks of it the more does it seem probable that the assignment was a debt of the city against Stoffel van Laer, and that it was given to Pietersen as part compensation for teaching service. In this matter, also, Pietersen was called upon to exercise patience. Stoffel van Laer did not heed the order given him. He paid neither in eight days nor yet in eight months. "On Xber the 5th, 1671," we find that "Upon the Complaint of Mr. Evert Pieters Itt is ordered that the sherif before the next court day shall cause the execution w^{ch} the s^d Evert Pieterse hath ag^t Stoffel van Laer to be Satisfyed or otherwise that

¹ In all, Pietersen's name appears 23 times in these records during a period extending from 1661 to 1677. In one instance he is "Evert Pieterse, schoolm^r." (N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Coll., II, (2).) The title "Mr." is applied 23 times (*ibid.*, pp. 61, 64, 67, 70, 73 (*bis*), 75, 86, 87, 88, 92, 93, 96 (*bis*), 97, 100 (*bis*), 104 (*bis*), 105, 116, 120, 127). In one instance only (1673) is there nothing to indicate the office of schoolmaster. (*ibid.*, p. 108.)

² Eccl. Rec., p. 610.

³ Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

⁴ Rec. of N. A., vi, 278.

y^e Execution shall be Issued out ag^t the Effects of the Sherif himselfe."¹ We may well believe that when the "effects of the Sherif himselfe" are thus jeopardized the execution would be satisfied. At any rate, we hear no more of the matter.

Before final action was had on the "assignment" just discussed, steps were taken by the church which seems to imply the promise of a regular support for Pietersen. In 1671 "y^e Offic^{rs} of y^e Reformed Dutch Church" in New York City petitioned Gov. Lovelace for permission "to make a Rate or Taxe amongst y^e Inhabitants, and those that shall frequent the Church * * * for y^e Maintenance of their Minister or Minist^{rs}, y^e Clarke, or other Offic^{rs} of y^e Poore, As also for y^e reparaçon of y^e Church." The governor approved the plan suggested and granted (Sept. 26) to "y^e p^{re}sent Elders and Deacons * * * full Power and Authority to make such a Rate or Tax, and to Levy the same."² It seems accordingly well-nigh certain that beginning possibly about 1672 a rate was levied for the maintenance of the church, including the support of "y^e Clarke." This officer we must understand to be the voorlezer, who was of course Evert Pietersen. Whether the rate was levied upon all "y^e Inhabitants" without distinction, or only upon "those that shall frequent y^e Church," does not appear certain, but probably the latter. We seem to see in this event a transition from city support of the school during the Dutch régime to church support of the English period.

It may be added that in spite of every difficulty of salary collection Pietersen was by no means reduced to indigence. In 1674 his name appears on a list of the 62 "best and most affluent inhabitants" of the city, with 2,000 guilders to his credit.³ School-teaching seems to have been relatively more remunerative then than now.

In as exact detail as the records would permit we have now traced the history of the "City School" of New York during the period from 1664 to 1674. We saw it maintained by the city of New York under Evert Pietersen, the Dutch master, certainly until February, 1669, and very probably until the end of second Dutch régime. We saw that as late as April, 1670, the city was paying "rent for the City School." We found no absolutely certain proof that the city during this decade ever paid its schoolmaster a salary, but the probabilities inclined us to think that either the town or the church by assessment did pay something. We seem, in conclusion, warranted in supposing that the school begun apparently by Roelantsen in 1638 was continued without serious intermission as the official school of the town from that early beginning to 1674.

¹ Rec. of N. A., vi, 247.

² Executive Council Minutes, II, 617-8.

³ See p. 106.

CHAPTER X.

THE SCHOOL OF THE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH OF NEW YORK CITY, 1674-1776.

The facts relating to the school of the Reformed Dutch Church in New York City during the period under consideration have been so fully and—on the whole—so fairly given by Mr. Dunshee¹ that we need here present only a general survey of the period, with attention to certain points not fully discussed in that work.

The support of the Dutch church after the second English occupation was no longer an object of municipal concern. The Dutch school, which from the days of Roelantsen had been closely connected with the church, became—during the second English period—the concern of the church solely. Whatever salary the master received besides the tuition fees must have come from the church treasury; the consistory now formed the sole board of control; and the religious purpose of the school seems to have been even more strongly emphasized.

On account of the fragmentary character of the church records for the first half of the period under consideration, we can make few specific statements covering those 50 years. Indeed, what has just been said is rather from our general knowledge of the subject than from specific records.

The line of reasoning used in the preceding chapter would seem to show that Evert Pietersen continued in charge of the parochial school possibly until about 1687. The baptismal records give him the title of "Mr." as late as 1677.² In December of 1686, when Pietersen's health was failing, Abraham De Lanoy was appointed to act in his place as "clerk, chorister, and visitor of the sick."³ As these offices had, in accordance with the usual Dutch custom, been filled by Pietersen while he was acting as schoolmaster, it seems a fair presumption that he retained the school likewise until 1686, or at least so long as his health permitted; although it is a little strange that nothing is said about the school in the minute.

Some indication of the arrangements made by the church to supply the salary formerly given by the civil authorities is seen in a petition of De Lanoy, soon after he took Pietersen's place, that he might have the "fees for recording baptisms." The consistory, however, "resolved that the yearly allowance of 50 guilders for baptism as

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 35-59. ² *N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Coll.*, II, 126, 127. ³ *Dunshee, op. cit.*, p. 36.

fees shall be made until the death of Evert Pietersen, but when he dies the fees for recording baptism shall be paid to petitioner."¹

While it was not so suggested by Mr. Dunshee, it seems quite probable that this Abraham De Lanoy succeeded Pietersen in the schoolroom and continued to hold the position until his death in 1702. The argument for this opinion, however, is rather circumstantial than direct. In 1668 De Lanoy had been by the mayor and council, "admitted as schoolmaster in this city."² His school at that time was supposedly a private one. Dankers and Sluyter refer in their diary to a visit made by them to De Lanoy's school in 1679. The quotation may prove interesting aside from the point at issue.

On my return home, the son of our old people asked me if I would not go to their usual catechizing, which was held once a week at the house of Abraham De Lanoy, schoolmaster * * *. I accompanied him there and found a company of about 25 persons, male and female, but mostly young people. It looked like a school, as indeed it was, more than an assembly of persons who were seeking after true godliness; where the schoolmaster who instructed them handled the subject more like a schoolmaster in the midst of his scholars than a person who knew and loved God * * *. They sang some verses from the psalms, made a prayer, and questioned from the catechism, at the conclusion of which they prayed and sang some verses from the psalms again. It was all performed without respect or reverence, very literally, and mixed up with much obscurity and error.³

During the period from 1681 to 1691, the baptismal records contain several references to "Mr. Abraham De Lanoy."⁴ As elsewhere in like connection the title "Mr." can hardly mean anything else than service in the schoolroom. Finally, his will dated August 3, 1702, begins "I, Abraham De Lanoy, of the City of New York, Schoolmaster."⁵ If De Lanoy taught thus continuously in the city from 1668 to 1702, if he was in 1686 appointed "clerk, chorister, and comforter of sick"—duties almost invariably given to the master of the school—if, furthermore, he succeeded the schoolmaster Evert Pietersen in these offices, the conclusion is easy—if not necessary—that he succeeded Pietersen likewise in the schoolroom. If De Lanoy was ever placed in charge of the parochial school, there is no known reason to doubt that he held the place as long as he taught at all; that is, until his death in 1702.

Should any object that a parochial school is not to be supposed in the absence of positive record showing its existence, the answer appears clear. As the Dutch were in the large majority during this earlier period, as they held tenaciously to their language well into

¹ Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

² *Rec. of N. A.*, vi, 115.

³ *Long Island Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 1, 134. It may be that De Lanoy had by this time already taken over Pietersen's school, but the probabilities point to the contrary. The criticisms here directed against De Lanoy must be taken *cum grano salis*.

⁴ *N. Y. Gen. & Bio. Soc. Coll.*, 11, 163, 170, 192, 204.

⁵ *N. Y. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 1892: 3-42. On page 235 appears an inventory of De Lanoy's school books, made just after his death in 1702.

the eighteenth century, as custom and ecclesiastic law alike required the churches to provide schools, as the continuous existence of the school from 1726, when the records recommence, is abundantly shown in the records—in the face of all this we can not doubt that during the whole period from 1674 to the Revolution the school was kept in fairly continuous operation.

Corroboration of the opinion just expressed is found in the charter granted to the New York City church in 1696.¹ In this, privilege was granted to the minister and elders and deacons to "nominate and appoint a clerk, schoolmaster, bell ringer or sexton, and such other offices as they shall stand in need of." The same were further "authorized, from time to time, to make rates and assessments upon all and every one of the members in communion of the said church for the raising of money for the payment of the yearly stipends and salaries of the aforesaid officers of the said school." The domine wrote the classis shortly thereafter that the contents of the instrument "in respect to the power * * * of choosing elders, deacons, chorister, sexton, etc., and of keeping Dutch schools, [were] all in conformity to the Church-Order of the Synod of Dort, Anno, 1619."²

It may be of interest to learn something of the thoroughness of the catechetical instruction of this period. D^r Selyns, in 1698, sent to the classis a list of 44 boys and 21 girls who "had learned and repeated; or were ready to repeat, publicly, freely, and without missing, all the psalms, hymns, and prayers in rhyme, in the presence of" the "consistory and of many church members." Apparently there was a contest, for D^r Selyns reports that "the girls, although fewer in number, had learned and recited more, in proportion, than the boys." The average age of the children was 10 years, ranging from 7 to 14. The "regular Sunday prayer, which is made before the sermon, was recited without any mistake, and with energy and manly (*sic*) confidence, by Marycken Poppinga, a child of five years." We need not be surprised that when the congregation repeated the prayer after the little girl, it was "not without tears." The catechumens were evidently pleased by their feat, for they had a detailed report sent, not only to the Classis of Amsterdam, but also to the Dutch church of London.³

The disproportion in number of boys to girls in this contest quite possibly is indicative of a similar disproportion in the numbers that attended school. We shall see later that the proportion of marks made by women to men in affixing names to legal documents is in somewhat greater disparity than would be the school attendance indicated by these figures.

About the beginning of the eighteenth century the colonial governor, Lord Cornbury (1702-1708), "insisted that neither the ministers or

¹ Eccl. Rec., pp. 1136-1165.

² *Ibid.*, p. 1172.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 1233-1240.

schoolmasters of the Dutch, although the most numerous persuasion in the Province, had a right to preach or instruct without his gubernatorial license."¹

At this time (1705) the Dutch church of New York City had no schoolmaster. Two Dutch masters, Goelet and Kerfbyl, who had "by personal petition" sought in vain for a license from Cornbury, now turned to the church, urging upon it the charter privilege of conducting a school.²

There was but one Dutch schoolmaster in the city of New York at the time, and the church felt the need of "another and still more of greater qualifications." "Our Voorlezer," so we read, "has made request twice in writing for this addition; and others with great urgency have insisted on it; but they were not able to secure anything." Cornbury, in defiance of the provisions of the church charter, declined their petition "to be allowed to have one more schoolmaster." The church, in apprehension that the congregation might grow less "from the decline of nurturing schools," made an earnest appeal "for the help and intercession of the rev. classis."³ Nothing, of course, could come from that source, but Cornbury's administration ended shortly thereafter; and no succeeding governor saw fit to repeat his oppressive measures.

In 1726 the records begin at length to give tolerably full accounts of the school. On January 5, 1725-6, Mr. Barend de Forest was appointed schoolmaster under the supervision of the consistory. The school by this time had come to be looked upon as of significance, principally, in training the children to take part in the church service. Although English was at the time recognized as "the common language" of the Province, and although the publication of De Forest's appointment before the congregation stated in so many words that "there can not but be a general agreement by each and all of us that it is very necessary to be versed in this common language, in order properly to carry on one's temporal calling;" still it was urged that "all who belong to the Dutch Reformed Church and have any regard for God, and prefer the worship of the Dutch Reformed Church, can not but see and acknowledge that * * * it is equally necessary for them to be versed in the language in which God's worship is conducted and exercised."

De Forest's contract stipulated that the master was "to obey strictly all such orders as shall be judged necessary for the advancement of the youth in the Netherlandish tongue, and in the first principles of the Christian religion." The children, "according to their ability," were "to be taught to spell, read, write, and cipher; and also the usual prayers in the catechism." "Every Monday" he was to appear "with all the children, at the public catechizing to

¹ Smith's New York, p. 172.

² Eccl. Rec., p. 1584.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 1684, 1700.

test their ability and their diligence." On Wednesdays likewise, when there was preaching, he was to "attend the service with all the children." The school was in operation the year round, except on "Festival days" and Wednesday and Saturday afternoons. The hours were, "in summer, from 9 to 11 a. m., and from 1 to 4 p. m. In winter, from 9½ to 12½ a. m., and from 1 to 4 p. m." "None but edifying and orthodox books," such as the consistory might approve, should be used. The consistory paid for the teaching of "the children of indigent parents" at the rate of "nine pounds for ten children."¹ Only children above 7 years of age might take advantage of this free tuition.²

De Forest continued in charge until December 3, 1732, when misfortune came upon him. We read that on that date "there was presented to the consistory a written request from Mr. Barend de Forest, clerk in the old church, now a prisoner for debt, that the consistory would please become responsible for £50 or £60, and continue him in his office, and * * * take one-half of his salary for debt and pay him the other half for his support." But after much consideration, the consistory declined the petition; and placed Mr. Isaac Stoutenburg, the assistant, in temporary charge "at the rate of £15 per year."

A few months later (March 21) "Mr. Gerrit van Wagenen (at present Foresinger in the Low Dutch Reformed Congregation at Kingstowne)" was named as "clerk and Foresinger" in the "so-called gld church * * * and also to be the visitor of the sick for the whole congregation, and to keep school in the Dutch language, and finally to keep the books" of the church. Of these duties Van Wagenen's predecessors in office had apparently found that of visitor of the sick burdensome, for the third article of the contract sets out that, "as each one of the schoolmasters has had the duty of visitor of the sick, so you are to make no piteous scruples concerning the service (however weighty in itself), but render it as the ministers shall orally direct you." His salary is stated more explicitly than was De Forest's. As voorsanger and sieckentrooster he was to receive £15; "for the school teaching of twelve of the children of the poor" £10; "for keeping the books of consistory" £9; "four cords of wood" for use in the school room; for recording baptisms, "at least a half quarter, and as much more as the parties shall present you"; "for the first two years (and no longer), six pounds, yearly, New York currency, for his house rent." Besides all this, the consistory thought if he carried on his school "industriously," the citizens would send him "such a number of children" that altogether his salary would furnish "all adequate support" for his family.³

¹ "A pound here is equivalent to eight Holland guilders" (£3.20). *Ibid.*, p. 260.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 2337-2343.

³ Dunshoe, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-4.

The announcement before the congregation concerning the new régime at school expressed the hope "that the Christian congregation will be pleased to support the same for the general good for themselves and their children, by assiduously and in good number sending scholars to Mr. van Wagenen's school of orthodoxy." The religious function of the school, as expressed in the case of De Forest, was repeated here. The school was considered "absolutely necessary, useful, and salutary for the Christian rearing, teaching, and training of our youth, in order to gain them, from the earliest period, to the language of our church, and to a love for the Dutch reformed worship."¹

It is almost pitiable to see the blind zeal of the church leaders in resisting the spread of the English language. The closer the touch with Holland the blinder and more vehement the zeal. If there had been an early willingness to accept the inevitable, to translate the church service into English, and to effect ecclesiastical independence from Holland, the numbers and wealth of this church at the present time would be vastly greater. But all the strength of the Dutch character seemed rooted in opposition.

In a "further explanation" of Van Wagenen's duties, made just before he took up the duties of schoolmaster, occurs the first certain specific reference to girls that the writer has found in connection with the Dutch schools of America. Certain catechism recitations were to be required of "the school children, both boys and girls." It seems reasonably sure that girls had been in school all the while.² That no earlier reference has been found is, however, certainly remarkable. In this "further explanation," it was provided that the master should "set none of the children of the poor to writing or cyphering, without the consent of one of the ministers."³ Why this should have been stipulated is hard to understand. It would seem that the poor were not to be encouraged to go further than reading.

Gerrit van Wagenen remained in charge for just 10 years. Upon his death Isaac Stoutenburg was appointed provisionally as clerk and recorder of baptisms. Possibly Stoutenburg was also schoolmaster; but this seems hardly probable, as in three months we find Huybert van Wagenen, the son of the former master, already for some time installed in his father's place as schoolmaster.

On November 21, 1743, it was decided to provide "another Dutch school." Mr. Abraham de Lanoy, second of the name,⁴ was to be paid for teaching "ten children of poor parents in our congregation, who live too far, especially in winter, to come to the school of Mr. Huybert van Wagenen." Mr. de Lanoy was to "catechize the chil-

¹ Dunster, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

² See p. 217.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 2620.

⁴ See p. 147.

dren in the new church, and Mr. van Wagenen in the old church."¹ Abraham de Lanoy continued to teach from 1743 to 1747, when he was succeeded by William van Dalsem, who taught until 1757. Upon his death in that year this second school closed.² Mr. Huybert van Wagenen continued to serve as schoolmaster at the old church apparently until 1749, when Daniel Bratt was called from a similar position at Catskill to be chorister and schoolmaster.

Master Bratt's contract was for five years. As chorister he was to receive "twelve pounds, ten shillings, New York money," besides the baptismal fees. As schoolmaster he was to have a dwelling house and school, and £12 10s. for teaching "twelve free scholars, six in reading and six in writing." For each scholar he was to receive a load of wood, "half nut and half oak."³ Later the number of "free scholars" was increased to a maximum of 20. Apparently Mr. Bratt was not successful, for we find the consistory notifying him 13 months in advance that he must retire when his five years should expire.⁴ Some of this haste may have been due to the resentment felt by the consistory that Mr. Bratt should have rented out a portion of his house, an act felt by them to be "to the prejudice of the church."⁵

At this point the school history must take account of a long and bitter ecclesiastical struggle within the Dutch churches of America. One party was anxious to adapt the church more fully to American conditions, desiring in particular to secure ecclesiastical independence of Holland and to introduce the use of the English language into the church services. The other party opposed both innovations with a zeal as determined as it now appears blind. Interestingly enough the reactionary party was strongest in New York City, with D^r Ritzema of the old church as its admitted leader. In connection we may quote Hamilton, who says, in his famous Itinerarium (p. 107), of the Dutch of New York City in 1744: "Now their language and customs begin pretty much to wear out, and would very soon die were it not for a parcel of Dutch dominies here who, in the education of their children, endeavor to preserve the Dutch customs as much as possible."

We have already noted that 25 years before the English language had been publicly admitted to be necessary for commercial purposes, although the Dutch language had been counted "absolutely necessary" for the church service. Evidently this dualistic arrangement could not be permanent in a country where the English language was officially established and the English-speaking population was being so rapidly recruited. The older members of the church, however,

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 2829. It may be noted that about this time the church owned considerable property at the Manor of Fordham, including a schoolhouse, which the consistory felt bound to keep in repair. No reference, however, appears to oversight by the consistory of a school kept there. *Ibid.*, p. 2909.

² Dunshee, *op. cit.*, pp. xvi, 31.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 3337.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 2909.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3357.

could not recognize the inevitable. Knowing the Dutch language themselves, they could not see why the young people should not continue in the old paths. Many of the younger Dutch people, on their part, not understanding the public services as conducted in Dutch, united with English-speaking congregations to the "visible decay" of the Dutch churches.

In 1754 William Livingston issued a series of articles under the title of the "Independent Reflector," in which he especially opposed the growing strength of the Episcopal party. In the first number in order to rouse the Dutch he discussed the "visible decay" of the Dutch churches, and attributed it to "the too long continued use of the Dutch language." "The Dutch tongue, once the common dialect of this province, is now scarcely understood, except by its more ancient inhabitants." "The churches have kept exact pace with the language in its retrograde state." To prevent this he admits that the greatest pains had not been wanting. "They have had well-regulated free schools richly supported by their churches, and yet maugre their utmost efforts parents have found it in a degree impossible to transmit" the language to their children. "To prevent, therefore, the ruin of the old Dutch churches, common sense pointed out the absolute necessity of disuniting them from the language" that was dragging them down.¹

However strongly such a statement might appeal to the unprejudiced, it could only arouse to more determined opposition such a reactionary as D^r Ritzema. The schools, he admitted, had failed to preserve the old state of affairs; but that was because they had failed to do their duty. The fault was with them; they must be made better. We accordingly find D^r Ritzema writing to Holland in behalf of his consistory, saying that they had "long lacked a suitable schoolmaster and chorister to the manifest injury of the youth as well as of worship." The church had accordingly "finally resolved to incur the trouble and expense of sending for one to Holland."²

This plan of bringing over a Holland master would not only have the merit of adding prestige to the school—no recalcitrant parent among the Dutch need hereafter claim that he could not afford to patronize the church school, "to the injury" of his children; but besides it would secure an ally to the Dutch party. A man who knew no English would not surreptitiously spread that commercial language, and certainly he would not favor loosening church ties with Holland. So determined was Ritzema's party for the plan to succeed that they offered "such compensation as almost doubles what any one in this service has ever before enjoyed."

¹ Independent Reflector, January, 1754. In view of these undoubted facts it is interesting to see an advertisement in the New York Gazette Post-Boy (Apr. 1, 1751) by one Klockhoff, offering to teach "reading and writing in Dutch, French, and Latin."

² Ecol. Rec., p. 3530.

"The qualifications demanded in such a person" were that as a chorister he should understand the art of singing, have a voice to be heard, and have "the gifts to instruct others in the art;" as a schoolmaster he should be "a good reader, writer, and cypherer," and he was to be "not under twenty-five nor above thirty-five years of age." "The emoluments offered to such a person" were "a free dwelling, new and commodious." In which "besides the large school room there is a small parlor, a large kitchen, two chambers above, a cellar under the house, and behind the house a kitchen garden, a well with a pump, and many other conveniences. This house would bring an annual rent of twenty pounds, New York currency."¹ In addition, he should receive fifteen pounds annually for leading the singing; twenty-four pounds for instructing "twenty poor children in reading, writing, and cyphering;" "fire wood for these children, six pounds yearly;" for keeping the church books, eight pounds; baptismal fees, at least seven pounds; and "besides these an annual salary of twenty pounds." "To this may be added that the school is open for the children of all the citizens." "As there is no other suitable school of the Holland Dutch in the city," the master might expect from this source "at least forty pounds more."² The combined income from all these sources, including house rent, would be £140, New York currency, or \$350, which was much above what most schoolmasters received at the time. We may note that the total number of pupils contemplated would be about 45, as we may reckon from the scale of tuition fees fixed by the consistory.³

It took nine months to get such a master, but on November 9, 1755, "Mr. Johan Nicolas Welp, with his wife and children, all in good health" arrived from Amsterdam. The consistory was pleased with his testimonials and "resolved to pay him eight pounds for his freight and waste of goods from New London here, besides the fifteen pounds promised for the expenses of his voyage."⁴ Nor was this all. "Considering the loss which Mr. Welp suffered in the sale of his goods, in consequence of his removing from Amsterdam at short notice, the consistory made up among themselves a present of twenty pounds, which he very gladly received."⁵

In spite of all this lavishness the effort to stem the oncoming tide of Americanizing influence was in vain. From 1743 there had been two Dutch schools, but two years after Mr. Welp came, the "ten children taught by the late Mr. van Dalsem were allowed to Mr.

¹ "One pound New York currency is a little more than six guilders and twelve stivers," that is, about \$2.20 (1755). *Ecel. Rec.*, p. 3531.

² *Ibid.*, p. 3530 ff.

³ "Mr. Welp was allowed to claim for his instruction of the children per quarter: For reading only, five shillings; for reading and writing, eight shillings, and six pence for pen and ink; and ten shillings for cyphering; and six shillings for those who learn singing." *Consistory minutes*, Nov. 16, 1755. *Ecel. Rec.*, p. 3621.

⁴ *Consistory minutes. Ibid.*, pp. 3614, 3641.

⁵ Letter of D^r Ritsema Dec. 29, 1755. *Ecel. Rec.*, p. 3642.

Welp provisionally."¹ Provisional as this was, it marked the last of the second school. Later Mr. Welp's salary was reduced to "£16 above his income" from tuition and other fees.² In the meanwhile agitation for an English-speaking minister had been successfully made, though only against determined opposition.³

In a letter of January 10, 1763, written by the consistory to Holland asking for an English-speaking minister, the decay of the Dutch language is pathetically set forth: "We have daily the mortification to see the offspring of the wealthiest members of our congregation leave our divine worship, not being able to apprehend what is taught." "There is scarce a principal family in this city and even in our own church whose children clearly understand the Dutch language."⁴ In 1765 Mr. Welp came before the consistory and "stated that the deacons had decided that they could not continue him on the same footing upon which he had before stood—receiving from them £16 above his income. He therefore humbly asked, inasmuch as the Dutch school was so poor, and his recording the names of baptized children had also greatly diminished, that the consistory would please to provide some other way. This the consistory considered favorably, and ordered that inasmuch as he had been appointed catechist and consoler of the sick, the £16 should on this account be allowed him."⁵ Even if we do not here admit that the baptisms had in fact fallen off, evidently the Dutch school was such a failure that Welp had to take up the offices of catechist and siecken-trooster in order to make ends meet.

Not only did the Dutch school fail of its purpose to keep alive the Dutch language, but there was strong effort to organize an English school, of higher grade. "A proposal was made by Mr. Jacobus van Zant to establish a Latin and English grammar school under the direction of our consistory. * * * This was agreed to by the majority."⁶ A subscription was begun "to build, or hire a suitable schoolhouse," but "for important reasons"—unknown to us now—the matter was delayed, and apparently came to nothing.

In the meanwhile the opponents of English preaching had not been reconciled. In 1767 they made a lengthy appeal to the colonial governor to redress their alleged wrongs. (Among the petitioners was Huybert van Wageningen who had previously served as schoolmaster.) The seventh grievance alleged in the appeal was "that the Dutch school is not taken care of by the rulers to the total ruin of the

¹ Consistory minutes, Aug. 22, 1757. *Dunshoe. op. cit.*, p. 51.

² *Ecl. Rec.*, p. 3983.

³ It was asserted by the opponents of the English party that "even Rev. Ritsema once avowed that rather than allow an English minister to speak in our church he would lay his head upon the block and say 'Cut it off.'" *Ecl. Rec.*, p. 3880.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3854.

⁵ Consistory minutes, Mar. 21, 1765. *Ecl. Rec.*, p. 3963.

⁶ Consistory minutes, July 29, 1765. *Ibid.*, p. 3999.

Dutch education."¹ The answer made by the school authorities to this seventh alleged grievance was "that we have at present and for twelve years past have employed Mr. Welp, who was sent for to Holland as a schoolmaster and catechist; he keeps a school constantly open, receives payment from us for teaching the poor children of the congregation to the number of thirty, which number never was completed; he is a person very well qualified to catechise and teach school, and we pay him a very handsome salary for his service, insomuch that his place is coveted by others."²

That not 30 poor children cared to avail themselves of free education in the Dutch language is sufficient commentary on the folly of trying longer to keep up a school exclusively in that tongue. The deacons seem to have accepted this view; for we find them requesting that the catechists be discharged because their salaries could not be raised "without injury to the poor." The consistory, however, would not agree to the plan. But later they withdrew from Mr. Welp the £16 allowed him as a catechist and as visitor of the sick; "for he is not in a condition, owing to bodily infirmity, to bear the burden" of these offices.³ This action in the case of an ill man seems a little hard; but perhaps we do not know enough to judge. When Mr. Welp died, some three years later, the church was more liberal. They canceled a debt against his estate of £5, paid his funeral expenses, allowed the family to continue in the church house for some months without charge, and gave the widow an annual pension of 20 pounds.⁴

In 1772 there was contributed "a sum of five and seventy pounds, eight shillings, as the beginning of a fund for the erection and maintenance of a public school, to be set up by the consistory."⁵ We hear nothing more of this prior to the Revolution. Quite likely the example of the Trinity Church School, which was now receiving many bequests, incited these members of the Dutch church to like activity.

When the consistory came to elect a successor to Mr. Welp, they recognized, as we have it in their own words, that "the Dutch language is constantly diminishing and is going out of use." They therefore "deemed it proper to call a person who is qualified to instruct and educate the children in the English as well as the Dutch language." The person selected for this was "Mr. Peter van Steenbergh, at present schoolmaster at Flatbush on Long Island." The instructions given are quite similar to those that we have previously examined. "For the instruction of 30 poor children" he was to receive £60; "firewood for one year, £8;" "books, paper, ink, quills, etc., for one year, £5; for the care of certain church chambers, £8."

¹ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., III, p. 309.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 426, 427.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 4106.

⁴ Consistory minutes, Apr. 23, 1772. *Ibid.*, p. 426.

⁵ Consistory minutes, Apr. 30, 1770. Eccl. Rec., p. 4184.

"For your encouragement, you shall have a dwelling house and garden free, and also a good room for the school." "It shall be allowed you to instruct as many other children as may offer themselves to you, but not beyond the number of 30, and also to keep an evening school."¹ Mr. Steenbergh accepted the proffered place and continued in charge as "the public schoolmaster of this congregation" until "the commencement of the war," when the school suspended operations.²

The consistory at this time decided to build a schoolhouse at a cost not exceeding £400.³ "With its dependencies, however, the final cost was £856:15:1 $\frac{1}{2}$."⁴ When the house was finished, the consistory adopted some rather interesting rules regarding the free scholars:

1. No boy shall be received under nine, and no girl under eight years of age.
2. No child so received shall remain in the school longer than three years, so as to make room for new ones; yet if no new ones be hindered thereby they may remain.

Children of the church members were to be given preference. The consistory should make a public visitation to the school every quarter, while the elders and deacons should go monthly "to see what progress the scholars are making."⁵

The last school reference prior to the Revolution is in a consistory minute of March 6, 1774, which states that the deacons were appointed a standing committee in relation to the poor children who are now maintained in the school.⁶ Mr. Dunshee states (p. 94) that the school from its origin to 1808 was "under the supervision of the board of deacons." One hesitates to differ from Mr. Dunshee on a point which would seem to lie so peculiarly within the scope of his knowledge; but the evidence hardly bears out the assertion. The reference just above given is an illustration to the point. The consistory, not the deacons—so far as appears from the records—settled every question relating to the school from 1674 to the date of the last-quoted reference. It is true that the deacons seem to have been peculiarly charged with the care of the church finances, and in this capacity we find them making recommendations to the consistory touching the school. In only one instance—when De Lanoy was asked to teach 10 poor children—does it appear that the deacons first acted without a special authorization. But in this case they took the first opportunity to make this known to the meeting (of the consistory), expecting that it would be approved.⁷

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 4261.

² Consistory minutes, Sept. 7, 1784. Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 4262.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4272.

⁵ Consistory minutes, Aug. 6, 1778. *Ibid.*, 4264-4265.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4270.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Nov. 21, 1743. *Ibid.*, 2820.

We have now traced the history of this the oldest school in New York from 1638 to the Revolution. There is no reason to suppose that at any time within this period was the continuity of existence broken. While it ceased in 1674 to be the official city school, it nevertheless retained throughout the whole colonial period of nearly a century and a half its connection with the Reformed Dutch Church of the city.

We may suppose, though the evidence is not abundant, that until the early decades of the eighteenth century the school remained uniquely the established elementary school for the Dutch-speaking population. With the spread of the English language the usefulness of the school evidently declined and became more and more a charity school, although that name was not applied until after the Revolution.¹

We noted the ineffectual effort to use the school to perpetuate the Dutch language. The presence of the two languages in New York City must have operated to the injury of the cause of education within the city. For the greater portion of the period under consideration the inhabitants of Dutch descent were in the majority. Their whole previous history both in Old and New Netherlands had made the church and the municipality, conjointly, the proper guardians and support of public education. In colonial New York, however, these two worked at cross purposes. If the municipality was to support any school, it must be for the teaching of English. The church, however, would support only Dutch schools. The great mass of the Dutch population could not give exclusive support to an education which served one day of the week only, ignoring the economic demands of the other six. Nor on the other hand could they, under the leadership of their ministers, feel cordial interest in a municipal school which would not merely ignore the church but would apparently wean the youth away from its influence. As a result of these conflicting interests the English apathy toward public support of education, instead of the Dutch custom of municipal schools, became the established policy of New York City during the colonial period.

We can never cease to regret that the splendid interest of the Dutch in education and the powerful force of their customary support of municipal schools should have been to so great a degree lost through the inability of their religious leaders to accept the English language as an inevitable necessity. Had the system of municipal schools been retained after 1674, giving instruction, however, in both languages, the transition from the Dutch to the English language could have been made with greater ease and with far less hurt to the Dutch church; and New York City would have gained a full hundred years in the development of its school system.

¹Dunshce, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

CHAPTER XI.

THE SCHOOL OF NEW HAERLEM AFTER 1664.

As we saw in Chapter VIII, Jan de la Montagne was schoolmaster in New Haerlem at the beginning of the English occupation. This position he held until October 23, 1670,¹ when he resigned. What his salary was under the new régime, or how it was collected, does not appear. To judge from what happened later, voluntary subscriptions furnished the greater part of the salary. The village was still small, the church in 1665 consisting of only 23 resident members.

In 1667 was erected a building primarily for church purposes but used also as a schoolhouse, having, moreover, a loft from which rent was sometimes collected. This seems so remarkable a compound of church, school, and finance, that we should doubt the statement did not the records plainly assert that the deacons, with the consent of the magistrates and community, let at public auction "the loft over the church or schoolhouse."² This seems to be one case where the schoolmaster did not live in the schoolhouse.³

We have said above that Montagne resigned October 23, 1670. To be exact, this was the date when his successor, Hendrick Jansen Van der Vin, was elected.⁴ The term of Van der Vin's service was fixed at three years. His salary for services as schoolmaster and voorlezer was "f. 400 yearly in seawant or in grain at seawant price," and also a dwelling house, with 60 loads of firewood. This last was furnished by the inhabitants, three furnishing 12 loads each, and four, 6 loads each. The salary was made up principally by subscription, Montagne, the outgoing master, subscribing 10 florins, 7 stivers. In order to help with the salary the town lot, garden, and meadow were leased for six years at 120 florins a year, in seawant or grain at seawant price.⁵

After one year's trial of the subscription plan, a tax was authorized to raise Van der Vin's salary, "calculated $\frac{2}{3}$ on the lands and $\frac{1}{3}$ on the erven (town residence lots); amounting for each morgen to f. 1: 12: 6, and for each erf. f. 6: 7." But, notes Montagne on the margin of the court record, "It came to nothing." As yet the

¹ Riker, *History of Harlem*, p. 269.

² *Ibid.*, p. 285. The quotation marks here are Riker's, from which we infer that the quotation itself was taken from the now hidden town records.

³ *But see* p. 162.

⁴ Riker surmises (p. 277) that Arent Evertson Molenaar may have served temporarily between Montagne and Van der Vin. Apparently there is no documentary proof of this.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 269. This salary (f. 400 seawant) was about equal to 40 dollars.

people were not ready for school or church taxes.¹ Nor were they entirely willing to pay the voluntary subscriptions. We find in 1673 the court, at the request of the voorlezer, directing the sheriff to collect the salary as per list of "free-will contributors."² What success the sheriff found in collecting the salary we do not know.

On November 1, 1673, Van der Vin was re-elected for another three years on the same terms as before, with the additional stipulation that the people should keep the house and garden fence in repair. The salary was to be paid half-yearly in grain at market value, and "according to the old list of free-will contributors." This list has been preserved. On it are 18 names, of whom, however, only 14 actually subscribed for the 1673-1676 term. The subscriptions range from 4 to 30 florins, and average about 16 florins. Besides subscriptions, "the town allotment" was rented for 120 florins annually, and "the meadows" at 35 florins, 1 stiver. The total amounted to 406 florins.

This second contract with Van der Vin was signed during the short return of the Dutch to power in 1673-74. The transition of government had been made easily. The Dutch governor sent the village a new charter, bringing back the old court of schout and schepens selected by the double nomination system common among the Dutch. The ninth section of the charter authorized the schout and schepens, "for the peace and tranquillity of the inhabitants in their district, to make any orders" (subject to proper approval) respecting highways, etc., "also for the observance of the Sabbath, respecting the building of churches, of schools, and similar public works."³ A report made to the Dutch governor at this time states that New Haerlem contained 16 householders, 22 males between 16 and 60 years of age, and a few males above 60. Of the 22 males of military age, 3 were Englishmen and 8 were "young men" (i. e., unmarried).⁴

When the Dutch gave back the colony (Nov. 10, 1674), it was apparently judged necessary to renew the contract with Van der Vin. The terms were the same as previously. This time 18 people subscribed, of their free will, sums ranging from 3 to 38 florins, the average being about 15 florins. Two declined to subscribe, claiming exemption on account of difference of religion.

In October, 1676, Van der Vin complained that his house was no longer fit to live in. Accordingly the town decided that for the winter they would move him into the schoolhouse or church after it

¹ Riker, *History of Harlem*, p. 276.

² *Ibid.*, p. 287.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 305-6. The same charter was sent simultaneously to some 29 other villages in New Netherland. O'Callaghan, *Laws of Netherland*, p. 476 ff.

⁴ Riker, *op. cit.*, pp. 286, 301-302.

should be repaired and adapted to his purposes, by putting in a bedstead,¹ chimney and mantel, and making the door and windows tight. It was further decided "to repair (vermaekern) the old house the following spring."²

We have several times called attention to the "free will contributions" by which the voorlezer was paid. It appears that there was in this practice a considerable element of compulsion in spite of the descriptive adjective. In 1676 two of the French inhabitants persisted in a course of not subscribing to the voorlezer's salary; one had failed to subscribe for three years and the other for two years. The matter was referred to the mayor's court at New York, which had jurisdiction, and on November 7 an order was passed that "the Clerk of the Parish be continued in his place, and have his pay what is behind, and for the future as formerly."³ There is so much indefiniteness in this order as to cause no surprise that the delinquents still held out in spite of many formal demands on the part of the local court. As the constables hesitated to use force, the matter again came before the mayor's court, which on March 6, 1677, issued the following order:

From the City of New York to the Town of Harlem:

The Court order, that Hendrick Jansen Vander Vin, the clerk of the said town be continued in his place according to former order, and have his pay, what is behind and for the future as formerly by the inhabitants: and if they or any of them refuse to pay what is due from them for the time past, and for the time to come, then the constable is hereby ordered to levy the same by distress and sale of the goods, for satisfaction of what is or shall hereafter become due to the said clerk.⁴

From this distance, even this second order seems vague as to the precise question at issue. We might even suppose that the city court meant to rule solely as to the salary due Van der Vin in his capacity as town clerk, leaving out of account his work as voorlezer and schoolmaster. The local court, however, did not take this view of the decision; and it does not seem to have occurred to the defendants to escape by that precise plea. When the summons for payment was issued in accordance with the court ruling, the answer was returned that Gov. Lovelace had said, "the French of the Town of New Harlem should be free as to contributing to the Dutch Voorlezer," now that they had a French minister. The local court would not accept this plea and directed execution against the defendants for the amounts due and the costs. After further efforts, one of the defendants paid up; but the other proved obdurate. Apparently nothing further was done to enforce payment.⁵

To use the term "free-will contributions" not only in connection with the forced collection of subscriptions already made, but even in

¹ Riker says "bedroom," but puts in parentheses "bedstede," which in Dutch means bedstead.

² Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 322.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 234-5-6.

connection with compulsory subscriptions, seems at this day entirely anomalous and self-contradictory. But one familiar with the period under consideration will recognize in the incident and in the terms used a normal stage in the development of public rate support of church, school, or poor out of a preexisting true voluntary contribution. The evolution has typically gone through three stages, first, a voluntary contribution, second, a contribution freely made if possible, forced if necessary, and third, a formal rate levied equitably upon all by the duly constituted public authorities.¹ New Haerlem at the time under consideration was evidently in the second period of the evolution. If events should proceed normally, a purely rate-supported school would result.

On February 7, 1678, the question of salary again came before the court. We read:

Is further resolved and concluded that the magistrates shall go about among the common inhabitants and see how much each is willing to contribute yearly, to the maintenance and salary of the *voorzeezer*, beginning the 23rd of October of the previous year, 1677, and following. The *voorzeezer* must have yearly for salary, according to agreement entered into the 23rd of October, 1670, the sum of 400 guilders; the magistrates remain held to furnish the money.²

There seems a little suggestion of threat in the closing clause of the resolution: If the money were not subscribed a tax levy might be made. As a result of the canvas "among the common inhabitants" 20 subscribe, not including the two recalcitrants. The amounts are much as formerly, varying from 6 to 40 guilders, with an average of about 13 guilders. The rents, however, are hardly more than half, so that only 342 guilders were available. When this deficiency was duly considered, Van der Vin agreed (May 8, 1678) "to the constable and magistrates" to be content with the sum available for that one year, provided that "the constable and magistrates shall then make a new and reliable assessment for the full sum of 400 guilders yearly as salary, according to the first accord of 23d of October, 1670."³ The word "assessment" in the resolution seems to indicate that the evolution of a tax rate was progressing rapidly, at least in the minds of the court.

Probably part of Van der Vin's willingness to take the reduced salary was due to a promise of the court to provide a new house. At the same meeting it was "also taken into consideration about the rebuilding of the town's house for the *voorzeezer*; it is found good to take the work in hand by the first opportunity; as the most necessary work to be done by the inhabitants, and they having leisure to properly haw and make ready the timber for the same." The court im-

¹ For the evolution of poor support in England, and of church and school support in colonial Massachusetts see Jackson, *Development of School Support in Colonial Massachusetts*, pp. 10-11, 18, 20, 73, *et passim*.

² Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 350.

mediately called into the meeting, a carpenter and asked of him an estimate. "Demands 200 guilders; whereupon it was not ordered, but the magistrates said they would think upon it and inform him when they should be able to have him do it." Four months later (September 7), "the constable and magistrates, with the advice of the whole community" contracted for the necessary timber for 130 guilders; "to wit: 5 beams twenty feet long, broad in proportion; 12 posts ten feet long; 4 sills twenty-two and twenty feet long, 2 rafters, 2 girders, 1 other spar, all twenty-two feet; also split shingles for the roof; all finished to deliver at the stump."¹ Apparently it took three or four years to finish the house. There is still in existence a detailed account giving many of the expenses, and the rate list by which the necessary funds were raised.² Twenty-six landowners were assessed amounts varying from 5 guilders 8 stivers to 104 guilders and 19 stivers, the average being about 31 guilders. The 800 guilders so raised does not, apparently, represent the whole cost of the house.

After this, our records grow less definite. Van der Vin died about the first of 1685 at the age of 70. Says Riker:

As he lives in the work of his pen, Van der Vin shows his culture, and incidentally his knowledge of Latin and Spanish. He was remarkable for his accuracy, very methodical and precise in small as well as greater matters, clerk of the court, both drafter and registrar of deeds, wills and contracts, accountant for the town and church; all these added to his specific duties as voorlezer and schoolmaster, it was raising to find minuted in his clear, neat hand, "set hen to brood, 15th July, 1675."³

In the early part of January, 1685, Jan Tibout, who had been dismissed from Flatbush for conduct unbecoming a voorlezer and schoolmaster (p. 173), was invited to succeed Van der Vin in these offices. But by the ecclesiastical comity (if not more positive regulation), he could not be admitted to the proffered place until he had been relieved of the censure laid upon him by the Flatbush church. Thither he accordingly sent his request with a testimonial from D^r Selyns "minister of N. York and N. Haerlem aforesaid, wherein it was stated that during the two years that Jan Thibald had passed under the ministry of N. York, nothing was heard of him except what beseeemed an honorable man." Upon this showing, the Flatbush consistory was prevailed upon (Jan. 16) "to remove the said Jan Thibald from censure * * * that he may enter upon the service to which he has been called."⁴

On January 20, Tibout accordingly entered upon the duties recently laid aside by Van der Vin. His salary was 300 guilders; he and his family were to occupy "the town's house."⁵ The collection of Tibout's salary again raised the question of forcing citizens of another faith to support the Dutch voorlezer." In 1686, one John Delavall, a Quaker, was indebted to the town "for stone, timber, lime, and

¹ Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 381.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 372-3.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 302-3.

⁴ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 62.

⁵ Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

morgen money, 236 florins (for the new church); for two years salary of voorlezer, 95 florins; for quit rents, 32 florins." Being a Quaker he had conscientious scruples against supporting the faith of the Dutch, so the town levied on 61 schepels of wheat belonging to him. An early American example of "passive resistance."¹

On April 23, 1690, Tibout yielded his position to Guiliam Bertholf, who in turn served only about a year and a half, leaving September 13, 1691.² Tibout then returned and stayed, so it appears, for six or eight years, after which he is said to have gone to Bushwick.³ His successor was Adriaen Vermeule, from Vlissingen, Zeeland, who entered upon his duties November 4, 1699. Riker says, "judging from his penmanship, he was a scholar." Upon the coming of Vermeule the town built "a new house, as a dwelling for the voorlezer, and as a school and a town house."⁴ Vermeule remained for eight years, when he was "requested to be voorlezer at Bergen," and was dismissed with commendation on January 1, 1708.

Following this there is a break in the records of a few years, after which Johannes Amsterdam van Haringen, was chosen to act as voorlezer, and with his service end our records. He stayed apparently for several years.⁵

We have now traced the school at New Haerlem for a period of over 50 years. From 1664 to 1708 there was no serious break in its operation. The master all this time was supported in major part by means of "freewill contribution," which approximated rate assessments. We need not doubt that tuition was also charged. The town furnished a school house and a dwelling for the master. Part of the time the master lived and taught in separate houses, and part in the same house. During the whole period⁶ the schoolmaster was voorlezer in the Reformed Dutch Church as well as schoolmaster, and besides acted as clerk of the town court. We have no reason to doubt the moral and religious character of any one of the schoolmasters unless we except Jan Tibout, and he was said to have reformed. The record of New Haerlem, as here given, provokes praise. For the greater part of the period under review the village numbered less than a score of families. But this small group, out of its limited means, moved by no external pressure, maintained a village school with unfailing regularity, paid the schoolmaster a fair salary, and furnished him with a free dwelling. In no other instance did the Dutch interest in education manifest itself more strikingly.

¹ Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 406.

² *Ibid.*, p. 407 n. Bertholf had previously been a cooper, and later became a minister. Eccl. Rec., 1051, 1073.

³ Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 408 n. Cf. Bushwick town record book (1660-1825), pp. 113-9.

⁴ Riker, *op. cit.*, p. 407 n.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 408 n.

⁶ Except possibly the break at 1711-12, when Morris was trying to introduce Episcopalianism. Eccl. Rec., pp. 1743, 1940. Dix, *op. cit.*, I, 176-7.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SCHOOLS OF FLATBUSH AFTER 1664.

The records available for Flatbush are fuller than for any other of the Dutch villages, affording accordingly the best account that we have of any of the village schools.

The Flatbush school was opened, as we saw, not later than January of 1659. The first master is not known. In 1660 Reynier Bastiaensen van Giesen was elected, and he was succeeded by Pelgrom Clocq, who was appointed schoolmaster October 26, 1663, "for one year and the engagement to be released on either side each year." The English came in September of 1664, some time before Clocq's first and only year had expired.¹

Cloq's successor was "the worthy Arent Evers Molenaer, late schoolmaster, precentor, and comforter of the sick at New Amstel," although it appears that a slight interim came between the two: Since Cloq's salary was paid for exactly one year, it seems probable that his time expired October 26, 1664, one year after his contract. Molenaer seems to have been in New Amsterdam after this time, since he had a child baptized there on November 9,² and he sold there, on December 10/20, his account against the city of old Amsterdam for services at New Amstel.³ We should probably not go far wrong to place January 1, 1665, as the beginning of his service at Midwoud. In March of 1665, "Mr. Arent Molenaer" bought a farm "in the vicinity of the town of Midwoud."⁴ On April 3 "Arent Evert Molenaer" witnessed a paper.⁵ On August 16 of the same year the deacons paid to "Arent Aeeversen" their share of his first year's salary, 50 guilders.⁶ In June of the succeeding year the church paid its part of the second year's salary to "Aert Evers."⁷ From

¹ Strong (History of Flatbush, p. 109-110) gives a continuous list of masters from 1659 to 1802. The names that he assigns to the seventeenth century are as follows: Adrian Hegemen, 1659-71; Jacob Joosten, 1671-73; Francays De Bruynne, 1673-74; Michael Hainelle, 1674-75; Jan Gerrit van Marckye, 1675-80; Derick Storm, 1680-81; Jan Tibout, 1681-82; Johannes van Eckellen, 1682-1700. It will be observed that neither Van Giesen nor Clocq appear on Strong's list, while no evidence is available that even tends to connect Hegemen with the school. On account of further inaccuracies in the list, it is necessary to pay more attention to names and dates than would otherwise be desirable; our resulting list will be very different, so far as concerns the seventeenth century.

² N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Coll., ii, 75.

³ Minutes of the orphan masters, etc., ii, 4.

⁴ Flatbush town records, 105: 21.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁶ Flatbush deacons' accounts, i, 13 A. It is assumed that his contract was the same as Cloq's.

⁷ *Ibid.*, i, 14 A. See also Flatbush town records, 106: 252, 259, for payments made by the church masters from the rent of the school land.

these two payments of exactly 50 guilders each from the church, it seems quite probable that his term of service extended over exactly two years. This finds corroboration in the salary payments of his successor.

As Molenaer's term was closing (Dec. 15, 1666), the church masters paid out "for plastering the chimney in the school and the covering 11 gl., p. 10 st."¹ As this house was built only three years before (see p. 126), it may excite some surprise that it needed covering so soon.² The use of thatch rather than shingles is probably the explanation.

Molenaer's successor was Jan Tibout, whom we have already met at Bergen (p. 137) and in New Haerlem (page 164) and shall meet several times in other connections. His contract is the first one found at Flatbush after the English occupation. His duties, while more nicely specified than were those of Van Giesen and Cloeq, are almost the same. He was schoolmaster, voorlezer, voorsanger, sexton, and court messenger. Tuition charges were for A, B, C, and spelling, 2 guilders per quarter; for reading and writing, 2 guilders, and for both together, 2 guilders and 10 stivers. His salary was 300 guilders,³ seawant, in grain, together with a free house, garden, and house lot belonging to the school. The service was to begin on December 25, 1666, o. s., and last for one year; though it was in fact continued for about four years. Interestingly enough this contract was signed by the court officials only, not by the consistory.⁴ What makes this change in the contracting parties the more interesting is that the schoolmaster's church duties are minutely prescribed, and that the deacons continued all during his term of office to pay the 50 guilders annually on his salary, just as had been done when they were parties to the contract. The regular salary payments made by the deacons and churchmasters of 50 guilders and 250 guilders, respectively,⁵ leave us in no doubt that Tibout remained in charge of the school until his successor came, November 1, 1670.

The successor to Tibout was Jacob Joosten, whom we have previously seen at Kingston (pp. 134-5). His contract was drawn up on August 8, some months in advance of the commencement of actual service. It is one of those long itemized school contracts which seemed to delight the Dutch sense of order and form. This is one of the very best of all the contracts we have, as it gives many minute details. Joosten, as contracting master, on the one hand, and the consistory and the town court, on the other, were parties to the contract. There are 12 articles, fixing among other

¹ Flatbush town records, 106: 259.

² Some \$30 or \$35 of our money.

³ Flatbush town records, 105: 87-88.

⁴ Flatbush deacons' accounts, 1, 15^A, 17^B, 22^B; Flatbush town records, 106: 279; Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 4, 12.

things the school hours, the religious services of the school, the catechizing, the master's duties as voorlezer, as voorsanger, as sexton, and as messenger of the church and court. He was required by the sixth article "to be modest in his demeanor and diligent and patient with the children; also always calm and friendly to them." His remuneration came from several sources: For providing the bowl of water at baptisms "12st. from the parents or the witnesses," for inviting to funerals, preparing the grave, and tolling the bell, "for persons 15 years old or upward, 12 gl.; and under, 8 gl.," with more if he went out of the town to extend the invitations. As court messenger there was a regular schedule of charges. The seventh item fixed the tuition charges: "To receive in payment of A. B. and spelling, 2 gl.; of reading and writing together, 2 gl., 10 st.; for evening school, reading and writing, 3 gl." He was "to receive, in addition an annual salary of 300 gl. in wampum, or grain, to be delivered at the ferry; in addition a house free of rent, with a garden and use of lands belonging to the school, and annually from each farm one load of manure and one load of firewood or the value thereof, and next summer a new and proper dwelling house on the school lot." The time of service was for one year beginning November 1, 1670. "All done in the meeting of constables and overseers and consistory of the town of Midwoud."¹

Although the English had been masters of New Netherland for six years, this contract shows almost identically the same conditions as were found in the Dutch days. In certain respects more nearly the same than was seen in Tibout's contract of 1666.

The promise to provide "next summer a new and proper dwelling house on the school lot" bore fruit. The church masters contracted with one Auke Jansz to build "a house according to plan thereof and conditions thereof at his own board expense" for the sum of 600 guilders.² Either the old schoolhouse received at the same time new roofing, or the roof for the new house had not been included in Auke Jansz' contract, for 30 guilders were paid out for this purpose with 15 guilders besides to the hod carrier.³ Either the work on the schoolhouse progressed slowly, or some accident befell; for on January 30, 1672, the church masters spent 15 guilders "for one half barrell good beer for setting the school to rights."⁴ The Dutch, as well as other of the early colonists, performed such public works more willingly, if not more effectively, with the aid of plenty of "good beer." A year later some repairing was necessary, for there were bought "50 nails for the schoolhouse" at 15 stivers and the roof again needed attention, as roofs do.⁵

¹ Flatbush town records, 105: 207.

² Flatbush church masters' records, p. 14. On p. 19 of the same this was called the "schoolhouse."

³ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁴ Flatbush town records, 106: 223.

⁵ Flatbush church masters' records, pp. 21, 22.

The question of side occupations of schoolmasters was, as we saw in Chapter II, a matter of some concern in Holland. In America little was heard of the question. However, one of the items in the deacons' accounts seems to indicate that Master Joosten had a side occupation somewhat unusual. Just after he had given up his position in Flatbush the deacons bought for 35 guilders "that little brew house of Jacob Joosten next to the schoolhouse."¹ Ownership and proximity to his dwelling would seem to substantiate the suggestion that Joosten added to his income by brewing, perhaps, that same "good beer."

How Joosten received his pay as schoolmaster will appear from the following excerpt from the church masters' report. The reader will note the variant spellings of proper names.

Year 1673, credit

Jan Burensen has delivered to Jackop Joosten 19 schepels peas.....	gl. 76-0
also delivered to Jackop Joosten 9 schepels rye.....	gl. 36-0
also to Yackop Joosten 2 schepels wheat.....	gl. 12-0
Van Beren has also delivered to Yacop Joosten 3 schepels rye.....	gl. 12-0?

It was about this time that we have the first extant census of Flatbush. In 1673 there were 73 men in the village;² but "men" here means apparently males of 16 and over. Two years later there were 54 heads of families.³ This number fell the next year to 47;⁴ in 1683 it was 48,⁵ in 1698, 66,⁶ while in 1706⁷ there were 52 landholders. The total population can only be estimated. In 1738 there was a white population of 406 in 76 families,⁸ or about 5½ persons to the family. The same ratio would give a population of 251 in 1676, 256 in 1683, and 352 in 1698—a relatively fixed population for a village in a new and growing country.

We have seen in Chapter VIII how certain lands were set aside during the Dutch period for the use of the Flatbush church and school. This was done several times again during the English period. In 1668 there was a division of the Canaryse Valley into eight divisions of six lots each. One lot each was reserved for the church, school, parsonage, and town.⁹ In 1701 there was a similar drawing, where the school got two lots.¹⁰ It is impossible to make any distinction between church and school lots. While we read at times of the "church lots" and the "school lots," as if they were separate, quite as often they are all included together under the head of "church lots," and even where a distinction of term is made, we find rent from both going to the schoolmaster or to the schoolhouse.¹¹ Both were equally in the charge of the

¹ Flatbush church masters' records, p. 38.

² Flatbush town records, 106: 205.

³ New York Col. Doc., II, 500.

⁴ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., IV, 97ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 200ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 293-4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III, 80.

⁸ King's County conveyances, II, 3, p. 185.

⁹ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., IV, 120. Besides the white population there were 134 negroes.

¹⁰ Flatbush town records, 105: 141.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 100: 252 ff.

¹² *Ibid.*, 106: 81, 249, 252.

churchmasters. It may be added that according to the 1706 assessment, the church lots then included 262 acres, while the largest single private holding was 159 acres, the median holding being 63. In 1663, the church and school lands were rented out for six years at 400 guilders the first years, and 440 guilders each succeeding year.¹ In 1668 and 1669 they were again rented out at about the same rates.² Apparently this was the source of the schoolmaster's salary.

In 1676, on the same conditions that obtained in the case of Joosten, "constable and overseers with the consent of the people," engaged Jan Gerritsz Van Marken "in the place of Jacob Joosten." The only difference in the terms was that Van Marken should receive no wood and manure, but should "receive therefor the sum of one hundred guildens, making the entire about four hundred guildens in grain at seawant price." The service was to commence May 1, 1676, and last "for the time of one year or longer, as is satisfactory to both parties."³

Van Marken was evidently not an exemplary character. He is said to have been expelled from Fort Casimir whither he had gone as a merchant.⁴ He went thence to Beverwyck and bought the excise right.⁵ After becoming schoolmaster at Flatbush he had the reputation of paying "more attention to the tavern than to the school."⁶ Finally, a quarrel with Dr. Van Zuuren of the Flatbush church proved his undoing. The domine, being for no sufficient (apparent) cause "most irreverently and slanderously abused by the schoolmaster," he "called together our consistory and, as is usual here, invited the magistrates to meet with them." These "all declared that they had long wished for some opportunity to discharge this schoolmaster,"⁷ and thereupon, after due deliberation, "the honorable consistory, in the presence of the worthy constable and overseers," decided that Van Marken was "unsuitable and unfit to have charge of the service of church or school in any Christian congregation," and accordingly discharged him, ordering him "to surrender the schoolhouse and all other privileges" of his office "before the 1st of May."⁸ The schoolmaster was much incensed at the treatment accorded him and fought back; "with the uttermost shamelessness, summoning those who had condemned his conduct, before the English court at Gravesend * * * accusing them of perfidy and injustice."⁹ Dr. Zuuren's party retaliated with threat of a slander suit. In fear, however, that the English courts might abridge the rights of the Dutch church, both sides were prevailed upon to arbitrate the matter. Van Marken, as a result, was put under bond to keep the peace; but he forfeited this and

¹ Flatbush town records, 106: pp. 249, 252.

² *Ibid.*, 106: 117-8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

⁴ Pearson, *First Settlers of Albany*, p. 128.

⁵ Bergen, Kings County, p. 345.

⁶ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 30.

⁷ Letter of Dr. Van Zuuren to the classis, June 25, 1681. *Ecc. Rec.*, p. 773 ff.

⁸ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 30.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

was afterwards "imprisoned for his overbearing conduct."¹ He did not long survive the contest, dying in February of 1683, whether of cholera or of excessive indulgence in drink is not stated.²

Van Marken's salary presents a problem. His contract, as we saw, was for 400 guilders a year. But the account show that the deacons paid him on January 29, 1677, "for his year's salary" 50 guilders. This was their pro rata according to what had been done since 1660.³ Besides this the churchmasters paid him the same year 500 guilders.⁴ The next year, the deacons (apparently) nothing, while the churchmasters again paid 500 guilders:⁵ while for the third year (1678) he received only 400 guilders "for one year's salary."⁶ The only explanation that at present suggests itself is this: That about the time Van Marken undertook the work, Dom: Polhemus, the aged minister at Flatbush, became too feeble to carry on the work and shortly thereafter died. It was practically a year and a half that the church was without a pastor.⁷ During this time Van Marken, as voortezzer, would almost certainly be called upon to take charge of the church services. As this coincided with the first year and a half of his school service, we can easily believe that the extra 150 guilders his first year and the extra 100 guilders the second year were paid him for this extra work.

The relation of the church and the village municipal authorities in the control of the village school has all the while been an inviting problem. Van Marken's career presents several most interesting phases. Van Giesen and Clocq were each engaged by the "schout and schepens with the cooperation of minister and consistory."⁸ Tibout's, so far as form went, was entirely a matter of the court, the consistory being ignored.⁹ Jacob Joosten's contract was arranged in "a meeting of constable and overseers and consistory of the town of Midwoud."¹⁰ But when Van Marken was elected in place of Joosten, it was by the "constable and overseers with the consent of the people."¹¹ The consistory again was (apparently) ignored, though probably it was consulted, if not formally, at least informally. When now D: Zuuren was wishing to get rid of Van Marken, he faced for the first time since coming to America the fact of the joint control of the school by the court and consistory, with the power of the court increasing. He seems then to have protested to the consistory that this was contrary to the

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 786.

² Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 174; deacons' accounts, I, 57^A.

³ Flatbush deacons' accounts, I, 101^A, 101^B, 102^A, 102^B, 13^A, 14^A, 15^A, 17^B, 22^B, 28^B, 32^B, 33^B.

⁴ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 36, 39.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 49. After the 50 guilders paid by the deacons on Jan. 29, 1677, we find no more record of their paying anything on the schoolmaster's salary (until 1711 possibly).

⁷ Eccl. Rec., pp. 688, 699.

⁸ Flatbush town records, 103: 24, 145.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 105: 871.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*; 105: 207.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 105: 208.

liberty of the Dutch church. We find in the consistory minutes (Feb. 16, 1680) a formal paper in the domine's own hand:

Since the church order of the Synod of Dordrecht, held in the year 1618 &c., enjoins that the consistories shall have control over the schoolmasters, as is seen in article 21,¹ the minister desired earnestly that they should govern themselves thereby, * * * The Dutch congregation ought not so to neglect their liberty. But in case they do not assert themselves he protested that he should have no part or guilt in these things or their complications.²

When a month later (March 21) Van Marken was dismissed from the school service the "action was taken in the church assembly of Midwood *in the presence* of the honorable magistrates, constable, and overseers;" and similarly the resolution dismissing him was passed by "the honorable consistory *in the presence* of the worthy constable and overseers."³ Van Zuren in writing the account of this meeting to the classis said, "I therefore called together our consistory, and as is usual here, invited the magistrates to meet with them."⁴ It is evident from all this that Van Zuren himself was accustomed in the Netherlands to seeing the consistory control exclusively in such matters. Further, being a strong fighter, a pronounced churchman, and being, moreover, ready to despise American customs,⁵ he was determined to keep things in the hands of his consistory as far as possible.⁶ This decade marks the height of the power of the consistory in copartnership with the court. The tendency to democracy in America was yet to prove too strong even for such as Dom^e Van Zuren.

On the 1st of November following Van Marken's dismissal the consistory and magistrates in meeting assembled were called upon to consider "that since the position of voorlezer and schoolmaster has now been vacant for more than half a year and no one has presented himself as a candidate for this service, whether it would not be appropriate to increase the compensation a little." The proposition met with approval, and the salary was raised from 350 to 400 gulden of grain at seawant value. "Thereupon, on the 4th of the same month Jan Thibald [Tibout] was accepted for this service." This is the same Jan Tibout who had previously taught at Flatbush (1667-1670). His service this time began on December 18, 1681.⁷ The terms of contract were quite similar to those already noticed in the case of Jacob Joosten. In particular, while the contract was signed

¹ For this article, see Eccl. Rec., p. 423.

² Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 16.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 30. The words are Van Zuren's own; Italics, the writer's.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 774.

⁵ See pp. 23 ff, where it is shown that such was not universal and probably not general in the Netherlands.

⁶ See his letters to the classis, Eccl. Rec., pp. 699-840, *passim*.

⁷ We shall later see (p. 194 n) a similar position taken by Dom^e Van Zuren on the election of churchmasters by the town.

⁸ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 39. This statement of the size of the former salary is irreconcilable with the known facts. It is possible that this action merely rescinds a proposed reduction.

by both consistory and court, the latter under the former, Van Zuren's previous phraseology is used: "Done in our assembly of Midwoud *in the presence of* the honorable constable and overseers."¹ His school calendar, however, introduced several features not heretofore seen in the history of the Dutch schools. Item 4 of the contract presents them, reading as follows:

He shall be bound to hold school nine months in succession, from September to June, in case 16 children come to the school. He must be present in person and instruct the children and keep them in order. So far as the three summer months are concerned, he shall be excused from keeping school himself, if the number of school children does not reach twenty, in which case his wife may keep the school. Also in the event that ten children come or less than ten, these shall make up the school money nevertheless to ten.²

This is the first reference to school keeping by a woman found so far in our study among the American Dutch.³ The bearing of these figures on the question of the customary attendance at the Flatbush school is quite interesting. Apparently we are to judge that during the major portion of the year above 16 might be expected, while in the summer the attendance might fall even below 10, and probably would not go above 20. The division of the year into these two parts seems to anticipate the present American custom, though not till long afterwards did our summer vacation become established.

Jan Tibout proved no more acceptable than had Van Marken. Before the first half year was quite passed (June 16) a meeting of the consistory was called "to ascertain the truth in regard to the rumors which have been spread abroad for some time past concerning the deportment of our schoolmaster, Mr. Jan Thibaud." The women "concerning whom the said schoolmaster is said to have behaved himself unseemly" were invited to testify.⁴ They severally accused him of "very scandalous and entirely indecent deeds, viz, that Jan Thibaud had approached them with dishonorable words and acts and that they in self defense had pursued him with blows." He, in his turn, attempted a denial, but his admissions and explanations only served to fasten his guilt upon him. The authorities were disposed to treat him with consideration, and gave him "one month to investigate his case and search his heart to find out the truth, and to give God the praise." In the meantime, by unanimous vote of court and consistory, he was "suspended from service in the church and deprived of the participation in our Lord's holy supper." Whether this carried with it suspension from the school service is not clear; but at the expiration of the month (July 30), nothing more being brought forward in his behalf, "it was decided to remove him

¹ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 41. The actual handwriting is Van Zuren's; the italics again the writer's.

² *Ibid.*, p. 46.

³ A similar reference at the New Lots of slightly earlier date will be presented on p. 187.

⁴ Flatbush consistory minutes, pp. 53ff.

at once from his school and church service, and he was enjoined to prepare himself at once to put his affairs in order and to leave his house at an early date."¹ There can be no question that Tibout deserved to be dismissed. By his own confession he was grossly obscene in addressing the women, and was besides too intoxicated at times to know what he was doing or saying. By the explicit testimony of several women he had made most improper advances upon their persons, and according to one he had been in her presence inexpressibly indecent.²

Tibout's successor was Johannes van Ekelon, of Albany, the term of service beginning October 1, 1682. It is his contract that has been so widely published.³ By this time the schoolmaster was no longer court messenger, but instead was usually town clerk. This, however, was not a matter of the school contract. Van Ekelon was to be voorlezer, voorsanger, and sexton. The provision for dividing the school year into two parts, which we saw in the case of Tibout, was repeated. It was stipulated that when the minister preached elsewhere than at Flatbush the master must "read twice before the congregation, from the book commonly used for the purpose." "The children as usual shall recite their questions and answers out of the catechism on Sunday" "before afternoon service." Tuition fees were exacted "from those who attended the day school for a speller of reader, three guilders a quarter, and for a writer, four guilders. From those who attended evening school, for a speller or reader, four guilders, and for a writer, six guilders shall be given." For baptisms and funerals the charges were the same as in the case of Joosten. "In addition to the above, his salary shall consist of four hundred guilders, in grain, valued in seawant, to be delivered at Brooklyn Ferry * * * with the dwelling house, barn, pasture lot, and meadows to the school appertaining."⁴ This is substantially the same salary as Van Marken and Tibout received.

The relationship between court and consistory is the same as was observed in the case of Tibout. The contract which was written by Van Zuuren was "agreed upon in the consistory in the presence of the honorable constable and overseers." The preamble states that the master was "called and accepted with the advice and consent of the honorable magistrates." It is evident that Van Zuuren was trying to minimize the part played by the court, while the members of this, on their part, were not willing to give up active participation in the control.

¹ Flatbush consistory minutes, pp. 53 ff.

² See p. 164, where the consistory removed the ecclesiastical censure from Tibout.

³ The original is in the Flatbush consistory minutes, pp. 57-59. It was first published in translation by Strong (*op. cit.*, p. 110 ff), and may be seen in Pratt (*op. cit.*, p. 65 ff) and in Dexter (*op. cit.*, p. 581 ff).

⁴ The rate governing wampum at this time was about five to one. This 400 guilders wampum would then be about 80 guilders Holland, or \$32 (Eccl. Rec., 702). It would be, in grain, 50 bushels of wheat, or 75 bushels of rye. Peas were valued at the same rate as rye.—Riker, *New Harlem*, p. 372, Flatbush town records, 104: 205.

Van Ekelen's contract was at first for only seven months, and accordingly was due to expire on May 1, 1683. Before that time "it was decided to renew the contract with the aforesaid Van Ekelen," but with certain expressed conditions. "In particular, that regarding the school service he should regulate himself according to the articles of his predecessor, Jan Thibaud, especially in accordance with the fourth article, which treats of the time of holding school." It is interesting that Van Ekelen at this time had no wife to whom he could entrust the summer school if the attendance should be less than 20.¹ Are we to infer that so small an attendance was improbable? The emoluments of the master, except the fixed salary, were increased. The burial fees were practically doubled, and the tuition fees for the day school were advanced to equal those of the night school: "For a reader or speller, 4 guilders per quarter, and for a writer, 6 guilders."²

Johannes van Ekelen, thus established as schoolmaster in 1682, continued for some years in the service. During the Leisler rebellion the Dutch on Long Island and elsewhere were much disturbed. "The furor of the common people," says Dr. Varick, of the Flatbush Church, "ran very high, so that everybody who did not escape was taken by the throat, or on feigned pretexts thrown into prison. I was imprisoned and declared guilty of high treason."³ Schoolmaster Johannes van Ekelen was a leader in this uprising. When order was restored and Dr. Varick released, he felt that Van Ekelen must be dismissed. In a complaint made to Gov. Ingoldsby Dr. Varick says:

That in the late Rebellion Joannes Van Ekelen, the then clerk and schoolmaster of Flatbush hath always bin a very great zealot for the faction of Leisler. * * * especially the afores'd Joanes Van Ekelen hath bin always opposing the minister and church council * * * publicly defaming the afores'd minister, setting the common people against him, offering his service to drag him out of his house by violence to a pretended court. * * * Upon these considerations and others too long to rehearse besides other complaints as to his service in the afores'd office, the church council did dismiss the afores'd Joanes Van Ekelen and did forbid him more to officiate, but choose in his place one Joannes Schenck a fitter person and well affected to the present government.

But "s^d Joanes Van Ekelen" did not mean to let the action of the minister and "church council" stop him from teaching. On the contrary, he "clandestinely without any of their knowledge procured a license" from the provincial governor; and "in defiance of their church and accustomed priviledges," he again set up school. Wherefore, continues the domino and his elder, "since it hath not bin accustomed to have two schoolmasters in that small town heretofore y^r petitioners humbly pray y^r honor that s^d Joanes Van Ekelen may

¹ He was married on Sept. 3 following this contract.--Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 115.

² Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 61.

³ Letter to the classes, Apr. 9, 1699. Col. Rec., p. 1046 ff.

be forbid farther to teach school in Flatbush and that y^r honour would please to authorize Joanes Schenck to be the only schoolmaster there."¹

Whether it was the concluding prayer "for y^r hon'rs health and happiness," or the loyalty of the petitioners, or the necessity of restoring order that availed with the governor, does not now appear; but on September 26, 1691, it was ordered that "s^d Schenck be admitted the only schoolmaster of Flatbush any former ord^r or warrant to any o^r [other] person whatsoever notwithstanding."²

Van Ekelen's party, however, was not disposed to yield. Being in the numerical majority, they took the matter to the town meeting and had Auke Jans and Englebert Lott appointed a committee to look after the interests of the town in the matter. This committee, being specifically instructed to choose a schoolmaster, selected, of course, Johannes Van Ekelen. Thus the village had two masters, one chosen by the consistory and authorized by the governor; the other chosen by the town and accordingly representative of the majority of the people. Van Ekelen had retained the key of the schoolhouse, and this gave him an advantage. Justice Joseph Hegeman, who had from the first sided with DeVarick against the Leislerians, issued a warrant to the constable directing him to get the key from Van Ekelen. When the constable went to deliver the warrant, others accompanied, including Jan Jansen van Ditmarsse, a strong Van Ekelen partisan. Van Ekelen upon reading the warrant, "delivered the key upon the table, whereupon John Johnson van Ditmarsse took up the key & askt if that was not the key of the school, and was answered yes, then he said he would keep it for the people;"³ which he did.

Justice Hegeman was not to be outdone in this fashion. "John Johnson van Ditmarsse" was clearly guilty of "contempt of their Maj^{ty}'s authority," and was accordingly haled before the court of sessions (12 March 1692) to answer for his conduct. Upon being examined, he acknowledged that "he took away the key of y^e schoolhouse of Flatbush from the table and that he still had it and that he was adviz^d to doe (so) by Ouchy Johnson (Auke Jans), & Englebert Lott and the people, and the said Ouchy and Englebert would justify his doing of it being for the privilege of the people."⁴ When "the said Ouchy and Englebert" were examined, they told of their appointment by the people "to choose a schoolmaster," complained that "the minister and Justice did w^t (what) they pleased against the privileges of the town" and that "there was another school M^r. put upon them by the Command^r in Chief and Council." The court having heard them bound them over to answer to the next session

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., xxxviii, 4 (quoted in Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 73-8).

² Council Minutes, vi, 55 (quoted in Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 74.)

³ Minutes of the court of sessions. Kings County court and record books, 1, 4-6.

under a bond of £100. At the next session Van Ditmarse pleaded guilty and was fined. The case against the others was continued several times, but finally coming to trial, both men were found guilty (1693 May 9) and fined.¹

This contest is significant in the history of the Flatbush school. Although the minister and church were victorious in the immediate issue, the victory was dearly bought. The spirit of democracy which apparently had already set in before Dr. Van Zuuren's time could not be permanently suppressed. Whatever else may be true of Leisler's "rebellion," on Long Island it was largely an uprising of the people against the more centralized management of public affairs which had previously prevailed. So far as can be judged from incomplete records, the participation of minister and consistory in the school decreased sensibly from this time until the Revolution. The town meeting, "the people," took over increasingly the direct management of all public affairs, pushing court and consistory alike aside.

The service of Johannes Schenck so elected is given exactly in the records: The Flatbush churchmasters' accounts contain records of annual salaries of 400 florins paid to Schenck for each of the years from 1691 to 1694 inclusive.² On April 2 of the last-named year he is paid besides "for a month's salary," 36 florins 6 stivers.³ Following this, Schenck's name appears no more for six years. We conclude accordingly that his first term ends about the 2d of April, 1694.⁴

Whether Schenck gave up his position voluntarily or whether the Van Ekelon party had by this time returned to power can not now be said; but the succeeding schoolmaster was none other than Johannes van Ekelon himself. The churchmasters' records show that he was paid annually 400 guilders for church service from August 1, 1694, to December 27, 1699.⁵ The size of the salary taken in connection with all the circumstances is sufficient to show that the "church service" is the customary combination of *voorzanger-schoolmaster* duties we have all the while found in the Dutch villages. The deacons' accounts contain the following item under date of December, 1699: "For a shroud, Johannes V. Ekelon, 6 gl."⁶ Similarly the churchmasters' account gives, under December 27, 1699, the following: "Paid to Tryntie Van Ekelon for nine

¹ Minutes of the court of sessions. Kings County court and roads records, pp. 8, 15, 17.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 121, 129, 134.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

⁴ It is stated (P. L. Schenck, *Memoirs of Johannes Schenck*; p. 3) that Schenck taught in New York City during the period 1698-1700. At any rate, he was in 1698 granted the rights of a freeman in New York City with privilege of keeping school (N. Y. Hist. Soc. Coll., 1885: 71), and he had a son baptized in the church there on Jan. 31, 1697, and on March 26, 1698, he was witness to a baptism there (N. Y. Gen. and Bio. Soc. Coll., II, 242, 260).

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 137, 147, 169, 180. The first of these references is a little doubtful.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*, I, 107^a.

months' salary, 300 guilders."¹ Evidently, Van Ekelen had died during the last year of service. The salary payments for 1695, 1696, and 1697 had each read "for a year's salary ending August 1st." That for 1698 had simply been silent as to when the year ended. Each of these payments was for 400 guilders. Nine months, counting from August 1, 1698, would bring us to May 1, as the time of his death. Whether to accept this reckoning or to accept the repeated Decembers of the two quotations as the proper date we seem now to have no way of deciding.

When Van Ekelen died, Mr. Johannes Schenck was recalled. The first payment in the records is of date April 18, 1700. His salary was 436 guilders a year.² How this odd-looking amount came to be fixed does not appear. Payments of salary are made to Schenck at intervals until May 3, 1711,³ after which his name no more appears in the records. The following town meeting minute belongs apparently here;

The people of Midwoud assembled together by a warrant from Justice Polhemus upon a petition of the consistory to choose two men to call a school master—

Vote for the two men to call a schoolmaster:

Jan Cornelie.....	111111111111 [13]
Rych Hendrickse.....	11111 [6]
Cornelis Cornel.....	1111111111 [10]
Jacob Hendrickse.....	111
Philippus Nagel.....	1111111 [8]
Johannes Symons.....	1
Mr. Peter Stürker.....	1111 [4]
Daniel Remse.....	1
Jan Cornelis.....	} being chosen. ⁴
Cornelis Cornell.....	

It is interesting to note the different parties engaged in securing a new master. The consistory, alert to the needs of the school, petitioned for a town meeting; the justice of the peace approved; the town in public meeting selected a committee, and this in turn called the schoolmaster. The struggle of the people over Van Ekelen seems to have fixed the authority of choosing a master within the town meeting.

Who was chosen schoolmaster to succeed Schenck does not appear. Strong says it was Jan Gancel.⁵ But the first reference to Gancel in any of the records is of date March 28, 1715, leaving thus a break of about four years. It may be questioned if any one was effectively called. Three suggestions, however, may be made for filling this gap, Jan Suydam, Isaac Selover, and Daniel Martineau. The first of these got an annual salary of 90 guilders for "church service" paid by

¹ Loc. cit., p. 150.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 154, 158, 160.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁴ Flatbush town records, 106: 104. This minute may possibly be of a later date.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

the churchmasters for a period extending from July 23, 1711, to March 28, 1715.¹ Except for the small salary one would naturally say that he filled the interim between Schenck and Gancel. Isaac Selover, however, received from the deacons as voorlezer an annual salary of (apparently) 120 guilders for the same four years.² Again, if the salary were larger and if one knew nothing of the other payments to Jan Suydam, one would not hesitate to say that Isaac Selover filled the interim in question. That he had previously taught at Flatlands (see page 208) would help one to accept this. As for Martineau, no one paid him a salary, so far as is known; but the following court minute seems to show that he actually taught in Flatbush in 1711:

Court of sessions held at Flatbush, 8 May, 1711. M^r Daniel Martineau has requested of the Court that he may have the liberty of keeping school in the county hall in the outermost room for the Education & Instruction of Children; granted; with this proviso that any time the Justices sheriff or supervisors have the privilege of s^d county house upon any publique business.³

That Martineau had already taught for a number of years at the New Lots (see page 189), that he arranged thus to teach in Flatbush in 1711, and that he was in Flatbush continuously until 1715⁴ would make it easy to suppose that he filled the interim under discussion.

The explanation of the two voorlezers is evidently found in the fact that during these years the church was rent in twain, one party including the old consistory, favored D^r Antonides for minister; the other, which had the town meeting on its side (and consequently the churchmasters) favored D^r Freemian.⁵ The deacons and churchmasters with their respective funds were, accordingly, on opposite sides of the controversy; and each party chose its own voorlezer. Whether either or neither or both taught school can not be decided with the information at hand. From the fact that neither Suydam nor Selover is given the title of "M^r" in the records, it may well be questioned whether either had a school. If this be so, it is the easier to understand that Martineau should set up as a private master in the courthouse, and depend solely on tuition fees for his salary.

The breach was healed at the close of 1714.⁶ Selover then withdrew, and Suydam was accordingly made voorlezer of the united church at a salary of 160 guilders, which position he held for the next four years.⁷

¹ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 166, 171, 172, 173. The first reference says "for a year's service" in Midwood. The last says "for nine months' church service" as if the term ended on Mar. 28.

² Flatbush deacons' accounts, II, 22, 23, 42, 52.

³ Kings County court and road records, I, 165.

⁴ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 166-174; *passim*.

⁵ Eccl. Rec., pp. 1938 ff., 1973 ff.

⁶ Eccl. Rec., p. 2023 ff. Flatbush town records, 102: 102, 103.

⁷ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, p. 174; deacons' accounts, II, 62, 102.

This factional fight within the church had the effect of causing the village to change the schoolmaster's salary and the manner of paying it. In the beginning the deacons had paid a portion of the master's salary out of the weekly church collection account, although this was primarily for the poor. The remainder came from the regular funds of the village municipal authorities. When the school and church lands came to bring in sufficient income, this second part of the schoolmaster's salary was paid from the rents through the churchmasters; but the deacons continued to pay 50 guilders annually from their funds. This continued until 1678; after which the churchmasters paid the whole amount. The contracts specified the several duties of the person paid as schoolmaster, as sexton, as voorlezer, as voorsanger, as errand man for the consistory, and as grave-digger,¹ but the salary (i. e., exclusive of the fees incident) was not apportioned out among these several duties. Indeed, it is very improbable that anyone concerned could have distinguished exactly where one set of duties ended and another began. The payment of one salary for all the combined duties continued until this factional disturbance arose and showed the people by actual experience what "church service" was when separated from the "school service." The customs of their English neighbors doubtless had its effect too. It accordingly appears that from 1715 to the end of the period the deacons paid to the voorlezer and voorsanger for "church services" a fixed salary of 160 guilders, or (after 1725) its equivalent, £4 currency, equal to about 10 or 12 dollars. The churchmasters likewise in 1715 began a rule which they also maintained to the end of the period of simply furnishing the schoolmaster with the schoolhouse (which was also his dwelling), the school lot of some 8 acres,² some wood land, and a meadow. Originally a pasture had gone along with the other school lands, but when, after the reconciliation, the ministers of both factions were retained, this pasture land (so we may believe) was taken from the schoolmaster and given to one of the ministers. And the churchmasters by way of recompense paid the schoolmaster annually the sum of 120 guilders, or (after 1725) £3 for pasturage, the amount being unchanged until 1762 (apparently) when it was raised to £4. In 1771, it was further raised to £4 and 8 shillings.³

The schoolmaster might be appointed voorlezer and voorsanger and so receive the 160 guilders "church service," or he might not, according to conditions easily surmised, but not stated to us in the records. From 1715 to 1719 the schoolmaster did not receive the salary from the deacons. From 1719 to 1755 and possibly to 1758, he acted as voorlezer, etc., and accordingly received this salary. From 1758 to

¹ Cf. Jan Tibout's contract of 1681.

² Doc. Hist. of N. Y., III, 113.

³ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 174, 189, 202, 206, 220, 226, 238, 280, 286, 306, 309, 312.

1773 one other than the schoolmaster was voorlezer; after which time the positions were again united in the same man.¹

Jan Gancel is the first schoolmaster after the factional division within the town of 1711-1715. Strong, indeed, assigns Gancel to this period as well, saying that his term extended from 1711 to 1715;² but no evidence whatever has appeared to support the contention so far as the period of 1711-1715 is concerned. The first reference found in the records is dated March 28, 1715, when the churchmasters paid "60 guilders for pasturage for Mr. Genseling's cattle."³ A similar payment on January 18, 1716, of "60 guilders for half of the pasturage of Mr. Genseling's cattle,"⁴ fixes the annual payment made for this purpose at the figures stated in the discussion made above, and probably fixes the beginning of Gancel's term of service as close to January 18, 1715. The use of the title "Mr.," and the 120 guilders a year for pasturage make it practically certain that Jan Gancel was in fact schoolmaster for a term beginning in 1715. The end of Gancel's service is pretty well fixed by the fact that on April 1, 1718, a town meeting met to choose two men "to call a schoolmaster and to make terms with him to the best advantage of the town according to their best judgment."⁵ It seems, however, to have been the latter part of the year before the transfer was actually made; for the churchmasters show on November 5th that they paid 5 guilders and 5 stivers "to Mr. Gancel for the writing of the contract of the schoolmaster."⁶ It is probably no accident that the consistory is not mentioned even in the calling of the town meeting to select the committee for securing a schoolmaster. The separation of function seems now complete between the consistory and the town authorities in the control of the school. Everything points to more direct management of affairs by the people themselves in town meeting, a marked change truly from the New Netherland days.

Adriaen Hegeman, second of the name in Flatbush, was Gancel's successor. His precise contract is not known. That he served under the same conditions as Gancel is wholly probable. The first salary payment to him noted in the records was on April 27, 1719, when there was "paid to Adriaen the schoolmaster for pasturage for his cattle 120 guilders." The next item gives the rest of his name and indicates an auxiliary occupation: "also paid to A. Hegeman for writing in the town meeting 15:0:0."⁷ The deacons also contracted with Hegeman for the "church service," paying him 160

¹ These statements will be justified in the subsequent detailed study of the several masters.

² Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, p. 109.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 173.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 174. The wrong spelling of the name is but an instance of what one finds all through the records.

⁵ Flatbush town records, 106: 136.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 187.

⁷ Flatbush churchmaster's records, p. 188. This 15 guilders would be about \$1.20 of our money.

guilders annually.¹ Occasionally, the payment is made to the voorlezer,² showing his title in church circles. During Hegeman's long career, in about 1725, the use of the Dutch money, guilders and stivers, finally gave way in the records to the English pounds, shillings, and pence. The ratio at the last was 40 guilders to the pound.³ The pound here used was the New York colonial currency, worth at that time about \$3 of present American currency.⁴ The ratio of "seawant" to "solid" money had been about the same since 1679, when Dr. Van Zuuren fought so vigorously over the relation of the ratio to his salary.⁵

Hegeman remained probably until 1741, some 23 years in all, much the longest continuous term of service found at Flatbush.⁶ His successor was Jores Remsen, who served also as voorlezer and town clerk.⁷ His contract seems to have been the same as Hegeman's. There was from the churchmasters the same £3 (the equivalent of the original 120 guilders) "for the field,"⁸ which began with Jan Gancel; and from the deacons the same £4 for "church service."⁹

Whether Remsen did not give entire satisfaction, or whether it was merely that the contract needed renewal or changing, does not certainly appear from the following town meeting minute of 1750:

We, the people of Midwood, have assembled together by a warrant from a justice, Jan Verkerek, esq.; and we, the people, have deemed it good that these two men, namely, Abraham Lot and Phillipus Nagel, should make an agreement with Jores Remsen how he shall keep school, or with some one else.¹⁰

Since we find references as late as April 20, 1755, of the £3 "paid Jores Remsen for the field,"¹¹ it seems clear that Lot and Nagel made a satisfactory agreement with him. In 1755 there was a "vote for two men to engage a schoolmaster in accordance with the old custom."¹² As Remsen, who had previously been town clerk, was no longer serving, and as his name appears no more in the salary accounts, it is quite probable that he now finally gave up the school. It is possible that he did this on account of failing health; for we find his will made in 1758 and probated in 1759.¹³

¹ Flatbush deacons' accounts, II, 13^b ff.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 23^b, 20^b.

³ Flatbush churchmasters' records, p. 204.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 2590.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 711 ff.

⁶ Strong (*op. cit.*, p. 110) gives this date as the time when Hegeman left. The last noted specific reference to his service was on Apr. 13, 1740 (Flatbush churchmasters' records, p. 235). The first specific mention of his successor was two years later (Apr. 20, 1742, *ibid.*, p. 239). Abundant references testify to the continuity of Hegeman's service.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 241, 264; Flatbush deacons' accounts, II, 44^b, 56^b, 61^b.

⁸ Flatbush churchmasters' record, 276, 279, 280, 282, etc.

⁹ *Loc. cit.*, II, 44^b, *et passim*.

¹⁰ Flatbush town records, 106: 204.

¹¹ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 276, 282.

¹² Flatbush town records, 106: 216.

¹³ "It is my will that after my decease my two children, John and Elizabeth Remsen, shall be taught at school to learn to read, write and arith at the charge of my whole estate." N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1886: 820 f.

Who was chosen to succeed Remsen can not now be stated. It may have been David Sprong, who was a candidate to succeed Jores Remsen as town clerk,¹ and who was voorlezer from about 1759 to 1773.² There was a schoolmaster, as the churchmaster's accounts show the regular annual payment "to the schoolmaster for the field 3 pounds."³

On April 17, 1758, the following newspaper advertisement appeared:

WANTED.

A Person qualified to teach Dutch and English, both Reading and Writing: Any such Person inclining to keep School may meet with good Encouragement by applying to Philipus Nagel, and Englebert Lott at Flatbush.

And also such another Person wanted for the New Lots in the Township of Flatbush; but, if this last, be well qualified to teach Reading and Writing English only, he may have good Encouragement by applying to John Vanderveer, and Johannes Lott, living in the aforesaid Precinct of Flatbush.⁴

Probably this marks the introduction of English into the Flatbush school, hitherto exclusively Dutch. To carry both languages side by side was certainly a wise course during the transition period. That such a course was adopted is to be explained by the fact that the town and not the church controlled the school. It took the church nearly 40 years longer to reach a similar conclusion in regard to its own services.

Again we are in doubt as to who was chosen schoolmaster. The churchmasters do not appear to have made any payments "for the field" between 1758 and 1762. The deacon's accounts are, if possible, more puzzling. No payments appear for 1758 and 1759, but on May 26, 1760, they paid "Jan Lefferts for church service, £7 17s,"⁵ and a month later "David Sprong for church service to April, 1760, the sum of £6."⁶ Since the annual salary for "church service" was £4, it may merely be that Lefferts was late in receiving his salary. The town records show that Jeremyas Vanderbilt was town clerk from 1755 to 1761,⁷ which year Petrus Van Steenbergh was chosen.⁸

It may be accordingly that Van Steenbergh was chosen in answer to this 1758 advertisement, although the first certain reference to his service is of later date. He is referred to as the schoolmaster of Flatbush, either by himself or by others, at intervals from 1765 to 1773.⁹ He was, however, never the voorlezer.

So far at Flatbush there has appeared no reference to free schooling, even of the poor. We saw in Chapter II that the Holland custom

¹ Flatbush town records, 106: 214.

² Flatbush deacons' accounts, II, 64 ff.

³ Loc. cit., pp. 284, ff.

⁴ N. Y. Gazette or Weekly Post-Boy.

⁵ Loc. cit., II, 64^b.

⁶ Loc. cit., 106: 214 ff, 226, 227.

⁷ N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1898: 350, 306; 1864., 1869: 299; Flatbush town records, 107: 61; Ecol. Rec., p. 431; Flatbush churchmaster's records, p. 301 (Steenbergh was town clerk at this time), 300, 310, 311.

required the poor to be taught for nothing by the parochial schoolmaster, and if the number were excessive the deacons should bear the expense.¹ The same thing appeared in Evert Pietersen's contract at New Amsterdam in 1661, where it was required that "the poor and needy, who ask to be taught for God's sake, he shall teach for nothing." Possibly, the Flatbush masters taught "the poor and needy * * * for nothing," and let not the left hand know what the right did, that is, left us no record of it. Certainly, the number of the poor was small. But quite likely after 1711, when the salary was in great measure withdrawn, and tuition fees accordingly loomed bigger before the schoolmaster's eyes, that worthy was not so much inclined to leave the door open for any who might claim exemption. Be that as it may, it is 1773 before any explicit record appears on the subject. The deacons' accounts, from first to last, are full of references of alms freely bestowed, and most are recorded in such general terms that payment of the tuition of the poor might be included; but the following school bill tendered by Van Steenbergh is the first case noted:

The deacons of Flatbush Church for John Hegeman D^r
To P: V: Steenbergh

1772 December 5 To 2½ Quarter ^s schooling for Catharine a 20.....	10 00
1773 March 11 To 4 Ditto for Rem a 40.....	16 00
	£ 1 6 0

Received the above Contents P me

P: V: Steenbergh.²

The deacons' accounts duly recorded on May 10, 1773, "paid for a poor man for schooling £1 6s. 0d."³ Following this case many instances of the same thing are noted in the records, the custom lasting apparently until the establishment of free schools in the nineteenth century.

During Van Steenbergh's term of service are found evidences of the extension of popular government in the school legislation passed by the town meeting. Thus, in 1767, "it was determined by the people of Midwoud (in town meeting assembled) that there should be brought for the school for each three quarters of year for each child one load of wood and in like proportion for a longer or shorter time."⁴ More to the point, however, are the instructions given to the committee appointed in 1773 to secure a successor to Van Steenbergh. The town meeting was not willing to allow the committee "to call a schoolmaster and to make terms with him to the best advantage of the town

¹ See page 27.

² Flatbush deacons' accounts, II, 87. This bill, attached to the page as given, is the original, written by Van Steenbergh himself. It is so neatly done

that any reader will feel himself drawn insensibly to the old master now so long gone.

³ Loc. cit., II, 87^B.

⁴ Flatbush town records, 107: 67.

according to their best judgment," as had been done in 1718. On the contrary, the town gave the committee most minute directions "to call the present schoolmaster of Bedford and to make him the following offer, viz, 5, 6, and 7 shillings per quarter. That is to say, 5 shillings for each Dutch pupil, 6 shillings for each English pupil, and 7 shillings for each pupil who is instructed in arithmetic or the science of numbers. The church service as voorsanger, for which service he is to have £4 per year. The burial of the dead, for which he is to have as is at present customary. Likewise the rent of the Domine's field, being £4-8-0, and the possession and use of house, meadow and woodland. And if they should not succeed with the above-named schoolmaster, then the said Trustees (i. e., committee) shall advertise in the newspaper."

Evidently the master of Bedford could not be obtained, for the *New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury* of July 26, 1773, contains an advertisement for a schoolmaster at Flatbush "who is capable of teaching the Dutch and English languages." Van Steenberg, whose departure was thus anticipated, taught until August 5, 1773,² when he left to take charge of the school of the New York Reformed Dutch Church.³ His successor was Anthony Welp, son of Johan Nicholas Welp, who, as we saw, was called from Holland to the New York school in 1755.

The contract with Anthony Welp is the only one of the eighteenth century that has come down to us from Flatbush. It is in many respects similar to the 1681-82 contract of Jan Tibout, though there are differences. The school hours and the devotional exercises are identical. To the reading and writing of the former curriculum is now added "also arithmetic so far as is possible for him, in case such is desired of him." As to terms, "the said schoolmaster shall receive for the instruction of each child or person in the Low Dutch spelling, reading, and writing the sum of four shillings, and for teaching English spelling, reading, and writing the sum of five shillings; and for teaching arithmetic the sum of six shillings; these amounts for every three months' instruction." The Heidelberg catechism is to be taught to the pupils or not "as those placed over them shall desire." The salary seems to have been considerably reduced from what it was in

¹ Flatbush town records, 107: 50.

² The following school bill, taken from Vanderbilt's *Social History of Flatbush* (p. 51), gives the date: Evert Hegeman, Dr.

To P. V. Steenberg

1773 August 5th

To schooling from the 15th March to this day

For half a load of wood

9s 9d
2 6

£0 11 11

Received the full contents:

P. V. Steenberg.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 695.

1682. 'In addition to "the schoolhouse, with the land, woodland, and meadow thereunto belonging," he should receive "four pounds and eight shillings for the rent of the school field." "The said schoolmaster shall also be paid yearly by the worthy consistory the sum of four pounds for taking charge of the church service as voorlezer and voorsanger." "For the burial of the dead * * * as much as is customary in the said town." In place then of the 400 guilders, wampum (worth \$32), which Jan Tibout had been promised in 1681, Welp was now promised 8 pounds and 8 shillings, New York currency (\$21). On the other hand the later tuition rates are somewhat higher than the earlier. An enrollment of 36 pupils would, together with the salary, have brought in almost identically the same annual income, namely, about \$75. The consistory was not a party to this agreement. It would seem, however, that the committee had the consistory's approval in some form, else the contract could not so certainly say, "The said schoolmaster shall also be paid yearly by the worthy consistory the sum of four pounds, etc." On the whole, immediate direct control by the people even in detail is everywhere evident. The church as well as the school committee appear to be instructed by the town meeting.

Anthony Welp, thus elected, remained in charge until the beginning of the Revolution, thus finishing the list of Flatbush masters so far as this account is concerned. There is no reason to doubt that the school had been kept continuously from 1659.

So far reference has been had only to the village of Midwoud proper. Within the township was a subordinate village called Oostwoud, or the New Lotts, which was laid out in 1677. Separate population returns are not given, but Dr. Van Zuuren's church membership list of 1680¹ shows that then about one-fifth of all were living in the new settlement. The rate list of 1683 shows 48 heads of families in the whole town.² There would be then in the New Lotts some 10 families. But true to the Dutch tradition they must have a school. Indeed, in the very patent itself of 1677 one lot of land was given to Rem Remsen, "schoolmaster of the town for the time being."³ Probably, however, this was hardly more than a legal device to set aside a lot permanently for school purposes.

The first definite move for a school was in 1680. In a meeting of the consistory it was decided that since the people of Oostwoud had increased both in families and children, it was "necessary that such means be adopted there for their instruction and education as are elsewhere made use of." The consistory therefore "at the request of

¹ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 165 ff.

² Doc. hist. of N. Y., II, 263-4.

³ This patent is in the Kings County Hall of Records Division of Old Towns Records.

the people of that place, decided that there shall be chosen there a regular public schoolmaster" "and accordingly on December 14, 1680, in the presence of the Magistrates, there was chosen therefor the person of Dirk Storm."¹

The contract made then is similar in many respects to Jan Tibout's of the succeeding year. The school year was similarly divided into two parts. From November to May, Storm himself must be present in person to give instruction; and similarly during the rest of the year "if ten or more children come, or if those who do come shall make up the tuition fees of ten." But if from May to November "six or more children come" his wife was to give the instruction. The hours were the same as Tibout's; "and at each session before the beginning of the same, the sign shall be given with the horn or drum." The compensation was to consist of "one hundred and forty gulden in grain at market price, yearly." "The people shall also furnish the schoolmaster with a suitable dwelling-house with a well, and convenient for holding school therein." The school fees were the same as Tibout's and there was the same provision for evening school. The frontier character of the place is well shown in the 13th article: "above all this, the people of Oostwoud promise in particular that they will each year clear one morgen [two acres] of land * * * and root out the stumps and plough the ground * * *." The term of service was to begin January 5, 1681, and last for three years. The contract was signed on the left side by the consistory, on the right by the magistrates, below by the deputies of Oostwoud, and "on the other side by the schoolmaster."²

The proper relationships between the two parts of the township in the payment of the school expenses came to be a subject of dispute. On the 4th of March succeeding the signing of this contract, the constable of the town brought suit against certain representatives of Oostwoud charging "that the people of Oostwoud are unwilling to pay town charges." The defendants answered "that certain of the magistrates in conjunction with the church consistory have made a contract for a schoolmaster and the building of a schoolhouse and that they are willing to contribute therefor, in case the old town also helped to bear their burdens." In rendering the decision the justices of the peace asserted that "the contract was proper to be carried out and that all common expenses which are authorized and approved by a majority vote must also be paid by the people in common, each according to his circumstances."³

¹ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 49. The italics in the last sentence are used to call attention to De Van Zuuren's wish and theory as to the part played by the magistrates in making the contract.

² *Ibid.*, p. 49 ff.

³ Flatbush town records, 107: 18.

This is a clear case of town charges for school purposes, for building the schoolhouse, and also apparently for the salary, as no reference to paying Storm's salary is found in either the deacon's accounts or the church master's accounts. The question of paying the charges, however, was not yet settled. The following November (24) it was "voted by the inhabitants of Midwoud and Oostwoud and approved by the constable and overseers that the old town of Middewoud shall be held to pay its portion of the town's expenses and the salary of the minister; likewise Oostwoud: the latter promises to build a parsonage and school house and keep same in repairs; and to pay the teacher's salary (one hundred and forty guilders a year)."¹

When Storm's contract expired it was renewed on much the same terms. Only he was not to demand "any salary in particular * * * Nevertheless, all who have plow and draught animals at Oostwoud, shall be bound to plow one day for him * * * or harrow or draw loads or work in some other way with horses and draught beasts." The contract was to continue at the pleasure of the parties, either to give the other a quarter's notice before a change.²

Either Storm never received the salary on his original contract or he was disposed to claim a salary in spite of the renewal contract, for the minutes of the court of sessions (1685) recite that—

an agreement [was] read between Derick [Dirk] Storm and Joseph Hegeman, Cornelius Berrien, John Stryker, William Guillaume, and others in behalf of y^e town of Flatbush, upon which Storm prayed a salary may be allowed him for serving the town as schoolmaster to their children. Court Stephens and Symon Jansen to examine y^e accounts and agreement between them, and these partys to stand to their determination.³

It is interesting to note that the case was brought against these men as agents acting "in behalf of y^e town of Flatbush," no mention being made of the church's connection. The same thing is apparent in the statement that Storm had been "serving the town as schoolmaster to their children."⁴ This may be taken as settling the question—if indeed it were a question—as to whether the school was a town or a church school. Legally; Storm was a public schoolmaster in the employ of the town. How the suit was decided by the commissioners does not appear.

This school at New Lots was maintained continuously from its inception in 1680. While the information regarding it is not as full as is that respecting the school at Flatbush proper, there seems abundant justification for the assertion made. The list of schoolmasters can not be made out with any fullness. Storm probably taught through 1686. Jores Van Spyk, of whom nothing else is known, was in

¹ Flatbush town records, 104: 200-1.

² Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 52.

³ Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 37. Both contracts must have been read; since some of these names are on one and some on the other paper.

charge in 1687 and 1688, and possibly a part of 1689.¹ Following him was a man whose full name is not even known:

M^r David was Voorlezer and schoolmaster of Oostwoud for ten months service in the year 1688² according to the statement of M^r Johannis Mortier's book and amounts to £208.10.³

This is significant as showing not only this otherwise unknown service, but as indicating that the churchmasters were under obligation to this M^r David at the rate of 250 guilders a year. There was a schoolmaster the next year, though we do not know his name.⁴ Possibly it was Daniel Martineau, who was the incumbent from 1692 to 1706⁵ at a salary for part of the time of 200 guilders annually and afterwards at 250 guilders.⁶

So far as appears, the immediate successor of Martineau was Jan Langestraat, who was paid a salary of 260 florins a year from 1701 to 1706, inclusive.⁷ After this our records are very scattered, being mostly confined to repairs made by the churchmasters. In 1712 the schoolhouse was rented out.⁸ This could easily mean that some resident householder was schoolmaster and taught in his own dwelling. Jan Suydam was apparently living in the house in "1714," for we find in that year a payment made by the churchmasters "to Jan Suydam for two hinges for a door on the schoolhouse at New Lotts."⁹ As he was afterwards voorlezer and probably schoolmaster at Flatlands,¹⁰ and was at this time voorlezer at Flatbush,¹¹ it may be that he was schoolmaster at the time that these and other repairs were made on the New Lotts schoolhouse.

But if Suydam was schoolmaster at the New Lotts he did not hold the position after 1719, for on September 22 of that year the following interesting item appears in the churchmasters' accounts: "Paid to the school dame at Oostwoud for a bottle of rum when the well was made, 3 guilders."¹²

To us the school dame is the most interesting feature of the scene; for, apart from the possible summer teaching of the wives of Tibout, Storm, and Van Ekelen, this is the first and only instance noted of a school dame among the American Dutch. Their wish to find a voorlezer and voorsanger in the schoolmaster undoubtedly had marked effect in making them prefer a master to a mistress. We know nothing more of this dame, not even her name. The bottle of rum evidently meant that the neighbors were called in to help with the well, and some "good cheer" was useful in helping the cause along.

Throughout the whole period the churchmasters were making repairs on this schoolhouse. In 1736 in particular they seem to have

¹ Flatbush deacons' accounts, 1, 70^A, 75^B.

² Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, p. 122.

³ Flatbush deacons' accounts, 1, 80^B.

⁴ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 118, 135, 123, 126, 147, 149, 150.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 154, 159, 162.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁸ See p. 208.

⁹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 192.

refitted, the schoolroom, planks for a table, glass for the windows, "an hourglass for the schoolmaster."¹ What a vivid reminder of the past is this hourglass, a past that seems entirely gone. It is worthy of note that it is "for the schoolmaster." The dame was not a permanent institution.

After Langestraat in 1706, neither leacons nor churchmasters of Flatbush seem to have concerned themselves with financial remuneration for either voorlezer or master for the New Lots. Probably they felt that the schoolhouse and lot was sufficient pay. Quite possibly, if we had fuller information, some compensating consideration would appear. The public interest is shown in the action of a town meeting in 1740 when it was decided that the surplusage from the "interest of the bonds which the church masters have in their possession * * * shall be used for the repair of the church and school (that is, the Low Dutch schoolhouse in Midwoud) and the schoolhouse in the New Lands."² The next and last reference so far found has already been seen in the newspaper advertisement of 1758:

Also such another person wanted for the New Lots; but if this last be well qualified to teach reading and writing English only, he may have good encouragement by applying to John Vandever and Johannes Lott living in the aforesaid precinct of Flatbush.³

It is interesting to note that while Flatbush proper was willing to have the English language alongside of the Dutch, the people of the New Lots were willing to have English alone. It may be that these lived more in touch with their English neighbors; and it may be that one who had command of both languages was harder to find. The absence of arithmetic from the curriculum is worthy of note.

The evening school must, it seems, be taken as a regular institution at Flatbush and probably throughout the American Dutch. Jacob Joosten's contract of 1670 included in the schedule of school fees, "for evening school, reading, and writing, 3 gl."⁴ In 1678 Jan Emant, apprenticing his son to learn the smith's trade, stipulated that the boy should receive his board, clothing, and instruction in the evening school in winter.⁵ Dirk Storm's contract at the New Lots in 1681, Tibout's contract at Flatbush in 1681, and Van Ekelens at Flatbush in 1682, its renewal of 1683, all contrast in the schedule of tuition charges the rates for day school with those for evening school; Van Ekelens of 1682, saying, "He shall receive from those who attend the day school, for a spellér or reader, three guilders a quarter, and for a writer, four guilders. From those who attend evening school, for a speller or reader, four guilders, and for a writer, six guilders shall be given."⁶

In another Flatbush apprenticeship (1695), the master agreed to furnish "washing, sleeping, victuals, and drink * * * also (to

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 229.

² Flatbush town records, 106: 113.

³ See p. 163.

⁴ See p. 168.

⁵ Flatbush town records, 101: 22.

⁶ Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

endeavor to instruct said Jonathan in said art and trade of a smith * * * also that said Jonathan may have the liberty to go in night school in the winter."¹ It is worth noting that both apprentices were expected to attend night school in the winter.

In order to present a full discussion of the subject, other references to evening schools may be added. Evert Pietersen, at New Amsterdam in 1661, was specifically allowed to charge more tuition in the case of pupils coming at night. An evening school was kept at Kingston certainly in 1668, and apparently as a regular custom.² An apprenticeship arranged by the Flatlands deacons in 1765 provided that the master should "teach and Instruct or Cause to be taught or Instructed" the apprentice "to Read, write, and two Quarters night schooling of Syphering."³ When Petrus van Steenberghe took charge of the school of the Reformed Dutch Church in New York City in 1773 he was allowed to "keep an evening school."⁴ Taking all these references together, and considering that they are widely separated in time and place, and that nearly every one refers to the evening school as if it were an established custom, we seem authorized to consider that the Dutch of America from the first considered the evening school as a normal and proper feature of the village school.

The schoolhouse has been constantly referred to; and it has been all the while evident that it was built, owned, and repaired by the public; that one building served as a dwelling for the master and as a house for the school has not been so explicit. We may therefore bring together the references bearing on the subject. In 1670 Joosten was promised that he should have "the next summer a new and proper dwelling on the school lot."⁵ The contract for erecting this building the next year describes it as "the schoolhouse."⁶ Apparently, then, the two terms are used interchangeably. In Storm's contract at the New Lots in 1681 it was stipulated that the people should furnish "the schoolmaster with a dwelling house * * * convenient for holding school therein."⁷ Bricks for an oven for the New Lots schoolhouse in "1744" show that the schoolhouse was then a dwelling.⁸ The house at New Lots might, of course, be of different style from that at Flatbush; but the custom is almost certainly shown. When Van Marken was dismissed, he was ordered to "surrender the schoolhouse."⁹ In a similar situation, Tibout was ordered "to put his affairs in order and to leave his house at an early date."¹⁰ Both orders evidently contemplated the same situation and the same response. So always there is reference to but one house; sometimes it is called the schoolhouse; sometimes it is the

¹ Vanderbilt, *op cit.*, p. 261.

² See p. 212.

³ Flatlands church records.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 4261.

⁵ Flatbush town records, 106: 207.

⁶ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 14, 19.

⁷ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 50.

⁸ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, p. 185.

⁹ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 80.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

dwelling house of the master. Both terms are evidently used interchangeably. Perhaps the most satisfactory single reference to show that at Flatbush there was only one house, which consequently was used both as a dwelling and as a school, is found in an itemized list of the school property included in a petition for a charter of the church in 1711. In this list the various lots of land are mentioned in all the detail which legal exactness could require, "also one howse & Lott of ground in the said Town called the School howse containing Eight acres."¹ Here it may be taken as certain that there is no omission. There was "one house * * * called the schoolhouse."² Evidently, then, from a very early date and throughout the period there was at Flatbush a schoolhouse in which the master also lived. The lot wherein this stood contained in 1711 about 8 acres, and upon it, besides the dwelling house, stood a barn (at least part of the time), and there went along with this a suitable pasture lot (rented to the domine after 1715), woodland, and salt meadow. As to the dimensions of the schoolhouse, we have no knowledge.

As to the school furniture and supplies, there are few references. Tables are a number of times referred to; on one occasion (1694) three were bought at once.³ Probably these were used for the writing pupils. Benches, of course, were used, and a number of references to them are found.⁴ In 1736 an hourglass was bought for the schoolmaster at New Lotts.⁵ For calling the pupils into school a bell was used at Flatbush—possibly the church bell;⁶ at the New Lotts (1681) a "horn or drum."⁷ Apparently, the small schoolboy with stones to throw was as omnipresent then as at some later periods, for putting in glass for the school was one of the commonest expenses from 1670 to the close of the period.⁸ Of all matters pertaining to the schoolhouse, the most remarkable purchase or repair was in 1681, when the churchmasters paid 12 guilders "for toes and teeth made in the schoolhouse."⁹ One stands amazed!

A brief discussion of the management of public affairs may serve to show more exactly the place of the school in the general scheme of public administration. The Dutch had a village court of schout and schepons as the only body of local control, and in the selection of these officials the public had no voice. This body united with the

¹ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., II, 113.

² Further references bearing on the point are found in the Flatbush town records, 106; 113; *ibid.*, 107; 59, 61 (see 5).

³ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 137, 181, 229, 238.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 147, 148, 238.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

⁶ Flatbush consistory minutes, p. 39.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁸ Flatbush churchmasters' accounts, pp. 6, 125, 149, etc.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 68. The Dutch words are "teen en tander." Most probably it was a colloquial phrase in use among the carpenters.

consistory to control school affairs. When the Duke's laws were put into operation with the coming of the English, this court was continued with the officers called by their English names of constable and overseers, and elected by the people in town meeting assembled. For many years after the passing of the Dutch régime this village court continued to be the principal body of local control, looking after the school as had been done during the Dutch period. All the contracts up to and including Van Ekelen's in 1682 were signed conjointly by it and the consistory. With the Liesler insurrection a strong democratic movement set in which seems to have lessened materially the influence of the village court.

The town meeting, which from this time becomes more important in public affairs, was composed of all householders, including even women who were heads of families.¹ The meeting had to be summoned by "a warrant from a justice," and apparently the purpose of the meeting had to be stated in the call. We give a specimen of such a summons in the original English, which was then used in higher legal processes. It is interesting to note the schoolhouse as the place of gathering:

Kings
County }^{ss}

To the Constable of Flatbush: *These.*

You are hereby in his Majesties name required and commanded to give warning to all the freeholders and inhabitants of the town of Flatbush aforesaid to appear at the schoolhouse at Flatbush aforesaid on Wednesday next ensuing the date thereof, at tenn of the clock in the morning of the same day to conclude with one another aboutt the places and especially concerning the charges as the church masters has ben at for getting a new cover upon the church of Flatbush aforesaid, etc. Hereof you are not to fail.

Given under my hand and seal, this ninth day of February, in the sixth year of his Majesties Reign, A. D. 1731.

Rych Suydam.²

A town meeting so summoned took care of the general welfare; it could sell the public land,³ levy taxes,⁴ and make regulations regarding public fencing.⁵ It had considerable authority in what we should now call church matters. In 1701, for example, it selected "four men from the people in cooperation with four from the consistory" to prepare such articles (concerning the church of Midwoud) as they shall find good for the benefit of the church and the people and that the same shall take effect without any objection on the part of any one."⁶ It had the legal right of electing the minister, and it exercised the right to a greater or less degree. The minister's salary; and the manner of raising it, were also decided by town meeting,⁷ as was

¹ Flatbush town records, 106: 25 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 178.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 113.

the question of selling or renting the church lots.¹ After 1711 it elected the church masters and prescribed their duties. Thus in that year it required of the churchmasters that—

they shall with all vigilance and diligence give their attention to the lands over which they have jurisdiction to the end that the same may be leased in good order and form and the rent guaranteed; furthermore to have the same oversight over the schoolhouse and over the church, which is now in bad condition, that suitable repairs may be made therein, and whatever other property may belong to the people.²

The churchmasters so chosen were commanded at the close of the year to "render an accounting of receipts and expenditures to the entire body."³

The most interesting function of the town meeting, so far as concerns our present inquiry, was their selection of a committee to choose a schoolmaster. In all, six instances appear where this was done, beginning in 1691 and extending to 1773.⁴

The churchmasters and consistory were important factors in the administration of public affairs. The former were, as we have seen, distinctly the servants of the town. To the quotation from the town meeting minutes given above may be added another excerpt to show how the church and school funds were public funds and subject to explicit direction from the town meeting. The town meeting in question (6 May, 1740) had been called "to decide with another regarding the calling of minister, how and what he shall be paid."

We, the people of Midwoud above mentioned, have reached a complete agreement regarding the payment of our ministers * * * they shall be paid from the interest of the bonds which the churchmasters have in their possession; and also from the rent of the church lots; * * * and it is further agreed that the surplus money from the interest of aforesaid shall be used for the repair of the church and school (that is, the Low Dutch schoolhouse in Midwoud) and the schoolhouse in New Lands. And in case there shall still be a surplus remaining of the aforesaid money, the churchmasters shall have the power to use the same and to spend it for the best advantage of the town of Midwoud. And the church wardens shall be bound each and every year to render an accounting to the next chosen church wardens * * * or to the people or otherwise, as the people shall deem good.⁵

It is evident from the foregoing that the churchmasters got their name from the principal object of their care, and in no true sense are to be conceived of as servants of the church. In Flatbush,

¹ Flatbush town records, 106: 150.

² *Ibid.*, p. 81.

³ *Ibid.* Apparently before 1711 the village court had chosen the churchmasters. At any rate that was the custom in 1679. At that time De Van Zuuren was trying to enlarge the powers of the consistory. In response to his prodding, the consistory "decreed that the management and lands of the Low Dutch Church ought to be entrusted to the consistory of the same," and accordingly requested "the right of choosing the churchmasters in conjunction with their Honors the Constable and Overseers." The request was granted for the election at hand. The next succeeding churchmaster, however, "was chosen by the magistrates without the consistory." For a short time this alternation seems to have prevailed. (Flatbush consistory minutes, pp. 17, 41.)

⁴ Flatbush town records, 106: 104, 136, 204, 216; *ibid.*, 107: 69; Kings County court and roads records, 1, 8-9.

⁵ Flatbush town records, 106: 112.

after 1711, they were virtually a standing committee of the people (town meeting), charged with the care of public property. As such they were elected by the people and had to report annually to the people.

The consistory, unlike the churchmasters, were the real servants of the church. The place of the consistory in the ecclesiastical organization had been fixed by the Synod of Dort (1618-19) beyond the reach of those democratic influences which in time changed so much of Dutch life in America.¹ In accordance with the enactment of the synod that the consistory "see to it that everywhere there were good schoolmasters,"² we find that during the Dutch period and for many years thereafter the consistory conjointly with the local civil authorities made contracts with schoolmasters. This was done uniformly, it appears, in the seventeenth century.³ Furthermore the consistory thus took part not only in the selection of the schoolmaster, but in discharging him from his office. In the cases of Van Marken (1680) and Tibout (1682), it did this in conjunction with the magistrates, but in the case of Van Ekelen, discharged in 1691, it is expressly declared that "the church council did dismiss the aforesaid Joanes Van Ekelen."⁴ This act of dismissing Van Ekelen (1691) seems to have marked the climax of power reached by the consistory. Probably too it hastened the decline of that same power. A very strong democratic spirit had by this time set in, in which the "common people"⁵ were arrayed against what had hitherto been a ruling clique. The people distinctly resented this action of the consistory in displacing Van Ekelen with Schenck. While the paucity of available records forbids a final generalization, it seems certain that the school passed more and more into the hands of the town meeting. The last explicit record found of participation by the consistory in school affairs is the case where a town meeting in 1711 to choose two men to secure a schoolmaster was called "upon the petition of the consistory." Apparently the consistory lost ground because it was too far removed from popular opinion to make its activity acceptable to the "common people." Doubtless, too, the unfortunate dissensions within the Dutch churches beginning about 1691 tended to weaken the force of the church authorities. During the first decade of the eighteenth century there were in several of these Long Island Dutch churches two rival consistories, each claiming to have the only legal existence.⁶

¹ Eccl. Rec., pp. 4220-1, 4338.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4220.

³ In this connection attention should be called to Van Zuuren's protest, in 1690, to his consistory that the civil authorities of right should have no part in the control of the school. (See p. 171.)

⁴ Pages 172, 173, 175.

⁵ To use DeVarick's phrase, *Pratt, op. cit.*, p. 72; Eccl. Rec., p. 1048.

⁶ Eccl. Rec., pp. 1943, 1944, 2084.

Under such conditions, control of the school must inevitably fall into other hands.

One further reference to the public consideration of the schools must be presented, even though there is nothing available to throw light on an otherwise wholly unexpected phase of school supervision. In the minutes of the court of sessions of the "West Riding of Yorkshire"¹ held at Gravesend on December 21, 1676, is found the following item:

The church affairs as to ministers or readers & schools for children moved to be considered. Gravesend noted to be most remiss herein.²

One would certainly infer from this that the court of sessions felt duty bound to pass in review, possibly at stated intervals, the various villages within its jurisdiction to see whether they were maintaining a certain standard in their support of churches and schools. But such an inference, however much warranted in the wording of the minute quoted, is utterly at variance with everything that we have been accustomed to attribute to the English control of colony. It is much to be desired that subsequent study of this period may throw light upon this act of the court.

The records of Flatbush furnish excellent data for a study of the illiteracy of the Dutch in that village. Seven full lists of the inhabitants are available, the assessment rolls of the town for 1675, 1676, 1683, and 1706; the roll of those who took the oath of allegiance, 1687, and two census lists for 1698 and 1738.³ The first three assessment rolls give the names of the heads of families, the number of polls in each family (males above 16), the number of cattle of various kinds, and the number of morgens of land that each owned. As many are included who pay simply on their own polls, we seem warranted in supposing that these three rolls contain complete lists of the male adults. The 1706 assessment roll includes only landholders. The two census lists appear to be complete. The roll of those taking the oath of allegiance seems to include all male Dutch inhabitants above 16. For the specific purpose at hand all women (widows, heads of families) and all men of non-Dutch stock are excluded; the latter (English, etc.) are excluded because they probably did not attend the Dutch schools; the women are considered separately.

The standard of illiteracy taken was the inability to write one's name to formal papers, or—to state it positively—the making of one's mark in signing such papers. The procedure was to hunt

¹ Yorkshire was the name given by Gov. Nichols to the region composed of Long Island, Westchester, and Staten Island. The West Riding of this included Staten Island, Kings County, and the town of Newtown. Brodhead, *op. cit.*, II, 63.

² Kings County conveyances, I, 14.

³ Found respectively in the Doc. hist. of N. Y., IV, 97-9, II, 269-272; *ibid.*, II, 293-4; Kings County conveyances, II, 3, p. 195; Doc. hist. of N. Y., I, 429; *ibid.*, III, 89; *ibid.*, IV, 122-4. The dates of the two last-named are not certainly those here assigned; but the variation can not be great.

through the available records for the names on the lists described above, and note whether or not the several individuals wrote their names or made their marks. Most of this information was got either from the original records or from certified copies. In some instances Bergen's statements¹ as to how the various persons signed their names have been taken. Bergen is far from being infallible; but it is believed that any error introduced in this way is so small as to be negligible. Unfortunately not every name could, in the time available, be found. After the illiteracy had been determined as far as possible by the foregoing plan, the next step was to ascertain whether or not each individual had passed the usual school period in Holland or in America. With the scanty data available, it is evident that only approximate accuracy was here possible. It was necessary in this search to use a variety of sources, conclusions being drawn in many instances from relatively slight preponderance of probability. Very likely the conclusions in not a few particular cases are incorrect, so that specific figures here found need not be accepted as final, but it is believed that the general tendencies are correctly shown.

The following table gives the results of both studies:

Illiteracy at Flatbush, 1675-1738.

	1675	1676	1683	1687	1698	1706	1738 ²	Com- bined lists. ³
1. Number of male Dutch on the several lists.....	52	47	45	69	57	42	61	274
2. Number of written signatures.....	29	30	31	52	48	30	52	235
3. Number of marks made.....	17	13	14	13	7	4	3	48
4. Number whose manner of signing was not found.....	6	4	0	4	2	2	6	21
5. Per cent of marks to total known ways of signing.....	37	30	31	20	13	10	5	19
6. Number of individuals probably trained in:								
Holland.....	31	27	24	23	18	1	2	90
7. Number of these who made their marks.....	9	6	6	2	3	1	0	23
8. Number of individuals probably trained in:								
America.....	9	10	15	41	30	28	53	130
9. Number of these who made their marks.....	6	5	5	11	4	2	3	17
10. Per cent of Holland trained who made marks.....	29	22	25	9	17	14	(²)	26
11. Per cent of American trained who made marks.....	67	50	33	27	13	7	6	13

¹ Including some 68 other Flatbush inhabitants not found on the several lists.

² Including one undecipherable name.

³ Number too small to make the per cent significant.

The higher figures of 1687 are due to the fact that (apparently) all males above 16 took the oath of allegiance; whereas, on the other rolls, youths over 16 living with their parents were not separately returned. In the 1706 assessment list, only landholders were included. The last column contains some few names that do not appear on any of the preceding published lists. The significant results are contained in items 5, 10, and 11. The most interesting and gratifying result is seen in item 11, showing the gradual improvement of the American-bred population as time went on. This improvement was probably due to the fact that the first generation

¹ *Op. cit., passim.*

of children to grow up after the principal immigration found little or no opportunity to attend school, whereas succeeding generations of children found well-established schools. Just why the Holland bred also should have made an increasingly better showing is not easy to explain. Possibly, the earlier immigrants were of a slightly lower grade of society than the later ones, so that the illiterates in 1675 were on the whole older and so died out earlier. The relatively better showing of the aggregate American bred (13 per cent) as compared with the aggregate Holland bred (26 per cent) is most striking. Evidently Flatbush presents an educational experience directly counter to that seen in some of the other American colonies where succeeding generations were less literate than the original stock.

The study of the illiteracy of the Flatbush women is not so gratifying, nor is the same detailed discussion possible. Not only were fewer names secured, but it did not prove feasible to distinguish these as Holland bred and American bred. Of the 50 names secured, 24 wrote their names and 32 made their marks, which gives an illiteracy for the women of 57 per cent. With numbers so small as these, the result is uncertain; but the names found probably represent not far from an "average sampling." Almost the same per cent was found from 33 names of Albany, although from the rest of the colony a larger per cent of illiteracy was obtained—about 66 per cent.¹ It, however, would not be correct to conclude that only 44 per cent of the women went to school. The tuition charges, as we have seen, distinguished between those who learned to read and those who learned also to write. Quite likely it was frequently counted sufficient to give the daughter "as much education as to enable her to read the Holy Scriptures."² Writing, except in business affairs, was but little needed.

The transition from the use of the Dutch language to English may properly receive some attention. With the coming into power of the English, the higher court proceedings were conducted in English, as were most of the communications with the provincial authorities. In many ways, commercial interests demanded a knowledge of English, and the evergrowing ratio of English to Dutch in the Province accelerated the movement. Nevertheless the Dutch were tenacious of their customs, especially where their religious interests were involved. The ministers in the Dutch churches during colonial days were almost exclusively natives of the mother country, who had been trained in the Dutch universities, and had come to New Netherland and colonial New York in the prime of life. With her ministers steeped thus in Holland tradition, with her formularies existing only

¹ See p. 229.

² Words taken from a Dutch will of Ulster County, 1770. N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1900: 238.

in the Dutch language,¹ with that strong conservatism which universally surrounds religious practice, the church became the center of opposition to the alien influence which was to supplant the old language and modify the old custom. The school, filling as it did the double function of preparing for the practical duties of life and of fitting for intelligent and appreciative participation in church service, found itself drawn in both directions. Its double system of control at Flatbush gave opportunity for the two tendencies to express themselves. Accordingly was found in 1758, the demand for a "person qualified to teach Dutch and English." It was at this very time that the reactionary Dr. Ritzema of New York in a supreme effort to stem the oncoming tide was importing a schoolmaster from the old country. In Flatbush, however, where there were no private schools, one school must do all the teaching, and meet all the demands. Hence the presence of both languages in the curriculum of the school. The town meeting even followed much later in the use of English, its last record in Dutch being of date April 4, 1775,² the first in English a year later.

The church, as was to be expected, held longer to the Dutch. Dr. Strong states,³ and there appears no reason to question the statement, that services in English were not introduced until 1792, and even then were confined to the afternoon service.⁴ Not until 1805 was English the exclusive language of church service. For still many years Dutch was used in the privacy of many of the old families.⁵

We gather, then, from the foregoing discussion that the Dutch village of Flatbush kept in continuous operation an elementary school from at least as early a date as 1659, while its subordinate village of New Lots maintained one from 1681. These schools were under the joint control of church and civil authority, with the people in town meeting gradually assuming more and more of direct control. It seems proper to call such an institution a public school, because its master was chosen and his work directed by the public, partly through the town meeting or its committee, partly through the village magistracy, partly through the church, which was in great measure a constituent member of the body politic. The school was public, furthermore, in that the master received his salary and the school-house was kept in repair by the income from lands set aside by the public for these and other purposes, which properties in turn were administered by public officials (churchmasters) elected by the people, and answerable to the people. It appears probable, too, that, if

¹ They existed also in Walkon French, but this would be no factor in the situation under discussion.

² Flatbush town records, 107: 65, 66.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 94.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

⁵ Mr. John H. Ditmas, at present living in Flatbush, has told the writer that Dutch was spoken in his father's family until after the Civil War.

necessary, a town rate was laid to supply the necessary school buildings.¹

If this school was public, it none the less had peculiar relations with the church. The consistory of the church, during the Dutch period, and in the early years of English control, was conjointly with the civil authorities charged with the care of the school and the selection of masters; although later the power of the consistory declined. A further connection of church with school is seen in the fact that throughout the period, the schoolmaster was (quasi ex officio) voorlezer and voorsanger in the Dutch church. As such not only had he a definite part in the public worship, but in the absence of the minister he took charge of the service and read a sermon. The most intimate phase of this church and school relationship, however, lay in the master's duty to teach religion by having the pupils learn prayers, church hymns, the church formulations, and the Heidelberg catechism, which they recited publicly before the congregation. Doubtless many, perhaps most, felt that the school was principally a subordinate agency of the church for giving religious instruction.

In considering this relationship of church and school, however, it ever needs emphasis to the present-day American mind that the church during this whole period was among the Dutch not conceived of as separate from and opposed to the civil authorities. Rather was it an integral part of a general and closely coordinated institutional scheme which in its totality contemplated the whole of life. Under the English system there was developed an even more intimate interaction among the several parts of this general institutional scheme than had obtained under the Dutch régime. The town meeting in accordance with the Duke's laws elected the churchmasters, and fixed a rate on all for the support of the minister. In time it took over practically all direction of the school. Thus by controlling the financial support of the church and by electing the minister the people in town meeting, whether church members or not, exercised all but absolute control over the church.²

Under these extreme conditions of democratic control, hardly equaled and certainly not surpassed elsewhere in the colonies, the little township of Flatbush maintained its two village schools. In the support of these schools were united the Dutch interest in elementary education and the now growing spirit of American democracy. Both influences agreed in an education of all the children³ in the same school under public auspices. The spirit here seen, multiplied many times in other similar villages, must in large part be the explanation of the early interest of New York State in general public education.

¹ Flatbush town records, 107: 12.

² Col. Laws of N. Y., 1, 26, 64; Flatbush town records, 104: 199, 253-3; 106: 16, 26, 81, 113, 150; Eccl. Rec., pp. 794, 1803, 1802, 1940, 1944.

³ For the education of the girls as well as the boys see p. 217.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SCHOOLS OF OTHER DUTCH VILLAGES AFTER 1664.¹

The accounts already given of the Harlem and Flatbush schools have shown in some detail how typical Dutch villages managed their school affairs. It appears more or less certain that Albany, Bergen, Bushwyck, Brooklyh, Flatlands, Kingston, New Utrecht, Schenectady, and probably many other villages more or less exclusively Dutch in stock and language kept up schools similar to the two already studied. It is quite possible that wherever was found a village predominantly Dutch in language and of sufficient size to maintain a church (but not necessarily a pastor), there—had we the data—one would find almost invariably a school, public in some sense, controlled more or less by the consistory and taught by the voorlezer of the Dutch church.

In 1664 Jans Jurians Beecker had, as we saw in Chapter VIII, a "Graunt to keep y^e Dutch school at Albany for y^e teaching of youth to read and to write." This was "allowed and confirmed to him" by the first English governor, who remained in charge until 1668. In 1670 (May 16) it was brought to the attention of Gov. Lovelace that "several others not so capable do undertake y^e like some particular tymes and seasons of y^e yeare when they have no other employment." The result of this irregular competition proved to be that "Y^e scholars removing from schoole to another not only give a great discouragement to y^e maister who makes it his business all y^e yeare but also are hindred and become y^e more backwards in their learning." "For the reasons aforesaid," Gov. Lovelace "thought fit that y^e said Jan Jurians Beecker who is esteemed very capable that way shall be allowed schoolmaster for y^e instructing of y^e youth at Albany and partes adjacent he following y^e said Employment constantly and diligently." It was besides further allowed to Beecker that "no other be admitted to interrupt him if being to be presumed that y^e said Beecker for y^e youth and Jacob Joosten who is allowed of for the teaching of y^e younger children are sufficient for that place."²

¹ The records of the Dutch villages have been made available only in a most fragmentary manner. In greater part these records have either been lost or remain as yet hid in the original Dutch MSS. Where fairly complete records exist in translation they have not as yet been printed. So that the adequate treatment of the schools of the many Dutch villages during the English period is at present impossible.

² Munsell's Annals of Albany, IV, 151.

Here then we see two teachers at Albany, one for "y^e younger children" and the other for "y^e youth." Whether they taught in one school does not appear; quite possibly they did. They charged tuition we know, not only from the general customs, but also from the permission granted (1665) to John Shutte to "bee the only English schoolmaster at Albany upon condition that the said John Shutte shall not demand any more wages than is given by the Dutch to their schoolmasters."¹ Probably Becker received a salary from the municipality for serving as voorlezer and schoolmaster, since we find that, during his term of office, "the Charge yearly of y^e Towne of Albany" included the item: "To y^e Reader 400 guild^r Zeaw^t."²

Becker and two others were chosen in 1676 to be the only schoolmasters at Albany. How long thereafter he continued to teach is not certain; until 1686 according to Pearson. He died about 1697.³ Jacob Jonsten was, as we saw, at Flatbush on November 1, 1670. So that he used the permission here granted for only about six months. He had probably come to Albany upon leaving Wiltwyck in 1665.

Gerrit Swart and Adrian Janse Appel are named by Pearson as the other masters appointed along with Becker in 1676. In spite of the permission for these three to be the only schoolmasters, there was appointed during the same year a baker, Luykas Gerritæ (Win-gaard), "because he was impotent in his hand."⁴

The following council meeting explains itself. Its old English style perhaps makes worth while its full reproduction:

Att a meeting of y^e Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council held in y^e City Hall of Albany, Ye 23d of January 1488.

The request of Cornelis Bogardus by y^e mouth of Mr. Will de Meyer to be admitted a schoolmaster for y^e City is taken into consideration and unanimously doe graunt y^e same, ad also a freeman of this City upon his arrivall.⁵

This teacher was the son of D^r Bogardus, the second minister of New Amsterdam. He stayed at Albany, it is said, only a short while. In 1703 "Evert Ridder of the City of Albany" made an "humble application to the Mayor, Aldermen and Assistance to be permitted to teach school in the City aforesaid," which was granted.⁶

¹ Munsell's Annals of Albany, p. 16.

² Executive Council Minutes, I, 82. (See p. 122, where this matter is discussed.) It appears that this public support of the voorlezer (and possibly the schoolmaster) continued into the eighteenth century. In 1695, "Hend. Roseboom, sen., voorlezer in y^e church of y^e city of Albany" appeared before the mayor's court asking for the payment of his salary (Munsell, *op. cit.*, III, 9). The support of Roseboom was divided equally between city and county in 1709, when it was noted in the minutes of the court of sessions that "y^e County (excepting y^e city and Colony Rensselaerwyck) must be credited for two hundred and fifty Ouders wampum value, being half of Roseboom's salary and Repairing y^e church yard, which was charged in y^e General County acct" (*ibid.*, IV, 124; see also *ibid.*, pp. 181, 187).

³ Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-3.

⁵ Munsell, *op. cit.*, IV, 106.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

The spirit of religious proselyting was prevalent throughout the period under consideration. The missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel at Albany writes, in 1710, that his "weak endeavors" have been so blessed that "a great many Dutch children" who at his coming were "altogether ignorant of the English tongue, were now able to distinctly say our catechism and make the responses at prayers." "I have used," he writes, "all possible methods to engage the children to their duty by giving small presents to the most forward and diligent, and by frequently visiting their schools; and for encouraging the schoolmasters I give them what charity is collected in our churches, obliging them to bring their scholars to public prayers."¹ We pass with a smile the partial notion of the children's "duty" and the unusual direction of the "charity" collection; but it is interesting to note the continued use of Dutch and the existence of several schools.

When the Albany church was chartered, in 1720, it was expressly stipulated that "it shall and may be lawful to and for the consistory of the said church to nominate and appoint a clerk or precentor, schoolmaster, sexton, bellringer, and such and so many other officers and servants of the same church as they shall think convenient and necessary."² The natural interpretation of this stipulation is, of course, that in it an old custom is given the sanction of law. It were to be desired that we had more data of the relation of the church and city in Albany school matters. Everything we have that is very definite is on the side of the city's interest.

The common council in 1721 in consideration of the fact that it was "very requisite and necessary that a fit and able schoolmaster settle in this city for teaching and instructing of the youth in spelling, reading, writing, and cyffering," and in consideration of the further fact that Mr. Johannis Glandorf had "offered his services to settle here and keep a school if reasonably encouraged by the corporation, it is therefore Resolved by this commonalty, and they do hereby oblige themselves and successors, to give and procure unto y^e said Johannis Glandorf free house rent for the term of seven years next ensuing."³ That this man was Dutch and the school was Dutch may be accepted as practically certain from the fact that the Dutch were so largely in the majority at this time. His name furnishes some corroboration. It is interesting to note that no salary other than house rent is suggested, and also that the church has nothing to do with the matter.

Hamilton, in his trip of 1744, says of Albany: "I went to see the school in this city, in which are about 200 scholars, boys and girls."⁴ This number is surprising, far exceeding that of any other school

¹ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., II, 540.

² Eccl. Rec., p. 216.

³ Weiser, Hist. of Albany, p. 287.

⁴ Itinerarium, p. 78.

known to us among the American Dutch. The coeducation is an interesting corroboration of the opinion elsewhere discussed.¹ That these 200 pupils were Dutch is altogether probable. For example, Hamilton elsewhere says of his same trip to Albany: "At ten o'clock we went to the English church, where was the meanest congregation ever I beheld, there not being above fifteen or twenty in church, besides the soldiers of the fort who sat in a gallery."² The size of this congregation may be taken as a fair idea of the relative number of English in the city.

With this ends the specific information so far collected that certainly concerns Dutch education at Albany, except that in 1789 it was stated that some seven or eight years previously "a competent English teacher was scarcely to be found in Albany."³ We infer from this that the Dutch language, until about the time of the Revolution, retained its hold so strongly as to prevent the earlier establishment of vigorous or well patronized English schools. It is stated that the first English preaching in the Dutch church was in 1776 and the first regularly settled English pastor was some six years later.⁴

An effort was made by the writer to ascertain the degree of illiteracy of the early Albany inhabitants, somewhat after the manner followed at Flatbush. On account of the lack of similar census rolls, the study at Albany could not be so satisfactorily done. The procedure accordingly was slightly different. Pearson's "Early Records of the City and County of Albany and Colony of Rensselaersyck (1656-1675)" was used as a basis of study. All the names of those whose manner of signing was given were utilized. Three hundred and sixty such names were listed, of which 77 or 21 per cent made their marks. The corresponding result at Flatbush we found to be 19 per cent. Effort was also made to separate the names according as the school period had been passed in Holland or in America, but with less satisfactory results than were obtained in the case of Flatbush. One-fourth of the whole number could not be assigned even probably to one place rather than to the other. As far as the ascertainable records go, the results are similar to those got in the previous study. Of the 231 assigned, certainly or probably to Holland, 50, or 22 per cent, made their marks; while of the 35 assigned similarly to America, only 4, or 11 per cent made their marks. The corresponding per cents at Flatbush were 26 and 13, respectively. The same tendencies then that were seen at Flatbush appear here independently and with striking agreement. The results at each place give additional weight to those of the other, although the Flatbush figures appear on the whole to be much more reliable.

¹ See p. 217. •
² *Liberarium*, p. 82.

³ Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 403. The quotation is from Morse's *Gazetteer*.
⁴ Munell, *op. cit.*, 1, 121. •

In the village of Bergen at the close of the Dutch period Engelbert Steenhuisen was serving as schoolmaster. His successor appears to have been Reynier Bastiaensen van Giesen, whom he saw at Flatbush from 1660 to 1663. At any rate Bastiaensen took the oath of allegiance at Bergen in 1665¹ and began teaching about that time. His term of service is unique among the American Dutch, as the Bergen church records show: "Reynier Bastiaensen van Giesen buried May 15, 1707, after having filled the office of voorlezer for about 42 years at Bergen."²

That service as voorlezer implies service as schoolmaster hardly needs proof in the case of so small a village as Bergen. But if any were needed there is available fairly satisfactory evidence. In 1673, as we see in the law case given just below, "precentor and schoolmaster" and "schoolmaster" are used interchangeably as referring to one and the same person then serving at Bergen. Moreover, the records of the New York City Reformed Dutch Church show that "Mr. Reynier van Giesen" was witness at baptisms in 1673, 1691, and 1694.³ The title "Mr." considered in the light of the Dutch custom, of Van Giesen's Flatbush school service and of his known connection with the Bergen school in 1673 can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as meaning that voorlezer Van Giesen was acting also as schoolmaster Van Giesen certainly as late as 1691 and 1694; and if he were schoolmaster so late as this we may easily suppose that he continued to teach as long as he acted as voorlezer.

In 1668 a new charter was given the town. In this "all freeholders" were "deemed and accounted Free men" with "a free voice in elections." They were to "choose their own magistrates" and "their own minister for the preaching of the word of God." "All persons, as well the freeholders as the inhabitants" were to "contribute according to their estates and proportion of lands for his maintenance, or lay out such a proportion of land for the ministry, and the keeping of a Free school for the education of Youth, as they shall think fit."⁴

Evidently the town chose to levy the vote rather than "lay out" the necessary land; for on the "18th X^{br}, 1672," the "Magistrates of the town of Bergen" by resolution decreed that "all the said inhabitants, without any exception" shall pay "their share towards the support of the Precentor and Schoolmaster."⁵ This action of the magistrates was deemed by the inhabitants of certain dependent villages to bear hardly on them, particularly as it appears that some of them were of a different "religious persuasion." In the meanwhile

¹ Winfield, *History of Hudson County*, p. 103.

² The writer is indebted to Mr. Daniel van Winkle, of Jersey City, for this and the two other quotations from the Bergen church records used below.

³ *N. Y. Gen. and Biog. Soc. Coll.*, II, 120, 204, 222.

⁴ Winfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-8.

⁵ *N. Y. Col. Doc.*, II, 672.

the Dutch had again united Bergen with New Netherland. The schout and schepens of Bergen accordingly appealed to Gov. Colve and his council (Dec. 24, 1673) "requesting that the inhabitants of all the settlements dependent on them of what religious persuasion so ever they may be, shall be bound to pay their share towards the support of Precentor and Schoolmaster." The governor and council acceded to the request of the magistrates and made the appropriate order.¹

But still the objectors proved recalcitrant. On the 24th of May next, the magistrates complained to the governor that "some of the inhabitants of their dependent hamlets" "obstinately refused to pay their quota to the support of the Precentor and Schoolmaster." The governor general and council persisted "in their previous mandate" and ordered the schout "to proceed to immediate execution against all unwilling debtors."² The next month (June 15) "the inhabitants of Minagagque and Penirepagh" through their agents requested "to be excused from contributing to the support of the schoolmaster at Bergen."³ The magistrates of Bergen were ordered to answer the petition, which they did on July 5. The governor and council, after considering both sides, "resolved and ordered that the inhabitants of Penirepagh and Minagagque shall promptly pay their share for the support aforesaid, on pain of proceeding against them with immediate execution."⁴

With this the contest seems to have ended, though it must be confessed that the equity in the case is not as evident now as it seemed to be to Gov. Colve. This is a clear case of the raising of a schoolmaster's salary by a rate upon the township. Kingston (see page below) seems to furnish a case of a general property tax, from which the schoolmaster was probably paid. New Haerlem also furnished a case quite analogous in many respects to this at Bergen. But so far as the writer has found this is the only absolutely clear instance of a specific school tax among the American Dutch. We have no sufficient reason to suppose that this school was free. On the contrary, every known instance everywhere among the American Dutch points to tuition fees.

Little else is known of the school. Dankers and Sluyter say of the village in 1697, "They intend to build a church next summer. For the present they have nobody except a voorlezer who performs this service for them on Sundays in the schoolhouse where they assemble."⁵ The church records of 1678 and 1680 refer to repairs on the schoolhouse. If it be admitted that the voorlezer of the church was always schoolmaster, the following schoolmasters succeeded Van Giesen: * Adriaen Vermeulen, 1708-1736; Isaac P. van Benthuyzen,

¹ N. Y., Col. Doc., II, 678.

² *Ibid.*, p. 720.

³ Long Island History Soc. Coll. I, 157.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 714.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 730.

* Taylor, *Classis of Bergen*, p. 167-8.

1736-1761; Abraham Sickles, 1761-1789. This Vermeulen is the same one that was at Haerlem, 1699-1708. The Bergen church records say with reference to him: "May 11, 1708, Adrian Vermeulen, voorlezer at Bergen, laid the corner stone (of the new schoolhouse)." The terms of service here given by Taylor are all so long as to raise some suspicions; but as pastor of the Bergen church Mr. Taylor had good opportunity to know. We may add that according to Taylor, Benthuyzen taught in both English and Dutch, but that the records of the church were until 1809 kept still in Dutch.¹ The charter of the Bergen church granted in 1771 contained the usual provision of the Dutch church charters that the consistory may maintain a school.² We should infer from this and all else known that the situation here was generally quite similar to that at Flatbush.

The village of Flatlands appeared in Chapter VIII to have no school organized as late as 1664, although the town itself had by that time been settled some 15 years and chartered 10 years. The first record of the school that has so far appeared is of date 1675. It seemed then to be well established, was under the care of the consistory, and was called "the school of the town." It is stated that the deacons for many years furnished or purchased for the pupils the books used in the school.³ This seems remarkable, and is probably due to a misconception of the record.

Besides the list of voorlezers (presumably schoolmasters), little has been found concerning this school. In 1691 the deacons' records contain sundry salary payments "to the schoolmaster."⁴ Apparently the words schoolmaster and voorlezer are here, as elsewhere, used interchangeably. At the close of the century (1694-7) the deacons are building a schoolhouse, on which they pay a sum equal to \$654.40. About the same time (Feb. 3, 1696-7), certain private parties sold "all that house and garden spot; as it is now in fence lying—in the town of Flatlands—now used and occupied for a schoolhouse for said town." It would seem probable that the new schoolhouse owned by the church had thrown upon the market a privately owned house up to that time used "for a schoolhouse for said town."⁵ In the petition for a charter to the church in 1711 we find among the land holdings of the church, "And also the church in said Town and one house called the school howse with the Land adjoyning containing two acres or thereabouts."⁶ Evidently this is the schoolhouse built some 10 or 15 years before. In 1762 a considerable sum was spent "for the schoolhouse;" in 1771 a "well for the schoolhouse," cost £1 11s. 3d.⁷

¹ Taylor, *Classals of Bergen*, pp. 101, 107.

² *Ibid.*, p. 121.

³ Stiles, *History of Kings County*, p. 76.

⁴ *Doc. hist. of N. Y.*, III, 113.

⁵ Stiles, *History of Kings County*, p. 77.

The following receipt referred by Pratt to Flatlands throws light on the early introduction of English into this Dutch school:

1708.—Jacobus Montfort hath been to school from May 4th to July 4th, which is 2 months now, from the 2d Sept. to the 2d Octob^r is one month, altogether 3 months.

(Comes to 10 guilders.

I. SELOVER
Schoolm.

If the point were of greater moment closer scrutiny would be necessary before basing argument upon a paper no better vouched for; but accepting it as it stands, the presumption seems to be that Selover was in 1708 already using the English language in his school. To the same effect is another receipt in English, found among the Flatlands church papers, given in 1733 by Abraham De Lanoy to "the Deacons of the church of Flatlands" for the "sum of six pounds, being in full for a year's salary." This Abraham De Lanoy is almost certainly the one whom we saw (p. 152) teaching in the New York school, 1743-7. An apprenticeship contract of 1765 bears testimony to the existence of a night school, it being stipulated that the master "shall teach and Instruct or Cause to be taught or Instructed" the apprentice "to Read, write, and two Quarters night schooling of Syphering."²

The complete list of Flatlands schoolmasters (voorlezers), according to Rev. Anson Du Bois,³ is as follows:

William Garretse (van Kouwenhoven), 1675-1688; Jan Brouwer, 1688-1691; Pieter Tull, 1691-1704; Martin Schenck, 1704-1712 [this date of 1712 is apparently contradicted by Selover's school bill quoted above]; Isaac Selover, 1712-1715 [these dates are contradicted by the Flatbush records of page 179]; Jan Suydam, 1715-29(?); Johannes van Siggelon, 1729-1733; Abraham de Lanoy, 1733-1742; Johannis Nevius, 1743-4; Abraham Voorhees, 1744-7; Lukkas Voorhees, 1748-1752; Dérick Remsen, 1752; Luykas Voorhees, 1755-68 (f); Abraham Voorhees, 1768-92.

For some unaccountable reason the town of Brooklyn gives no positive evidence regarding a Dutch school after the English occupation. It is incredible that no school was maintained; for Brooklyn, in size, early forged ahead of the other Dutch towns on Long Island. But when in 1711 Brooklyn, Flatbush, and Flatlands petitioned for a church charter, the latter two churches owned schoolhouses, while Brooklyn does not include a schoolhouse among the church property.⁴

To strengthen the presumption from general considerations that the Brooklyn people did not lack educational facilities, certain illiteracy records of 1663, 1708, and 1723 may be presented in contrast. At the earliest of these dates a petition of 28 inhabitants of the village showed 9, or 32 per cent of the whole, who made their mark.⁵ In 1708 a similar list of 56 members of the village church shows 52 men,

¹ Loc. cit., pp. 117-118.

² Flatlands church records.

³ Sillies, History of Kings County, p. 76.

⁴ Doc. hist. of N. Y., III, 113.

⁵ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 322.

of whom 11, or 21 per cent, make marks.¹ For 1723 there are similarly 60 names, of whom 57 are men; of these 11, or 19 per cent, make marks.² These figures would indicate an improvement somewhat similar to what was found at Flatbush,³ though the record here is not so good.

The little village of Kinderhook by a fortunate accident got into the colonial records in connection with the domineering Gov. Cornbury. In 1702 "one Paulus van Vleck" had been "lately called by some of the Inhabitants of Kinderhook to be their clerk without any license from his Excellency for so doing." As Van Vleck had previously been forbidden by the governor to preach, he was called before the governor "to answer his contempt" for presuming to act now as clerk.⁴ In reply to this demand, certain inhabitants of Kinderhook gave a certificate that Van Vleck had, "during the whole of the time that he hath resided here and since he was accepted as Precentor and schoolmaster of our church," properly deported himself and had not preached "in house or barn."⁵ It further appears in the same paper that "one Hendrich Abelsen before his death" had filled the office of Precentor and schoolmaster; that Joghem Lamerssen had succeeded Abelsen, but had resigned, and that Van Vleck had then been called.

Some seven years later (1709) Van Vleck had "for some years past performed a reader's duties" at Kinderhook.⁶ He was then entering the Dutch ministry. Beyond this nothing is known of the Kinderhook school. It is of interest, however, to note that this little place sustained a reader and schoolmaster, and also that Lord Cornbury exercised here the right of licensing schoolmasters with the same determination that he had shown elsewhere. Of Van Vleck himself it is known that in 1710 he joined the Presbytery of Philadelphia, but later withdrew pending a trial for bigamy, drunkenness, swearing, etc.⁷

The early history of Poughkeepsie shows us something of the lack of schools and the attitude of the church authorities in the matter. A letter of Dr. van Schee written in 1730, shortly after he had taken charge at Poughkeepsie and Fishkill, tells us that "it can hardly be believed what trouble and toil a minister has to introduce any civility into these places where there never has been a minister before." "Most of these people can neither read nor write." (The records

¹ Kings County Conveyances, III, 230.

² *Ibid.*, v, 41.

³ See p. 197. A paper drawn up at Flatbush under the same circumstances and in the same year as the Brooklyn, 1706, paper here quoted, gave an illiteracy of 12 per cent.

⁴ Doc. Hist. of N. Y., III, 538.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 539.

⁶ Eccl. Rec., p. 1709.

⁷ Records of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (Philadelphia, 1841), pp. 17, 21, 25, 31-2, 35, 37, 39.

show that of the two consistories of Poughkeepsie and Fishkill, only one in each made his mark.)¹ "Finally in reference to a good schoolmaster; although one is very much needed in each of my charges, yet the churches are not in a condition to call one. But I live in the hope that when the churches, which are yet young and newly organized, have grown somewhat, in the course of time, that they will then makē provision; for there is a good enough chance for this in this congregation."² In reply to this letter, the classis wrote, "We hope that your congregation will soon feel itself able to appoint schoolmasters, in at least one of your charges, for the instruction of the youth. This is a matter of the utmost importance."³

No connected history of these two congregations can be given; but in 1765, when these churches with New Hackensack and Hopeful call a pastor, each church has its own voorlezer,⁴ which would possibly mean that each now had a schoolmaster.

Of the village of New Utrecht, the first definite knowledge of the school appears in connection with the Leisler rebellion which, as we saw, entered likewise into the history of the Flatbush school. When "some ill men from New Utrecht" were marching "towards the fort, agst the kings forces," they "then did threaten Joost DeBaane y^e schoolmaster and reader of said town to turne him out of that Impley because he refused to side with them in their Rebellion." Afterwards, when the rebellion had been quelled, "some of those disaffected persons without any cause given forced the said Joost de Baane to forsake the place."

In view of these facts the minister (the same one that had suffered at Flatbush) and the justice of the peace, Jacques Cortelyou (who had given "out of his proper estate y^e land out of which the schoolmaster and reader is maintained"), petitioned the colonial governor "in the behalf of the said Joost de Baane" that he might be continued "schoolmaster and reader of the said Towne" and that he might be allowed his salary from the time when he was "causeless turned out."⁵ The governor took the side of the petitioners and ordered (1692) that "A Lysence be granted unto the said Joost De Bane," that he receive the salary asked and that the justices "suffer none other to officiate in the quality of a schoolmaster in the s^d Towne without a Lycense from the Government."⁶

In Flatbush the incumbent had sided with the rebels, and the minister had him turned out. Here the incumbent had declined to side with the Leislerians, and the town (or consistory?) had turned him out. In both cases the minister carried his point against the people by an appeal to the governor. Evidently from the foregoing there was a regular school, whose master was supported by the rent from school lands.

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 2602.

² *Ibid.*, p. 2590.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 2604.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2604.

⁵ N. Y. Col. MSS., xxxviii, 154. (Quoted in Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 74.)

⁶ Council Minutes (MS.), vi, 111. (Quoted in Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 74.)

It is nearly a century before our next item. In 1768 a public subscription of £39 7s. 3d. was taken to repair the school.¹ As the town minute of this is in English, we can not certainly say that the school was a Dutch school. But as the English is very bad English and as every name, but one or two, on the subscription list is Dutch, it would be easy to suppose that English was then taught in what was in origin and control a Dutch school. Some years later (1777) we find that "Jacques Denise hirred the Church Land for ten years £6-5-0 per year and three acars of (sic) for the schoolmaster, Peter Muenenbeldt."² While the words are a little uncertain, it would seem that the custom found at Flatbush held here in regard to the use of church and school lands for the support of the school.

The town of Schenectady was settled toward the close of the Dutch régime, being surveyed officially for settlement in 1664. Of school matters little has been found. In 1681 the "commissioners of Schaenhechtade" wrote to the classis, "we have always had a voorlezer."³ We elsewhere learn that the voorlezer at this time was Reynier Schaets,⁴ the son of D^e. Schaets, of Beverwyck, previously mentioned. We should hardly doubt that Schaets was also schoolmaster, did not Pearson, the historian of Schenectady, say, apparently on documentary evidence, that he was a "chirurgion."⁵ It is, of course, possible that he was both schoolmaster and surgeon, but the combination was unusual and hardly compatible. Dankers and Shuyter, those cynical seers, said that the village proper consisted (1680) of about 30 houses, "having only a homily (postyl) read on Sundays;" and that the parish reader (*voorlezer van de plaits*) "was a little conceited."⁶

Pearson gives a partial list of the voorlezers; Jan Dellamont, 1735-1749, salary £7 to £12; Philip Riley, 1750-1757, salary £8-10 to £14; Johannes van Sice, 1756-1766, salary £12; Daniel Price, 1768; Pieter van Benthuyzen, 1760-1770, salary £12; Cornelis De Groof, 1771-1800, salary £20.⁷ The first use of English in the church was in 1794, when an arrangement was made for one sermon in English every two weeks.⁸

After the revolution (1785) there is found in the minutes of the consistory an interesting use of school terms. The consistory were about this time negotiating with the magistrates for the improvement of the common schools (*triviale scholen*) of the town and for the

¹ New Utrecht town records (MSS.), 200: 219-220. (Brooklyn Hall of Records.)

² *Ibid.*, p. 234.

³ Eccl. Rec., p. 788.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 830.

⁵ Contribution for the genealogies . . . of Albany, p. 96.

⁶ Long Island Hist. Soc. Coll., 1, 311, 315.

⁷ History of Schenectady Church, pp. 160-1.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

establishment of an *Illustre School* or academy.¹ Here we have a double instance of the deterioration of terms, "trivial school" had been reduced from its position of a grammar, rhetoric, and logic school to one of the three R's, while "illustre school" had similarly been reduced from a university to a secondary school.

It is probable that when the records of the village of Kingston are made available by publication (as surely must be done some day), a very interesting school history will be found. So far, however, little information is accessible. From some secondary sources² it seems that Jacob Joosten, who was in Wiltwyck at the close of the Dutch period, remained there for about a year after the English occupation.³ Perhaps there was an interim after he left. According to the same secondary source, Matthys Capito, secretary of the Esopus; sued in 1665 one Hester Dousouse for the schooling of her daughter.² Capito, however, could have served only temporarily, for on June 7, 1666, Willem de la Montagne, brother of the trivial schoolmaster of 1652, was at the request of many residents appointed schoolmaster.³ Later, "at an ordinary session of the court at Wiltwyck, September 6, 1667, Willem La Montagne asks by petition for salary because in the absence of a pastor he is filling both places, that of forereader and foresinger in the church here." He was granted "an annual salary of five hundred g'ders light money⁴ over and above his salary as foresinger, besides free rent."⁵

The same day the court gave Montagne permission to "occupy the front part of the village house and one-half of the upper floor, the hon. court reserving the back portion of the house besides the other half of the upper floor and the cellar to its own use." It would seem, then, quite probable that the school was held in the "front part of the village house." This "village house" was "the Domino's House or Town House," built for D^e. Blom in 1662 at a cost of 3,000 florins.⁶ Reference is made in the Executive Council Minutes in 1669 to the "frequent use of it both for Religious Duties and Civil Affayres."⁷

Cornelius Looegeboom, on November 17, 1668, petitioned the court to be allowed to keep an evening school. His request was denied, "because Wilhelmus La Montagne has been appointed, and he do it winter and summer, and petitioner is unwilling to do it in summer. Therefore, nobody else (than Montagne) will be permitted to keep school in winter."⁸ This seems to be an exact repetition of the

¹ Pearson, *History of the Schenectady Patent*, pp. 433-4.

² Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

³ Holland Society Yearbook, 1897: 126.

⁴ That is, wampum; worth then possibly about 3 for 1. The 500 guilders would accordingly be worth about \$67.

⁵ *Olds Ulster*, 2: 272.

⁶ Executive Council Minutes, 1, 270-1; N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 229 f. This sum would be \$1,200.

⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁸ *Olds Ulster*, 1: 227.

situation which we saw at Albany. Hoogeboom wished to keep school during the long winter evenings, when he had nothing else to do. The court felt that this would be unjust to Montagne, who lived solely by his work in school and church. We need not doubt, and indeed it is said to be expressly stated, that Montagne taught in the day as well as evening.¹ Although Hoogeboom was disappointed in the petition presented in 1668, on October 23, 1671, he was elected schoolmaster for two years and was given a portion of the village house rent free.²

If—as seems highly probable—this Hoogeboom's salary was a part of the "Publick Charge of the Towne," we have a case where the schoolmaster's salary came in part from a specific tax levy. The "Excize" paid in 1672 "the Summe of sixteen hundred Guild" towards the "Publick Charge of the Towne;" but this was not sufficient, and accordingly a "Voluntary Contribution," or "Tax" (as it is indifferently called), was imposed "upon each Morgen of their Improved Land, as also upon their Working Horses and Milch Cowes." "The said Voluntary Contribution" was to "bee Collected & paid in to Mr. Isaak Gaveratt the schout in good Corne."³ The "Voluntary Contribution" is in part a repetition of what took place at New Haerlem; only here it seems to have been more nearly a mere tax rate.

In 1704 Lord Cornbury licensed Stephen Gracherie "to read the service of the Low Dutch Church at Kingstone * * * until you receive further orders from me." The same paper further states "You are likewise hereby impowered to and licensed to keep a reading and writing school at Kingstone aforesaid, until you receive orders from me to the contrary."⁴

It will be recalled that it was Lord Cornbury who interfered in New York with the appointment of a schoolmaster by the Dutch church. This license of Gracherie is a part of the general scheme either of Lord Cornbury or of the English Crown to win the Dutch away from their church allegiance.⁵ When Dom^s Nucella left Kingston, in 1704, Cornbury "appointed the Rev. Mr. Hepburn to preach and to read divine service to them, whereby the English who had never a minister among them, have the benefit of public worship, and are good hopes of bringing the Dutch to a conformity."⁶ There were at this time "not six English families in the place," according to the next Dutch minister.⁷ And Rector Vesey in the

¹ Old^s Ulster 1: 237.

² Holland Society yearbook, 1897, p. 123. Evért Nolden intervened, however, being appointed in 1669, *ibid.*, p. 127.

³ Executive Council Minutes, I, 159-100.

⁴ Eccl. Rec., p. 1574.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1488.

⁶ Report (1704) on the state of the church," by Will^m Vesey, the rector at Trinity. Doc. Hist of N. Y., III, 77.

⁷ Eccl. Rec., p. 1617.

report above quoted admits that "the Rev. Mr. Hepburn has at present small encouragement from the people." A new Dutch minister from Holland (D^r Henricus Beys) was denied the right to preach without Cornbury's license. "He (Cornbury) threatened," wrote D^r Beys, "that if I presumed to go and preach without it he would drive me away and banish me from his Government."¹ In this letter we have the history of the Gracherie license:

I also learned that the schoolmaster formerly appointed by my consistory had been demanded, under oath, who had appointed him to that office and how he had dared to accept the position of reader and schoolmaster without his Lordship's license. He was told in the most severe tones and with threats that if he did not ask for and accept his Lordship's license, he (the Governor) would know what to do with him. He was thus compelled, with the knowledge and consent of the Consistory, to ask for and receive such a license.²

How Cornbury could expect success from such extraordinary proselyting is impossible to see. His power, however, was ended by 1708, and no subsequent governor interfered in so high-handed a manner.

We note in the last extract that the consistory at Kingston appointed Gracherie in the first instance. This may be a full statement of the case, but more likely the town court had its part in making the contract. Little else has been found concerning this school. In 1733, when Gerrit van Wagenen was called to be schoolmaster, etc., for the Dutch church in New York, it was said that he is "at present Foresinger in the Low Dutch Reformed Congregation at Kingstown." Almost certainly he was also schoolmaster.

So far as the facts are ascertainable we have substantial agreement in the management of the school at Kingston with what we saw at Flatbush, the same union of secular and religious functions with schoolmaster and voorlezer, the same conjunction of civil and ecclesiastical authorities in the support and control of the master.

In concluding the chapter little remains to be said. A few disconnected facts may be added. Daniel Bratt, called to the mastership of the Dutch church school in New York (1749), is referred to as "chorister at Catskill."³ Similarly, it was resolved by the consistory of New York in 1753, "since the precentor's place in the Old Church is now vacant, that the president should write by the first opportunity to Mr. Harmanus Van Huyzen, schoolmaster at Tappen, and request him to exercise his gifts here."⁴ It was previously seen in reference to Hackensack (1693) "that there is a certain cooper from Sluys, William Bertholf, who is also schoolmaster and precentor there."⁵ In the contest over local church government the Holland party complained that Frelinghuysen, the opposition leader, permitted "Jacobus Schuurman to be a schoolmaster among them, in spite

¹ Eccl. Rec., pp. 1615-6. ² *Ibid.*, p. 1617. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 3025. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3409. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1051.

of his not only not teaching but even forbidding the children to say the Lord's prayer."¹ This was at Raritan, in 1725.

All such references to otherwise unknown school situations would lead one to believe that only lack of data prevents our seeing a widespread system of quasi public schools fairly coextensive with the sphere of dominant Dutch influence. In Bergen and Albany the interest of the civil authorities in the matter of schools is evident. With the exception of the town rate at Bergen, and possibly a somewhat similar rate at Kingston, no specific taxes are known to have been levied for school support. Probably all of the chartered towns studied had much the same policy toward the problem of education. The municipal court felt, on the whole, responsibility for the school-house and the master's salary. The church consistory on its part felt the responsibility of stirring the civil authorities to action and of advising with them in the appointment of schoolmasters. Apparent deviations from these terms of relationship are to be closely scrutinized and may represent the feeling of the civil or religious reporter, as the case may be, that his party was the principal actor. While the original Dutch policy was that of maintaining a harmonious agreement between the secular and the religious authorities in the management of schools, it is none the less true that on the whole the influence of the secular arm grew, as time went on, beyond that of the church; so that in most, if not in all, of the Dutch villages, there was in time the normal development of a purely secular public school. The Dutch villages in this regard present a marked contrast to what has been found in certain other colonial communities where non-English speaking people have predominated.

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 2257.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FROM WITHIN.

Not even the slightest connected account of the inner life of the Dutch American school has come down to us. If only some school-boy had written his experiences to his grandfather back in the Netherlands, or if some master had in a long gossipy letter to a Holland friend related the trials of school keeping in the new country, we might be able to present to the reader a more satisfactory account of the school as master and pupil saw it. In the absence of even one picture made on the spot, nothing is left but to piece out an account from scattered hints, here a little and there a little, binding the whole together with our general knowledge of Holland custom.

The school hours in Dutch America were almost universally from 8 to 11 in the forenoon and from 1 to 4 in the afternoon.¹ The annual calendar, however, is not so simple. Apparently, the school was kept through the year, that is, both in summer and in winter.² The specific statements are not so conclusive as might be wished; but in the light of the Holland custom we have no difficulty in accepting the statement as made. The pupils were free "on festival days—and according to custom on Wednesday and Saturday afternoons."³ This again was the rule in the Holland schools. The "festival days" probably varied in different places, but quite likely most of the children of New Netherland enjoyed St. Nicholas day (December 6), Christmas, New Year, Twelfthnight, Easter, Pinkster (Whitsuntide), and Kermis.⁴ The Dutch custom both in Holland and America was to hold school six days in the week, although by 1773 Flatbush had come to the present American practice of "five days in each week."⁵

The schoolhouse presents a most striking contrast to those known now to most of America. Almost invariably school was held in the

¹ The only exceptions found were in New York church schools, where in 1728 the first morning hour was nine in summer and nine-thirty in winter (Ecl. Rec., p. 2338); and in 1733, where the winter morning hours were from eight-thirty to eleven-thirty (*Ibid.*, p. 2626). See minutes of the orphan masters, II, 115; Flatbush town records, 105: 207, 107: 60; Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 67; Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 110; Flatbush consistory minutes, pp. 39, 49.

² If only there were sufficient pupils at New Lots (1681) and Flatbush in 1681 and 1682. These are interesting cases in that the year was divided into two parts; one more formal in charge of the master, the other less formal in charge of his wife (see pp. 178, 187). On the calendar in general, see N. Y. Col. Doc., I, 155; Flatbush town records, 105: 207, 107: 60; Flatbush town consistory minutes, pp. 40, 49, 61; Ecl. Rec., pp. 2636, 2626, 4261.

³ Ecl. Rec., p. 2626.

⁴ Griffs, *The Story of New Netherland*, p. 152. For the Synod of Dort church days, see Ecl. Rec., p. 4324.

⁵ Flatbush town records, 107: 60 (sec. 4).

master's residence.¹ The size of the schoolhouse appears to us ridiculous even for the few pupils then to be accommodated. We saw that the burgomasters at New Amsterdam petitioned in 1662 for a school lot 30 by 15 feet, and that the town of New Haerlem in 1680 built "the townhouse for the voorlezer" 22 feet long and 20 feet wide.² The largest schoolhouse noted was the one proposed at Beverwyck, 34 by 19 feet.³ When we recall that these measurements included possibly one or more living rooms in addition to the schoolroom we can only wonder. As to the internal arrangement of the schoolroom and its furnishings we can say but little from American data. We may suppose that, following the Holland custom, the room contained the master's chair and desk and a number of benches probably without backs. The pupils were seated in such a way that the oldest were nearest the master, and the girls were farthest off, sometimes in a corner. Tables, presumably for writing, were also provided; certainly at Flatbush, if not generally.⁴

We have just said that the girls were probably separated from the boys. The question has been raised as to whether girls did in fact attend these schools. The answer seems clear. The Holland custom was most certainly for girls to attend school. The strong presumption would then be that the same custom prevailed in New Netherland, and only positive evidence to the contrary could make us doubt it. Curiously enough there has appeared no explicit statement prior to 1733 that girls did attend the Dutch schools of America. At that date it was required in the New York school that "the school children, both boys and girls," should recite on Saturday forenoon the appropriate "Lord's Day."⁵ An equally explicit reference and even more significant, coming as it does from a more purely Dutch center, is the testimony of Hamilton in his *Itinerarium* (1744) that in the school in Albany there were "about 200 scholars, boys and girls."⁶ But if there be no earlier explicit statement, evidence on the question is not lacking. The marriage contracts and wills, in particular, contain much pertinent material.

It was the Dutch law that before a widow or widower, the parent of minor children, should remarry, guardians—other than the contracting parties—should be appointed for the children, and the affiant parties should appear before official orphan masters and make formal agreement regarding the care of the child or children and of the property to them due.⁷ Quite a number of such marriage contracts are on

¹ The only certain exception noted to the contrary was at New Haerlem. See p. 161.

² See pp. 92, 164.

³ See p. 119.

⁴ See p. 192.

⁵ Eccl. Rec., p. 2628.

⁶ Loc. cit., p. 78.

⁷ See Minutes of the Orphan Masters, *passim*.

record, and in them we find definite references to the education of girls. In 1632 a contract was drawn promising with regard to Reesel [Rachel] and Jan "both minor children," "to keep them at school, to teach them a trade."¹ A boy and a girl are here to be treated alike. The same is true of the contract drawn by Dr. Everardus Bogardus and Annitje Jans. The children are Sarah, aged 16; Tryntje,² aged 13; Lytje, aged 11; Jan, aged 9; and Annitje, aged 5. The affiants here promise "to keep them at school and let them learn reading, writing, and a good trade."³ In another contract of the same year, the children are both girls, Catrina and Johanna, and the promise is to "let them learn to read and write and have them taught a trade."⁴ The reader will note that even in this case, where only girls are concerned, a trade is none the less to be taught. So of Aelje Claes (1643), "to clothe her, to send her to school, to let her learn reading and writing and a good trade."⁵ Sometimes accomplishments more evidently feminine are mentioned; thus, in 1663, "instruct her in God's word, let her go to school, have her taught to sew."⁶ Thus, according to the marriage contracts, girls were expected to go to school and to learn to read and write. We may add that in no marriage contract examined has there been found any discrimination against girls and in favor of boys, either in the fact or the extent of schooling. So far as this evidence is concerned the sexes are on an equal footing.

Quite similar testimony appears in the wills of the period, though here the evidence is not quite so satisfactory as the foregoing, because of the later dates and the consequent uncertainty as to whether we have the pure Dutch tradition. However, since the English custom discriminated against girls,⁷ we need not on the score of possible English influence discount to any great extent the force of the argument. In the will of Christopher Hoogland, of New York (1676), it was said of four boys and one girl, "they are to be caused to learn to read and write, and a trade by which they may live."⁸ Similarly in 1680 Cornelius van Bursam, of New York, gave instructions to his wife: "She is to maintain my daughter Anna decently, and cause her

¹ N. Y. Col. MSS., i, G.

² Names ending in *je* are feminine.

³ N. Y. Col. MSS., ii, 20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁶ Minutes of the Orphan Masters, i, 231. Other similar references that refer to the education of girls are: N. Y. Col. MSS., iii, 150; Minutes of the Orphan Masters, i, 23, 28; *ibid.*, ii, 20, 24; Early Records of Albany, 227, 246, 261; Flatbush town records, 105: 68, 180, 184, 185. Contrary to statements sometimes made, not all such marriage contracts contained specific educational clauses, e. g., Early Records of Albany, pp. 47-48, 50-51, 211; Flatbush town records, 105: 85; N. Y. Col. MSS., i, 231, and others. None of these here noted are later than 1670.

⁷ For instance, Thomas Foster, of Jamaica, says in his will of 1663: "My children are to be taught to read English well, and my son to write when they doe come of age." N. Y. Hist. Soc. Coll., 1893: 19. For other instances of discrimination, see *ibid.*, 1900: 174, 301, 309.

⁸ N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1893: 142-3.

being taught reading and writing and a trade, by which she may live."¹ John Hondrickse van Bommell, of New York, included in his will of 1689: "My daughter Lyntie is to be maintained and put to school and learning until she is twenty years of age or is married."² These wills seem to show the same attitude toward the education of girls that was found in the marriage contracts.

While we should have been glad to find in the records of the Dutch days some explicit reference to the school attendance of girls, still the existence of the Holland custom (dating in the case of Utrecht at latest from 1583), the desirability, if not the necessity, that the girls have their religious training in the school, the ample corroboration afforded by marriage contracts and wills, and the explicit reference to girls and boys in the New York school of 1733—all these seem to put it beyond a reasonable doubt that in the ordinary Dutch parochial school girls as well as boys attended, at least until they learned to read.³

Of the schoolmasters not much can be said. It would be desirable to know the extent of their learning, but little evidence is available. While no indication has been found that any of the parochial masters were university trained, there is no reference which would certainly disparage their learning. The few specimens of handwriting seen by the writer would indicate, on the whole, formed intellectual habits rather than the contrary. Jan Tibout presents the only exception.⁴ We have noted from time to time what additional duties some of the masters carried along with their school duties. Almost universally the parish schoolmaster was also *voorlezer* and *voorsanger*. The only instances to the contrary were one at Albany and two at Flatbush,⁵ and these were not all certain. Somewhat more often was there a *voorlezer* who was not the schoolmaster. Several instances were noted at Albany and at Flatbush and possibly one at Schenectady.⁶ The instances of later New York where the *voorlezer*, or catechist, was not also schoolmaster are hardly to be mentioned; since at that time there were in New York several churches and but one Dutch schoolmaster. In the small villages the schoolmaster was regularly not only *voorlezer* and *voorsanger*, but he was also sexton and frequently either court messenger or clerk of the town court. We may suppose that he also drew legal papers. This is so inherently probable as hardly to need proof, but there is corroborative evidence in the records.

¹ N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1862, p. 130-1.

² *Ibid.*, 1863: 417-8. Other Dutch wills that bear on the question of the education of girls are found in N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1862: 161, 297-8, 342, 451; 1863: 375-6, 379, 204; 1900: 191, 259, 313; 1902: 122; Flatbush town records, 100: 90.

³ See p. 229 for discussion of the illiteracy of women.

⁴ See p. 172.

⁵ See pp. 120, 179, 181, 183.

⁶ See pp. 120, 179, 211.

The curriculum of the school has already been given in part; and we may here bring together the scattered statements. What might be called the official Dutch program for the colonies was that promulgated by the classis in 1636 in the instruction "for schoolmasters going to the East or West Indies":

He is to instruct the youth—in reading, writing, cyphering, and arithmetic, with all zeal and diligence; he is also to implant the fundamental principles of the true Christian religion and salvation, by means of catechizing; he is to teach them the customary forms of prayers, and also accustom them to pray; he is to give heed to their manners and bring these as far as possible to modesty and propriety.¹

This curriculum we may divide into three parts, the three R's, the religious training (the catechism and forms of prayers), and manners. The last, so far as appears, was to be taught incidentally; and nothing further about it is found in the American records.

How far this curriculum was actually carried out needs to be considered; for school orders and school practice have not always agreed. Out of 30 (distinctly Dutch) marriage contracts studied, 20 specify the education to be given, and each of these stipulates reading and writing. In no case does reading or writing appear separately, and in no case does arithmetic or any other school study appear. (We may add that 11 of the 30 specify a trade; and in the case of 2 girls, sewing was mentioned). Out of 17 Dutch wills (prior to 1725) which refer to education, 9 specify reading and writing, again neither study appearing separately. One of these (1683) says arithmetic, and 10 say a trade. It would appear from this that, on the whole, reading and writing were counted necessary, but that arithmetic was not in the public consciousness as a required, or even a desirable study. To the same effect we may quote the Great Remonstrance that the children should be instructed "not only in reading and writing, but also in the knowledge and fear of the Lord." Again, the petition for a Latin school (1658) says of the youth that they are very numerous and "many of them can read and write."² Similar statements appear in 8 of the 11 curricula of the Dutch villages (outside of New York City). In each we find reading and writing (with spelling in several instances). In two instances only, Albany in 1721 and Flatbush of 1773, does arithmetic appear. In the latter instance, the records say, "arithmetic, so far as it is possible for him, in case such is desired of him"³ but this is so near to the Revolution as to constitute the exception which proves the rule. In the account of the South River school in 1657, as it is given in the Ecclesiastical Records, the translator seems to think cyphering was implied, but a sufficient reason for this opinion does not appear.⁴

¹ Ecc. Rec., p. 98.

² Rec. of N. A., III, 15-6.

³ Flatbush town records, 107: 60.

⁴ Ecc. Rec., p. 402.

So far then very little arithmetic is found in the schools of Holland America. We have, however, yet to examine the formal curriculum of New Amsterdam and Dutch New York. Here we find an interesting exception. While the outlying Dutch villages, except commercially minded Albany, offer only reading and writing, New Amsterdam (later New York), so far as we can say, always included arithmetic in its curriculum. Evert Pietersen's instructions of 1661 mention arithmetic specifically.¹ In the legislation of the director general and council (1664) on public catechizing for the New Amsterdam school, "reading, writing, and arithmetic" are mentioned.² After this no curriculum is given until 1726, but in that and all subsequent curricula arithmetic is included. Further, we have the curricula of four private schools in New Amsterdam; in two of these we find arithmetic.³ Arithmetic was thus a commercial subject, and formed a part of the curriculum only where the demands of trade made it desirable.⁴

In the foregoing discussion we have several times referred to the fact that in all the data cited reading and writing appear together if at all. In all the writer's reading three exceptions to this rule were found. Each instance treats of a girl's education, and in each reading alone is mentioned. The first is the adoption by a father of his illegitimate daughter (1643). He promises "to let her learn to read."⁵ The next is a case of apprenticeship by the deacons at Albany in 1710. "The master shall teach her, or cause her to be taught to read."⁶ The third is a will of too late a date (1770) to be included in the study given above. A daughter is to have "as much education as to enable her to read the Holy Scriptures, either in English or Dutch."⁷ That the three should be girls is probably significant. They must therefore be grouped with that large per cent of women who could not write their names. These cases, however, form no exception to the statement made above, that nowhere in the literature of the elementary Dutch schools has the writer found an instance where, girls and boys both being mentioned, the girls were discriminated specifically against. The English-speaking colonies are full of instances of positive discrimination, both as to fact and extent; but no expression of such discrimination has been found among the Dutch.

We seem, then, to find that the Dutch of America followed the early seventeenth-century traditions of the fatherland: Reading and

¹ See p. 68.

² O'Callaghan, *Laws of New Netherland*, p. 461.

³ N. Y. Col. Doc., xiv, 424; Rec. of N. A., II, 246; Pratt, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 33.

⁴ Thus in 1712 D^r Freeman writing to Amsterdam of an orphan, Girard de Peyster, of New York, says: "He has gone through arithmetic in his studies, for he does not know what God may lay upon him to do." (Ecol. Rec., p. 1938.)

⁵ N. Y. Col. MSS., II, 4.

⁶ Munsell, *op. cit.*, vii, 236.

⁷ N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1900: 228.

writing for both girls and boys, with but little arithmetic save in the more commercial atmosphere of the capital and at Albany. The only secular subject other than the three R's found in Holland was the *Spiegel der Jeugt*, a history of Dutch wars used from about 1650. The only similar reference in America so far found is in "9 Historical school books" which belonged to schoolmaster Abraham de la Noy's estate in New York, 1702.¹

The religious part of the program was much stressed. It included certain prayers, the catechism, and hymns. If we may piece out our knowledge of American procedure by regulations in Holland, the daily order was for the pupils to take turn in saying "the morning prayer" at the opening of school; and likewise in the "prayer before dinner" on leaving for the noon recess. On reassembling, there was the "prayer after dinner," and "the evening prayer" when leaving at the close of the day. After the pupils had learned these they were taught the Lord's prayer, "the twelve articles of the Christian faith," the ten commandments, and afterwards "the confession of sins" or prayer before the sermon. Besides all these, were taught "the small and the large [Heidelberg] catechism and the gospel for each Sunday." "Before school closes," say Pietersen's instructions, "he shall let the pupils sing some verses and a psalm." Van Ekeler's evening school at Flatbush was required to "begin with the Lord's prayer and close by singing a psalm." There was one public weekday catechising in the church. In New Amsterdam this catechising was fixed by the director general and council for Wednesdays. Pietersen and his assistant "with the children entrusted to their care" were required to "appear in the church to examine, after the close of the sermon, each of them his own scholars, in the presence of the reverend ministers and elders."² At Flatbush (1682) and later in New York (1726) this catechising took place on Monday.

While our information as to the Dutch American Sunday procedure is not full, still we may suppose some such program as the following: The master would on Sunday morning open the church, "place the stools and benches in the church or meeting house in order," put on the "psalm board" the psalms to be sung before the sermon, and ring the first bell. Then he would return to the schoolhouse (his home) where the children had in the meanwhile assembled, march with them to the church, and have the older ones sit about him to assist in the singing. The second bell would then be rung, after which he would "read a chapter out of the Holy Scriptures." "After the third ringing of the bell he shall read the ten commandments and the twelve articles of our faith, and then take the lead in the singing." It was the master's duty to secure proper behavior and attention during the church services.

¹ N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1892: 314.

² Dumabeo, op. cit., p. 30.

After the morning service there was an intermission for dinner. Then the pupils assembled in the schoolroom, where the older ones were questioned on the morning's sermon, and all on the catechism. This being done they marched to the church for afternoon service.¹

The punishments of the American Dutch school have had little mention in the written records. Only Curtius is known to have referred to the question, when he complained that some parents objected to having their boys whipped. We can not doubt, however, that *plak* and *roede* came over from Holland with the first master and did their share in rearing the sturdy Dutch youngsters.

The school books have a larger place in the records than have the *plak* and *roede*. We saw how the Lords Directors sent over school books for the schools of Pietersen and Curtius; and how these were to be charged to their accounts. We also saw that Pietersen when at South River bemoaned the lack of paper and pens, and slates and pencils. The use of slates here seems rather early, but there appears no particular reason to doubt the statement. In 1665 at Albany the inventory of Rutger Jacobsen's estate shows a "slate with a frame" valued at 10 florins and in the item next following "ditto without a frame" 4 florins.² The first certain instance that we have of the names of textbooks in Dutch America is found in the inventory of the estate of Dr. Gysbert van Imbroek, a physician at Wiltwyck (Kingston). Fifty separate titles are listed of which the following are specifically classified as "schoolbooks."

Quartos—

- 83 written and printed Histories of Tobias
- 8 Histories of David
- 3 Last Wills
- 7 Hours of Death
- 17 Exquisite Proofs of Man's Misery
- 3 General Epistles

Octavos—

- 100 Catechisms
- 23 Histories of David
- 102 A, B, C Books
- 27 Arts of Letters
- 19 Succinct Ideas (large)
- 9 Steps of Youth
- 13 Exquisite Proofs of Human Misery
- 8 Books of the Gospels and Epistles
- 48 Succinct Ideas, by Jacobus Boistius
- 1 Short Way, by Megapolensis

¹ Compare the third article of Van Eken's contract: "He shall instruct the children on every Wednesday and Saturday in the common prayers and in the questions and answers in the catechism, to enable them to repeat them better on Sunday before the afternoon service, or on Monday when they shall be catechised before the congregation. Upon all such occasions the schoolmaster shall be present and shall require the children to be friendly in their appearance and encourage them to answer truly and distinctly." Strong, *op cit.*, p. 111.

² Pearson, *Early Records of Albany*, p. 534. At the orphan house at Enkhuizen is a gable stone of date 1616 on which is carved a picture of a Dutch school. In this is a boy writing on something that looks much like a slate. One, however, can not feel certain. A photograph of the stone is seen in Muller's *Oude Goude Erven*, vol. 2, p. 368.

To these we may add two arithmetics that were not listed among the "schoolbooks", one by Jans Belot Hutteman and the other by Sybrand Hansen Cardinael (both octavos); and besides, Sebastiaen Frank's World Mirror (a quarto).¹

Why this physician at Wiltwyck should have so many schoolbooks may be explained by the fact that he was a shopkeeper in New Amsterdam at least from 1653 to 1655. In the latter year he received formal permission from the public authorities "to make a lottery of a certain number of Bibles, Testaments and other books."² Apparently these schoolbooks were some "dead stock" carried over from his shopkeeping. It is easy to conclude that these schoolbooks were those actually used in New Amsterdam in the fifties. Some of these are so distinctly religious as to suggest that they were to be used in connection with the work of the comforter of the sick rather than in the schoolroom.³ As such, one should select Hours of Death, Exquisite Proofs of Man's Misery, and possibly the Succinct Ideas. The Arts of Letters is a well-known A B C book. The Steps of Youth is evidently De Trap der Jeugt which we saw in the Utrecht list of 1650, but what kind of book it was we did not learn.⁴ The Short Way, by Megapolensis, is probably one of his catechisms, which we have previously discussed. The books of the Gospel and Epistles, the Histories of David and the Histories of Tobias are the reading books which we saw in use in Holland. The catechisms we recognize of course, as old friends. Of the first-named arithmetic the writer has learned nothing. The second is probably the "Het eerste school-boeck van Mr. Sybrand Hansz. Cardinael's Arithmetica ofte Reecken-Konst."⁵ The Last Wills are almost certainly copies of a book by Lowys Porquin.⁶

Another list of schoolbooks, made up for the East Indies in 1649, may be considered almost certainly as being the same books that were used in New Netherland:

25 Bijbels in 4°
5 Bijbels in 8°
50 Psalm-boecken in 4°
1,000 Catechismi
1,000 Historien van David en Tobias
500 Vraagboeckjens van Aldegondē⁷

¹ Old. Ulster, I: 368-370.

² Rec. of N. A., I, 288, 291, 294.

³ Compare Eccl. Rec., p. 507-508, N. Y. Col. Doc., xiii, 155, and Dunshee, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁴ See page 34.

⁵ This book was published at Amsterdam in four parts, each of which appeared in several editions. In Mr. G. A. Plimpton's mathematical library (New York) are several copies of the four parts bound, all dating, however, a little later than 1655.

⁶ Den uesteren wille van Lowys Porquin. Door hem by maniere van Ilesyck Testament gestelt, tot onderwys ende sticckenge van syne kinderen * * * in dichte gestelt by Anthonis Verensia. Amst. by Herrn. Jansz. Muller 1600. (The last will of Lowys Porquin. By him made after the manner of a pleasing testament for the instruction and edification of his children * * * done into verses by Anthonis Verensia.) Buddingh, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

⁷ Acta van particuliere Synoden van Zuid-Holland, III, 266-267.

The history of Tobias has this full title: "The history of the elder Tobias and the younger Tobias, including many fine lessons; how a father shall instruct his son and how a God-fearing child will be obedient to his father. Also the history of the great cleverness of the noble widow Judith."¹ The "question book" of Aldegonde had as its full title: "Summary of the principal heads of the Christian religion, arranged in the form of question and answer for the benefit and profit of the tender raising of youth and for the edification of all Christians in general."² These same books, together with the *letter-consten* (spelling books) are included on another similar list with the accompanying statement that they were common in the schools of the Netherlands.³ Since the conditions under which the East India Company sent books to its colonies were so nearly the conditions that obtained at New Netherland, there is hardly room to doubt that these books "common in the schools of the Netherlands" were also used in the schools of the American Dutch.

Our next and almost only other reference to the actual Dutch-American schoolbooks is again gained from the inventory of an estate. This time of "Abraham de la Nox of New York, schoolmaster." As we saw, he was probably master of the school of the New York Reformed Dutch Church from 1686 to his death in 1702. From the inventory we select the following items, which seem undoubtedly to be textbooks used by him in his school.

6 books of Evangelists.....	£2-35
9 historical schoolbooks.....	3- 4
10 books of Cortimus.....	3- 9
14 catechism books.....	3- 6
32 song books.....	4- 6
13 books of Golden Trumpets.....	2- 6

The first item was a book of the four gospels used as a reading book, probably after the "groot A B C boeck." The historical school book may be "De Spiegel der Jeugt," treated of the Dutch wars. It may, however, be a book of biblical history. If it be "De Spiegel der Jeugt," we have in it one of the earliest instances in America of the separate teaching of modern history. Of the "Books of Cortimus" nothing has been found. The catechisms books were likely the simple Heidelberg catechisms, which were universal in the Dutch schools. The song books were probably metrical psalms, quite possibly St. Aldergonde's. The "Golden Trumpets" would seem to be a song book. With one book totally unknown, the rest with one possible exception are distinctly religious.

¹ Acta van particuliere Synoden van Zuid-Holland, III, p. 214 (editorial footnote). The book was published at Amsterdam in 1617.

² Delft, 1599. *Ibid.*, p. 214. The author Marinus van St. Aldegonde was a prominent Calvinist, a soldier and *literateur*, author of a version of the psalms and one of the founders of modern Netherland prose. Blok, *History of the Dutch people*, III, 193.

³ Acta van part. synod. van Zuid-Holland, III, 374.

⁴ N. Y. Hist. Soc. Pub., 1892: 313.

Leaving these religious books we come next to a book, not only not religious, but one actually written by "a crafty freethinker from Groningen,"¹ the arithmetic of Pieter Venema, a master of mathematics and writing, here in New York.² So far as the writer has found, this is the only textbook in the Dutch language published in America. It seems to be the third arithmetic published in America. Such a book would find no place probably in the elementary Dutch schools, but would be taught in those private schools, principally commercial in character, which were common in New York from before the beginning of the eighteenth century.³

Putting together the school procedure known to have been followed in America and the probable Holland custom, we may in résumé make an ideal reproduction of the school life of the Holland-American village children.

The child, whether boy or girl, began school at about 7 years of age. The school was kept in the largest room of the schoolmaster's home, which was near the church. The session opened at 8 o'clock in the morning and closed at 4 in the afternoon, with an intermission from 11 to 2 for dinner. A bell or a horn or a drum might be used to summon the pupils. Six days in the week the year round did the children go to school. The holidays were Wednesday and Saturday afternoons,⁴ and St. Nicholas Day (December 6), Christmas, New Year, Easter, and Pinkster (whitsuntide), with possibly others.

The schoolroom had as furniture only the master's desk, and chairs, and backless benches for the children, with tables for writing. The boys and girls sat in separate parts of the room, the girls furthest from the master. The little boys, especially if they were timid, might sit with the girls. Each child must be taught his lesson once and must recite twice in the forenoon and the same in the afternoon. The boys, as soon as they entered the room in the morning, must raise their caps to the master and must remove them when they recited; at other times the cap was kept on the head. The first thing on the opening of school was the morning prayer, led by the older pupils in turn. All joined in this if the master so directed. Similar prayers opened and closed each half day's session.

The first book studied was an alphabet book, on the title page of which was a large cock. In this the child found the alphabet repeated

¹ Eccl. Rec., p. 2786.

² *Arithmetica* | of | *Cyffer-Konst*, | Volgens de Muntten Maten en | Gewigten, te Nieu-York, | gebruykelyk | Als Mede | Een kort ontwerp van de | Algebra, | Opgeſtelt door | Pieter Venema, | Mr. in de Mathieſis en Schryf-konst. | Nieu-York | Gedrukt voor Jacob Goelet, by de | Oude-Slup, by J. Peter Zenger, | MDCCXXX.

Arithmetic or the art of ciphering, according to the coins, measures, and weights used at New York, together with a short treatise on algebra drawn up by Pieter Venema, master in mathematics and the art of writing. New York, printed for Jacob Goelet, near the Old Slip, by J. Peter Zenger, 1730.

³ Chaplain Sharpe writes in 1713 of New York: "The City is so conveniently Situated for Trade and the Genius of the people is inclined to merchandise, that they generally seek no other Education for their children than writing and arithmetic." *N.-Y. Hist. Soc. Pub.*, 1880: 241.

⁴ The Holland schools still have these weekly half holidays.

in different sizes and types, the vowels, syllables such as ab, eb, ib, ob, ub, the Ten Commandments, the general Christian creed, the Lord's prayer, the church formularies for "holy baptism," "holy communion," and "Christian punishments," together with the morning and evening prayers and the prayers before and after dinner, the prayer of Solomon, and (later) the Dutch counting table. Next was a reading book consisting of the evangelists and possibly other selections from the New Testament; after this would come Old Testament history selections, perhaps the history of David. At the close of each half day session, just before the prayer, a psalm was sung, and for this some book of metrical psalms was necessary.

All of the boys and most of the girls entered the writing class; but as the girls by this time were needed at home, many would stop before they learned even to write their names. Probably all the pupils learned to count and to recognize and, possibly, to make the figures; and the ambitious boys learned privately to reckon. Each day there was a lesson with the catechism, but Wednesday and Saturday mornings were especially devoted to this. On Saturday morning the last hour was given up to learning the psalms for the next day's church service. On Monday, or perhaps Wednesday, all the children went to the church and there were catechized publicly before the ministers and elders and such of their parents as cared to come. This was the most important occasion of the whole week. If any child missed his lessons or had broken—whether in school or out—any of the long list of rules posted in the schoolhouse, he must be punished either on the hand with the *plak*, or if especially bad, with the dreaded *roede*. And somehow punishments were frequent. If the boy had not by 12 years of age learned as much as seemed necessary, he was sent to evening school. Each quarter the father paid the master the regular tuition or the child could not continue in school.

All in all, it was a simple life, hearty enough, and earnest enough. There were no rich people and no poor ones, and few servants. In school the children learned to read and possibly to write, but especially how to take part intelligently in the church service. When contrasted with the school life of twentieth-century America, the picture here given seems simple, indeed. But in the very simplicity is an earnestness which commends this school of the irrevocable past. Life is now more complex, and preparation for it more difficult. Perhaps the school of Holland-America, standing between the home and the church and close to both, fitted the children of that day for their life quite as adequately as does its more pretentious successor in these days of more difficult adjustment.

CHAPTER XV.

CONCLUSION.

The Dutch control of New Netherland lasted for only about 40 years; but the original stock held tenaciously to its language and customs long after the English took possession. The educational institution of the Dutch village during the whole period, even down to the American Revolution, was the parochial school, which had been fashioned in Holland to meet both secular and religious needs. During the Dutch régime, the West India Company supplied salaries for the New Amsterdam schools—both parochial and Latin—and assisted some of the villages in supporting their schoolmasters. In no true sense, however, was there a central colonial system in the management of school affairs. Control was in the hands of the local magistracy and consistory, except that in New Amsterdam a third factor was the director general. As in Holland, so in New Netherland, tuition charges were universal, save for "the poor and needy." The expression "free school" was nowhere found among the American Dutch.¹ Girls attended the school on the same footing as boys, but sat apart and recited in different classes. Evening schools seem to have been the rule throughout Dutch America. Dame schools were very seldom found. The curriculum of the elementary school was exactly transferred from Holland. The parish school taught always two of the three R's but offered the third only where commerce made reckoning necessary. A little modern history was taught in Holland and possibly at places in America. The religious part of the curriculum was much stressed.

The elementary school of New Amsterdam was continued as the city school of New York until the second English occupation (1674); since which time it has been maintained as the school of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York City. Its practically continuous operation since 1638 gives it possibly the priority in America as an elementary foundation. The schools in the Dutch villages were continued as the public schools of those villages until the Revolution, and probably longer.

The showing of the American Dutch in the matter of illiteracy is better than that found in some other colonies. At Albany of 360 men's names examined, covering the years from 1654 to 1675, 21 per cent made their marks. Of 274 men's signatures at Flatbush, covering a longer period, 19 per cent made their marks. Corresponding

¹ Except at Bergen in 1668 (see p. 206); where, however, the term is quite likely of English origin.

figures for other American colonies are available in only a few instances. Of the German male immigrants above 16 years of age who came to Pennsylvania in the first half of the eighteenth century, 11,823 names have been counted, with the result of 26 per cent who made their marks.¹ Bruce found, by a most painstaking count of the seventeenth-century Virginians, that of 2,165 male adults who signed jury lists, 46 per cent made their marks; and of 12,445 male adults who signed deeds and depositions, 40 per cent made their marks.² In comparison with these last figures, both Dutch and German made a much better showing. A further significant result appeared from our study of illiteracy, namely, that the male Dutch inhabitants of Flatbush made continuous improvement in this respect, the percentage of illiteracy decreasing gradually from 40 per cent in 1675 to about 6 per cent in 1738.

In the case of the Dutch women fewer names were collected, and the showing was not so good. At Flatbush the names of only 55 persons were secured, of whom 32, or 56 per cent, made marks. Thirty-three Albany women gave 55 per cent illiteracy. The nearly identical results in the two cases would be quite significant had we not a third list of 46 Dutch women made up from other portions of the colony, which shows an illiteracy of 66 per cent. Putting all the Dutch women together we get, for the figures available, 154, a percentage of illiteracy of 60 per cent. Bruce found in Virginia, out of 3,066 women signing deeds and depositions an illiteracy of 75 per cent.³ If we can accept conclusions from the small numbers, the Dutch on the whole make a better showing, the superiority being greater with the men than the women.

By way of comparison with these results a study was made of the signatures to deeds, etc., executed in Suffolk County (Boston), Mass., for two periods in the seventeenth century, a generation apart. Two volumes of the published deeds were used:⁴ the first covering the period 1653-1656, the other, 1681-1697. The results are as follows:

Suffolk County (Mass.) illiteracy, 1653-1697.

	1653-1656	1681-1697
Number of men's names.....	179	199
Number of men's marks.....	20	22
Per cent of men making marks.....	11	11
Number of women's names.....	48	130
Number of women's marks.....	28	49
Per cent of women making marks.....	58	38

¹ The count was made by the writer in an unpublished study of I. D. Rupp's "A collection of * * * 39,000 names of German * * * and other immigrants in Pennsylvania, 1727 to 1776" (2d ed. Philadelphia, 1898). The year 1750 divides nearly equally the immigration. Of 11,201, who came in the years 1751 to 1774 (inclusive), 1,638 made marks, which gives the much better showing for the later period of 15 per cent illiteracy. The whole number of Germans counted was 23,024, of whom 4,735, or 21 per cent, made marks.

² Bruce, *Institutional History of Virginia in the 17th Century*, I, 452 ff. (New York, 1910).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 457.

⁴ *Suffolk Deeds*, libers II and XIV. Boston (1833 and 1906).

The showing here made for this Massachusetts county presents some interesting contrasts with the results of the Flatbush study. In the latter there was marked improvement from 1653 to 1697; in the former there was improvement only in the case of the women. At the early period the Massachusetts men made a much better showing than the Flatbush men, while the women are nearly the same. For the later period the men of the two regions are about the same, while the Massachusetts women have advanced. Of course these figures are too small to admit of final comparison with Bruce's figures for Virginia; and for two reasons, moreover, are not precisely to be compared with those from Flatbush. Signatures taken from deeds give a selection in favor of the property class, and consequently should show less illiteracy; and the presence of Boston within the county of Suffolk would give a somewhat different grouping of men from that which was found in the small farming village of Flatbush.

That the Dutch schools of America are properly called public seems unquestionable. They were open to all the children, were controlled by the duly constituted civil authorities, and were both housed and supported by the public moneys. It is true that direct tax levies for school support were not (as a rule) made, that tuition was regularly charged, and that the church had more or less voice in the management. There was, therefore, a failure in these results to reach the present conception of the American public schools; but neither one nor all of the defects can destroy their essential character as public schools.

The question as to the influence of these schools on the development of the American public education would for a satisfactory answer carry us far beyond the scope of this work. Rather has this study been planned to supply information regarding the Dutch in America that can be used by others in the investigation of such questions. The attitude of the English in colonial New York was not of a nature to utilize the Dutch interest in education, nor did the Dutch seem disposed to seek a basis of helpful cooperation. Public education in New York City accordingly did not flourish during the century of English control. But with the Dutch villages the case was far otherwise. Apparently in each was maintained a genuine public school. It seems, therefore, unthinkable that this deep interest in public education, which for over a century was extended through so much of the colony, should have had no part in early committing New York to a strong policy of State public schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

SOURCE MATERIAL.

- Acta der particuliere synoden van Zuid-Holland 1621-1700 uitgegeven door Dr. W. P. C. Knuttel. 's Gravenhage, 1909. 3 v. (to date).
- Acta ofte handelingen des nationalen synodi * * * tot' Dordrecht. Anno 1618 ende 1619. Dordrecht, 1621.
- Acta synodi nationalis * * * Dordrechtii habitae Anno MDCXIX. Hanoviae, MDCXX.
- BIDDINGH, D. Geschiedenis van opvoeding en onderwijs * * * in de Nederlanden. Tweede stuk, tweede gedeelte. 's Gravenhage, 1843.
- Colonial laws of New York. 5v. Albany, 1894.
- Colonial manuscripts in the State library at Albany. Dutch and English.
- Documentary history of New York. E. B. O'Callaghan, *editor*. Quarto edition. 4v. Albany, 1850-1.
- Documents relative to the colonial history of the State of New York. E. B. O'Callaghan and B. Fernow, *editors*. Quarto edition. 15v. Albany, 1853-1887.
- Ecclesiastical records of the State of New York. 6v. Albany, 1901-6.
- Early records of the city and county of Albany, translated by Jonathan Pearson. Albany, 1869.
- EKKHOF, A. Bastiaen Jansz. Krol, etc. 's Gravenhage, 1910.
- Flatbush church records (MSS.) in vestry room of Flatbush R. D. church. 6v.
- Flatbush town records (MSS.) in Kings County hall of records. 8v.
- Hamilton's Itinerarium * * * 1744 * * * edited by Albert Bushnell Hart. St. Louis, 1907.
- HQES, ROSWELL RANDALL. Baptismal and marriage registers of the old Dutch church of Kingston. New York, 1891.
- Journal of a voyage to New York 1679-80 (by Dankers and Sluyter). Long Island historical society publications, vol. 1. Brooklyn, 1867.
- Kings County conveyances (MSS.) in hall of records (Brooklyn).
- Kings County court and road records (MSS.) in hall of records (Brooklyn).
- KIST, N. C., and ROYAARDS, H. J. Nederlandse archief voor kerkelyke geschiedenis. 9v. Leiden, 1841-9.
- Laws and ordinances of New Netherland, translated by E. B. O'Callaghan. Albany, 1868.
- Minutes of the executive council of the Province of New York. Victor Hugo Paltsis, *editor*. 3v. (two to date). Albany, 1910.
- Minutes of the orphan masters of New Amsterdam, translated by Berthold Fernow. 2v. New York, 1902, 1907.
- Second volume contains other miscellaneous records.
- Narratives of New Netherland. Edited by J. F. Jameson. 1609-1664. New York, 1909.
- New York genealogical and biographical society collections. 2v. (to date). New York, 1890—
- New York public library MSS. (Moore sales collection No. 1791).
- PRATT, D. J. Annals of public education in the State of New York. Albany, 1872.
- Records of New Amsterdam, translated by Berthold Fernow. 7v. New York, 1897.
- REITSMA, J., and VAN VEEN, S. D., *editors*. Acta der provinciale en particuliere synode gehouden in de Noordelyke Nederlanden 1572-1620. 8v. Groningen, 1892-9.

- Report of the state historian of New York. (2d and 3d reports). Albany, 1896-7.
 RUTGERS, F. L., *editor*. Acta van de Nederlandse synode der 16^{de} eeuw. (Werken der Marnix-Vereeniging. Series II, Deel III.) Utrecht, 1889.
 VAN FLENSBURG, J. J. DODT. Archief voor kerkelyke en wereldsche geschiedenis, inzonderheid van Utrecht. 7v. Utrecht, 1838-1848.
 Van Rensselaer-Bowier manuscripts, translated by A. J. F. van Laer. Albany, 1908.

COLLECTIONS CONTAINING SOME SOURCE MATERIAL.

- BRANDT, GERARD. The history of the Reformation, etc., translated from the Dutch. 4v. in two. London, 1722.
 ENSCHEDÉ, A. J. Inventaris van het archief der stad Haarlem. 3v. Haarlem, 1866-7.
 MUNSELL, J. Annals of Albany. 10 v. Albany, 1850-9.
 New York historical society collections. Publication fund series. 38 v. (to date). New York, 1868-1906.
 O'CALLAGHAN, E. B. Calendar of historical manuscripts. Part 1, Dutch. Part 2, English. 2 v. Albany, 1866.
 Old Ulster, an historical and genealogical magazine. 6 v. (to date). Kingston, N. Y., 1905—

GENERAL HISTORIES.

- BLOK, P. J. History of the people of the Netherlands. English translation. New York, 1898-1912. 5 v.
 BRODHEAD, JOHN ROMEYN. History of the State of New York. New York. Vol. 1, 1853 (2d edition, 1859); vol. 2, 1871.
 References are to second edition of vol. 1.
 O'CALLAGHAN, EDMUND BURKE. History of New Netherland. New York. Vol. 1, 1845 (2d edition, 1855); vol. 2, 1848.
 References are to first edition of vol. 1.
 OSGOOD, HERBERT L. The American colonies in the seventeenth century. 3 v. New York, 1907.

LOCAL HISTORIES.

- BERGEN, TRUNIS G. Early settlers of Kings County * * * to 1700. New York, 1881.
 HOES, JOHN C. F. The (first) Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of Kingston. n. d. n. p.
 PEARSON, JONATHAN. Contributions for the genealogies of the first settlers of the ancient county of Albany. 1630-1800. Albany, 1872.
 ————History of the Reformed Dutch Church of Schenectady (pp. 54-260 of the "Two hundredth anniversary of the First Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of Schenectady"). Albany, 1880.
 ————History of the Schenectady patent. Albany, 1883.
 RIKER, JAMES. History of Harlem (City of New York). Revised by Henry Pennington Toler. New York, 1904.
 SCHOONMAKER, MARIUS. The History of Kingston. New York, 1888.
 SMITH, WILLIAM. History of New York. London, 1757.
 STILES, HENRY R. History of Brooklyn. 3 v. Brooklyn, 1867-70.
 ————*editor*. Civil, political, professional and ecclesiastical history * * * of the county of Kings. 2 v. New York, 1884.
 STRONG, THOMAS M. The history of the town of Flatbush. New York, 1842 (reprinted in facsimile, Brooklyn, 1908).
 TAYLOR, BENJAMIN C. Annals of the Classis of Bergen. 2d edition. New York, 1857.

- VALENTINE, D. F. Manual of the corporation of the city of New York. New York, 1841-1869.
- VANDERBILT, GERTRUDE LEFFERTS. The social history of Flatbush, etc. New York, 1881.
- VAN RENSSELAER, Mrs. SCHUYLER. History of the City of New York. 2 v. New York, 1909.
- WEISE, A. J. History of Albany. Albany, 1884.
- WINFIELD, CHARLES H. History of the county of Hudson, N. J. New York, 1874.

HISTORIES OF EDUCATION,

- BEERNINK, G. Het onderwijs te Nijkerk (Bijdragen en Mededeelingen der Vereeniging "Gelre," deel x, pp. 101-118).
- BOELIS, W. B. S. Frieslants Hoogeschool on het Rijs Athenæum te Franeker. 2 v. Leenwarden, 1878.
- DOUMA, H. Geschiedenis van het lager onderwijs en de schoolopvoeding in Nederland. Amsterdam, 1900.
- DUNSHIE, HENRY W. History of the school of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York. New York, 1853 (2d edition, 1883).

References are to second edition unless otherwise stated.

- JACKSON, G. L. Development of school support in Colonial Massachusetts. New York, 1909.
- KUIPER, J. Geschiedenis der wording en ontwikkeling van het Christelijk lager onderwijs in Nederland. 's Gravenhage, 1897.
- SCHOTEL, G. D. J. Het oud-Hollandsch huizegezin der zeventiende eeuw (Hoofdstuk x, De scholen). Haarlem, 1868.
- WATSON, FOSTER. The English grammar schools to 1660. Cambridge, 1908.
- WOLTJER, J. Wat is het doel van het Christelijk Nationaal schoolonderwijs. Amsterdam, 1887.

MISCELLANEOUS.

- CORWIN, EDWARD TANJORE. A manual of the Reformed Church in America. 4th edition. New York, 1902.
- DIX, MORGAN. The parish of Trinity church in the city of New York. 4 v. New York, 1898.
- GRIFFIS, WILLIAM ELLIOT. The story of New Netherland. Boston, 1909.
- Holland society yearbook for 1897. New York, 1897.
- INNES, J. H. New Amsterdam and its people. New York, 1902.
- MULLER, P. L. Onze goude eeuw. 2 v. Leiden, 1908.
- MURPHY, HENRY C. Anthology of New Netherland. New York, 1865.
- O'CALLAGHAN, E. B. Register of New Netherland, 1626-1674. Albany, 1865.

INDEX.

- Abelsen, Henrich, master at Kinderhook, 209.
 Albany. *See* Beverwyck.
 Amerfoort (Flatlands), no school known prior to 1664, 129, 140; school affairs after 1664, 207-208.
 Appel, Adrian Janse, master at Albany (1676), 202.
 Apprenticeship records, educational provisions, 190-191, 208.
 Arithmetic. *See* Curriculum.
 Beauvois, Carel de, licensed as private master in New Amsterdam, 124; master at Breuckeled (1661-1669), 123-125.
 Beaker, Jan Juriacns, master at Albany (1663), 117., 122-123, 201-202; private master at New Amsterdam (1660), 116-119.
 Bequest for school, 157.
 Bergen, school affairs (1661-1664), 137-138, 140; school affairs (after 1664), 203-207.
 Bertholf, Gulliam, master at New Haerlem (1690-91), 168; at Hackensack (1693), 214.
 Beverwyck (now Albany), public support of school, 120, 122-123, 202n; school affairs (up to 1664), 119-123, 139; after 1664, 201-204.
 Board money for schoolmasters, 64-65, 67, 81, 101, 130n.
 Bogardus, Cornelis, master at Albany (1700), 202.
 Books. *See* Textbooks.
 Boswyck (Bushwick), school affairs (1662-1664), 138-140, 166.
 Bratt, Daniel, master of the New York R. D. Church school (1749-1755), 153.
 Brazil, lack of schools in, 73, 79-80.
 Breuckelen. *See* Brooklyn.
 Brodhead, John R. (discussed), 41-42, 95.
 Brooklyn (Breuckelen), school affairs before 1664, 123-124, 139; after 1664, 208-209.
 Brouwer, Jan, (probable) master at Flatlands (1688-1691), 208.
 Burgomasters and schepens (of New Amsterdam), 14; control of elementary school, 65-66, 69, 79, 83-84, 86-91; dispute with director general and council over the excise, 86-89; interested in Latin school, 100; relationships with private masters, 115, 118.
 Burgomasters (of New Amsterdam), 14; control of elementary school, 60-68, 79, 83-86, 91-93; of Latin school, 100-104, 106, 109.
 Bushwick. *See* Boswyck.
 Calendar, school, 28-29, 58-59, 161, 173-174, 187, 216, 226.
 Capito, Matthys, (possible) master at Kingston, 212.
 Carelsen, Joost, not a private master, 112.
 Catechizing school children, 10, 26, 35, 68-70, 78, 85, 148-153, 156-157, 168, 174, 185, 200, 203, 222-223.
See also Religious instruction.
 Catskill, 153.
 Charter of freedom and exemptions of 1629, 12-13, 79, 119; of 1630-1635, 79; of 1640, 82; of 1650, 82.
 Charters, educational provisions, church, 149-160, 161, 203, 207; Dutch villages, 134-135, 137, 205.
 Chorister. *See* Voorsanger.
 Church and civil authorities in relation to schools, 141, 215; Breuckelen, 123-124; Latin School, 109; Midwoud (Flatbush), 125-128, 166-200; Netherlands, 20-25, 38; New Amstel, 129-130; New Amsterdam, 62-64, 68-70, 83-84, 93-94; New Haerlem, 132-133; New Lotts, 186-188; New York (1664-1674), 142-146; Wiltwyck (Kingston), 133-134, 214.
 Church and education. *See* Catechizing of school children, Church attendance of pupils, Church and civil authorities in relation to schools, Consistory, Creed subscription, Religious instruction, Supervision of schools by church authorities.
 Church attendance of pupils, 35, 222-223.
 Church masters, 60, 62, 66, 76-77; at Midwoud (Flatbush), 127, 167-171, 177, 179-182, 189-190, 194-195.
 Church used as a schoolhouse, 160-162.
 Church wardens. *See* Church masters.
 Claessen, Frans, private master at New Amsterdam, 113-114, 118.
 Classis, 15.
 Classes of Amsterdam, 15, 39, 45-46, 54, 57, 63, 64, 71-82, 88, 93, 98, 107, 129-130, 141, 149-150.
 Clock, Pelgrom, schoolmaster at Midwoud (1663-64), 127-128, 166-167.
 Comforter of the sick. *See* Sleekentrooster.
 Consistory, Brooklyn, 124; connection with new Amsterdam school, 65, 73-74, 76-78, 93; Flatbush (Midwoud), 125-128, 167-181, 186-187, 193, 195, 200; how chosen, 15; Hudde's request for license referred to, 113; Kingston, 214; New York, 145-146, 149-151, 153, 155-158; Schenectady, 211.
 Consistory (of Amsterdam), 45-47, 71, 76n.
 Control of schools. *See* Burgomasters, Burgomasters and schepens, Church and civil authorities, Classis of Amsterdam, Consistory, Director General and council, Latin school, Loening, Lords Directors, Ministers, Nine Tribunes, States-General, Supervision by church authorities, Synods.
 Cornbury, Lord, demands licenses of Dutch masters, 149-150, 200, 213-214.
 Corneliasen, Jan, master at New Amsterdam (c1680), 61-62, 70.
 Cortelyou, Jacques, private tutor, 110.
 Court of sessions, supervision of schools, 196.

- Creed subscription, 20, 22, 24-26, 28, 36.
 Currency. *See* Money.
 Curriculum, 32-38, 60, 68, 72-73, 97-100, 106, 109, 115-117, (bis), 127, 133, 141, 150, 155, 167, 168, 174-175, 183, 185, 190-191, 201, 203, 208, 213, 220-226.
See also Religious instruction.
 Curtius, Alexander Carolus, Latin master at New Amsterdam, 83, 100-104; bad discipline, 104; excessive tuition charges, 102-103; lawsuit, 101-102; objects to paying excise, 102; salary, 100-103.
 Dames, school, 28, 110-111, 173, 175, 187, 189.
 Dankers and Sluyter (quoted), 110, 148, 206, 211.
 Davit, master at New Lotts (1690-90), 190.
 De Baane, Joost, master at New Utrecht (c1690) turned out by the Leislerians, 210-211.
 De Forest, Barend, master of New York R. D. Church school (1726-1732), 150-151.
 De Groof, Cornelis, (probable) master at Schenectady (1771-1800), 211.
 De Lanoy, Abraham (1st), private master in New York (1698-1699), 148; probably master of the church school till 1702, 148-149, 225; succeeds Plebersen (1696), 145, 147.
 De Lanoy, Abraham (2d), master of Flatlands school (1733-1742), 208; master of the second school of the New York Reformed Dutch Church (1743-1747), 152-153.
 Dellamont, Jan, (probably) master at Schenectady (1735-1749), 211.
 Deputat lid Indicas res, 15, 39, 61, 72-75.
 Director general and council, dispute with city over the excise, 86-89; Latin school, 99, 102, 104, 106-108; New Amsterdam elementary school, 13-14, 55, 57, 59, 63-64, 67, 77-79, 82-85, 92; private masters, 110-118; require Van Corlaer to stop teaching, 114-116; schools of outlying villages, 123, 125-141, 132-135, 138-139, 141, 206. *See also* Stuyvesant, Pieter.
 Discipline, 32, 38, 68, 104, 223, 227. *See also* Punishment, School rules.
 Drisius, Domine, Latin school due to, 99.
 Duke's laws, 17, 183.
 Dunshee, probable indebtedness to Brodhead and O'Callaghan, 42; mentioned, 51, 147; responsible for 1633 as date of first school, 40.
 English attitude toward public education, 18, 159, 230.
 English language, transition to, 150, 152-154, 156-157, 159, 182-183, 185, 190, 198-199, 202-204, 207-208, 211.
 Esopus. *See* Kingston.
 Evening school, 68, 158, 168, 174-175, 190-191, 208, 212-213, 227.
 Fees, school (America), 26-27, 58-59, 68, 84f, 93, 100-107, 140, 230; Bergen, 137; Beverwyck (Albany), 121, 202; fixed by authorities, 77, 84-85, 102-104; Midwoud (Flatbush), 127, 167-168, 174-175, 184-185, 187, 190; school of the New York Reformed Dutch Church, 156n.
 Flatbush. *See* Midwoud.
 Flatlands. *See* Amersfoort.
 Fordham schoolhouse, 153n.
 Free instruction of the poor, Dutch villages, 140; Flatbush, 183-184; Netherlands, 20-21, 24; New Amsterdam, 68; school of the New York Reformed Dutch Church, 151-153, 157-158.
 Free school, 205, 206.
 Free-will contributions. *See* Voluntary contributions for school purposes.
 Gancel, Jan, master at Flatbush (1716-1718), 178, 181.
 Girls, education of, Netherlands, 30-31; Dutch America, 149, 152, 203, 217-221, 227.
 Glandorf, Johannes, master at Albany (1721 #), 203.
 Goeliet, Dutch schoolmaster in New York (c 1705), 150.
 Gracherie, Stephen, master at Kingston (1704), 213-214.
 Great Remonstrance, 14, 60-62, 74-75, 80, 85-86, 220.
 Hackensack, 214.
 Harlem. *See* New Harlem.
 Hogeman, Adriaen, master at Flatbush (1718-1741), 181-182.
 Herbarium, 100-101.
 Holidays, school, 29, 151, 216.
 Hoogeboom, Cornelius, master at Kingston (1671), 212-213.
 Hudde, Andries, application for license as private master, 113, 118.
 Huygen, Jan, not a schoolmaster, 48, 50.
 Hypodidasculus, use of term, 95n.
 Illiteracy, Albany, 204, 228-229; Brooklyn, 208-209; Flatbush, 196-200, 228-229; New Harlem (1661), 132; Pennsylvania Germans, 229; Poughkeepsie, 209-210; Suffolk County, Mass., 229-230; Virginians, 230.
 Joosten, Jacob, schoolmaster, at Albany (c 1665-1670), 201-202; at Flatbush (1670-1676), 167-170; at Wiltwyck (1660-1665), 134-135, 212.
 Kerfbyl, Dutch schoolmaster in New York (c 1705), 150.
 Kinderhook, school affairs, 209.
 Kingston (called also Esopus and Wiltwyck), school affairs (1658-1664), 133-134, 140; (after 1664) 151, 212-215.
 Kitchen used as schoolroom, 60.
 Kranken-besoeker. *See* Stocken-trooster.
 Krol, Bastiaan Jansz., instructions as kranken-besoeker, 46; not a schoolmaster, 44-48.
 Lamersen, Joghem, master at Kinderhook (c 1700), 209.
 Langestraat, Jan, master at New Lotts (1701-1706), 189.
 Latin schools, Netherlands, 21-22, 24, 26, 35; New Amsterdam, 95-109; number of pupils, 101, 103, 105; support and control of New Amsterdam school, 95, 99, 100-101, 104-105, 106, 109; trivial school of 1652, 96-99.
 Leicpster's school order, 22.
 Licensing of teachers, English régime, 18, 117, 148-150, 175-176, 201-202, 209, 210, 212-214; Netherlands, 22, 25-26, 38; New Netherland, 39-40, 46, 72, 112, 124, 129-130.
 Lords Directors, 11, 13, 14; elementary New Amsterdam school, 57, 63, 66-67, 69, 72, 74-76, 79, 81-85, 88-89; Latin school, 95-98, 99-101, 104-106; Wiltwyck, 135.
 Lubbertsen, Jan, private master at New Amsterdam, 116, 118.
 Luyck, Aegidius, master of New Amsterdam Latin school (1602-1605), 105-107; private tutor to Stuyvesant, 105, 110, 137; salary, 106; subsequent career, 107-108.
 Manners of school children, 31, 226.

- Manout, Boudewyn**, schoolmaster at Boswyck (1663-64). 138-139; to be examined by clergy, 138-139.
- Marriage contracts**, educational provision in, 49, 217-218, 220.
- Martineau, Daniel**, master at Flatbush (1711-1715), 178-179; at New Lots (c. 1691-1700), 189.
- Megapolensis, D^r Johannes**, catechism for schools, 124, 224.
- Midwood (Flatbush)**, school affairs up to 1664, 124-129; school affairs after 1664, 166-200; school lands, 125; typical Dutch village, 128-129; village court, 128.
- Ministers**, interest in schools, 77-78, 113; to examine Manout, 138; university graduates, 15.
- Molenaar, Arent Evers**, master at Midwood (1665-1669), 166-167; possibly master at New Haerlem (1670), 167n; schoolmaster at New Amstel (1661-1664), 130-131.
- Money**, varying values of, 16, 151n, 174n, 182.
- Montagne, Jan Monjaer de la**, master at New Haerlem (1664-1670), 133, 160; master of trivial school, 95, 99.
- Montagne, Willem de la**, master at Kingston (1666-c. 1669), 212-213; (possible) master at New Haerlem (1663), 132.
- Monster-kaart**, 26.
- Muenenbeldt, Peter**, master at New Utrecht, 211.
- Names**, Dutch system of, 130n.
- Netherlands**, education, church interest in, 19ff; extent of education, 37; public interest in, 19, 23-38; relation of church and State in school affairs, 21-25, 38.
- Neivius, Johannis**, (probable) master at Flatlands (1743-44), 208.
- New Amstel**, school affairs (1657-1664), 129-131, 140.
- New Amsterdam**, control of city school, 76, 93 (see also Burgomasters, Burgomasters and schepens); government, 14, 86-87; population growth, 13, 139; revenue, 89; support of city school, 86-83; support of Latin school (see Burgomasters).
- New Castle** See New Amstel.
- New Haerlem**, school affairs (1660-1664), 131-133, 140; (after 1664), 160-165.
- New Lots (Oostwoud)**, a subordinate village of Flatbush (Midwoud), school affairs, 186-190.
- New Netherland**, founded 11; population, 13.
- New Utrecht**, no school known prior to 1664, 139-140; school affairs after 1664, 210-211.
- New York City**, continuation of the 1638 school, 147, 159; school of the R. D. Church (1674-1776), 147-159; under control of consistory, not deacons only, 158.
- New York City school (1664-1674)**, 142-46; continuation of the New Amsterdam school, 142, 146; supported by a rate (1871), 146.
- Night school**. See Evening school.
- Nine Tritunes** (called also nine men), 59, 79, 83, 85-86, 112.
- Nolden, Evert**, master at Beverwyck, 120; at Kingston, 213n.
- O'Callaghan, E. B.**, (discussed), 41, 58, 55.
- Oostwoud**. See New Lots.
- Parochial schools in the Netherlands**, 20-26, 38, 71; in Dutch America, 93, 104, 148.
- Patrons**, 12-13, 119-120. See also Van Rensselaer, Kiliaen.
- Pietersen, Evert**, schoolmaster, at New Amstel (1657-1661), 129-130; at New Amsterdam (1661-1664), 66-70, 82, 84, 136; of New York City school (1664-1674), 142-146; of Reformed Dutch Church school of New York (1674-c. 1686), 147; wealth, 107-108, 142-143.
- Population**, New Amsterdam, 13, 139; Boswyck (Bushwyck), 138-140; Brooklyn, 123; Flatbush (Midwoud), 140, 166, 186; (New Lots); New Haerlem, 132, 140, 160-161, 165; New Netherland, 13, 139b; New Utrecht, 139-140.
- Poughkeepsie**, school affairs, 209-210.
- Precentor**. See Voorsinger.
- Price, Daniel**, (probable) master at Schenectady (1708), 211.
- Private schoolmasters**. New Amsterdam, 110-118; private tutors, 110; regulated by director general and council, 110-111; school dames, 110-111; Van Cortner is required to stop teaching, 114-116.
- Provoost, David**, private master at New Amsterdam, 111-112, 118.
- Psalm-singing**, 34-35, 68, 124, 222.
- Public school**, Dutch America, 188, 190-200, 230; Netherlands, 20-38; New Netherland, 65, 81-94, 117 (unusual use of term), 139-140.
- Punishment**, 32, 104, 223, 227.
- Pupils**, number of, 101, 103, 130, 155, 157-158, 178, 187.
- Reader**, 196. See Voorlezer.
- Reformed Dutch Church**, 15, 19-20. See also Church and education.
- Religious instruction**, 31-35, 68, 72, 78, 98, 123-124, 168, 222-223, 227. See also Catechizing of school children.
- Remonstrance**, (great). See Great remonstrance.
- Renusen, Derick**, (probable) master at Flatlands (1752), 208.
- Remsen, Jores**, master at Flatbush (1741-c. 1755), 182.
- Remsen, Rem**, (possible) master at New Lots (1677), 186.
- Revenue**, public, New Amsterdam, 89; villages, 122, 125-127, 134-135, 140-141, 212n; West India Company, 83n.
- Ridder, Everet**, master at Albany (1703), 202.
- Riley, Philip**, (probably) master at Schenectady (1760-1757), 211.
- Roelantsen, Adam**, certification record 40; close of his term, 53-58; deposition of 1638, 41; not an official teacher prior to 1637, 48-49; opened school, 44, 50; private life, 51-53, 55-63.
- Rule of the Dutch schoolmasters**. See Valckoogh.
- Salary**, schoolmaster's, 140; at Beverwyck (Albany), 120, 122, 202-203; at Boswyck, 138-139; at Brooklyn, 123; at Flatlands, 207-208; at Midwoud (Flatbush), 125-127, 166-172, 174, 177-178, 180-181, 185-186; at New Amstel, 130; at New Haerlem, 133, 160-161, 163-164; at New Lots, 187; at New York (school of R. D. Church), 151, 153, 155, 157-158; at New Utrecht, 210-211; at Schenectady, 211; at Wiltwyck (Kingston), 134, 212-213; in Latin school, 95, 100-101, 106-100; in New Amsterdam elementary school, 57, 64-65, 67; in the Netherlands, 20-27; paid by the company, 57-58, 67, 81, 83-84, 80-80; possibly in part by the city, 81, 86-92. See also Fees, Board money for schoolmasters.

- Schaafs, Domine Gideon, "schoolmaster for old and young" at Beverwyck (1652ff), 120-121.
- Schenck, Johannes, master at Flatbush (1691-94, 1700-1711), 175-178.
- Schenck, Martin, (probable) master at Flatlands (1704-1712), 208.
- Schenectady, school affairs, 211-212
- Schepens, 14, 77. *See also* Burgomasters and schepens.
- Scholars (Netherlands), 22-23, 27, 29, 38.
- School. *See* Calendar, Curriculum, Education, Holiday, Netherlands, Punishment, Religious instruction.
- School attendance. *See* Pupils, number.
- School equipment, 29, 192, 217, 226.
- School hours, 31, 67, 151, 168, 216, 226.
- Schoolhouses, America, 216-217; Bergen, 138, 200-207; Beverwyck (Albany), 119-120, 203; Flatlands, 207; Fordham, 133n; Kingston, 212; Latin school, 95, 99-100, 104; Midwood (Flatbush), 126-128, 167-169, 176-177, 179-180, 185-186, 193-194; New Amstel, 129; New Amsterdam, 59-62, 65-69, 76-77, 81-82, 84-86, 89-92; New Haarlem, 100-165; New Lotts, 187, 189-190; New Utrecht, 211; New York City (school of Reformed Dutch Church), 161, 153, 155-156, 158; New York City (1664-1674), 143-144; the Netherlands, 29.
- School lands, at Midwood (Flatbush), 125-128, 168-170, 174, 180-185; at New Haarlem, 160-161, 163; at New Lotts, 187-188; at Bergen, 216; at Flatlands, 207; at New Utrecht, 210-211.
- Schoolmaster (Dutch America), appointment, 40, 62, 64-66, 72-78, 82, 84, 95, 100, 106-106, 109, 123, 125, 127-130, 132-134, 136-139, 141, 150-153, 155, 157, 167-168, 176-176, 178, 181-188, 194-196, 203, 207, 212; certification by church authorities, 39, 46, 71, 76n, 77-78, 93, 100, 113, 129, 138-139, 141; clerk of church, 145, 147, 151-152, 209; clerk of court, 133, 140, 162, 164-165, 174, 181-183; comparative wealth, 167-168, 142-143; court messenger, 123-125, 127, 134, 137, 140, 167-168, 174; education of, 164-165, 219; instructions (contract), 67-68, 72, 84, 102-103, 123, 125, 127, 137-138, 150-153, 155, 157-158, 167-168, 173-175, 181, 185-188, 190; term of service, 54, 63-64, 127, 130, 151, 153, 160-161, 166-168, 170, 175, 187-188, 203; moral character, 51, 54-55, 61-63, 66, 69-70, 102-104, 116-117, 127-129, 132, 135, 137-138, 164-165, 171-171, 173-175. *See also* Clerks of Amsterdam; Licensing, Private schoolmasters.
- Schoolmaster (Netherlands), appointment of, 23-24, 26; auxiliary occupations, 27-28; qualifications, 25; remuneration, 26-27. *See also* Creed subscription.
- Schoolmasters, assistant, 28, 69-70.
- Schoolmistresses, 28. *See also* Dames, school.
- School rules, 31-32, 104, 227.
- School support. *See* Support of schools.
- Schools, number of, 124, 130-140, 201.
- Schuurman, Jacobus, master at Raritan (1725), 214-215.
- Seawant. *See* Money.
- Selover, Isaac, master at Flatlands (1708), 208; voorlezer at Flatbush (1711-5), 178-179.
- Sexton, schoolmaster as, 63, 123-125, 127, 129, 440, 167-168, 174, 186.
- Shutte, John, English master at Albany (1665), 202.
- Sickles, Abraham, master at Bergen (1761-1789), 207.
- Sicken-trooster (comforter of the sick, seeker of the sick, krankenbesoeker), 15, 44-50, 61, 63, 66, 73, 75-76, 83, 129-130, 133, 145, 147-148, 151.
- Slates, school, 130, 223.
- Sluyter. *See* Dankers and Sluyter.
- Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 203.
- Sprong, David, possible schoolmaster at Flatbush (c1755-c1758), 183.
- States-General of the Netherlands, 11, 14, 35-36, 75, 78-81, 94, 97.
- Steenhuysen, Engelbert, master at Bergen (c1662-1664), his dispute with village court, 137-138.
- Stevensen, Jan, master at New Amsterdam (1642-1648), 54, 57-60, 70.
- Steyn, Hans, private master at New Amsterdam, 112-113, 118.
- Storm, Dirk, master at New Lotts (1680-c1686), 187-188.
- Stoutenberg, Isaac, assistant and temporary master in New York (Reformed Dutch Church) school (c1732), 151-152.
- Strong, Thomas M., discussed, 127, 166n.
- Stuyvesant, Pieter, 13-14, 56, 59-61, 63, 65-66, 69, 73-77, 81-82, 95-96, 99, 105-107, 109-110, 113-114, 135-136.
- Stuyvesant's Bowery, school at, 135, 140.
- Supervision by church authorities, 20, 22-23, 25. *See also* Ministers, Synods.
- Support of schools, Netherlands, 27; New Amsterdam elementary school, 87, 86, 91; New Amsterdam Latin school, 95, 99, 100-101. *See also* Fees, School lands, Tax for school purposes, Voluntary subscriptions for school purposes.
- Suydam, Jan, (probable) master at Flatlands (1710-c1729), 208; voorlezer at Flatbush (1711-1719), 178-179, 189.
- Swart, Gerrit, master at Albany (1676), 202.
- Synods, interest of, in education, 15, 19-20, 23, 71-74, 76-77, 97, 172.
- Tappen, 214.
- Tavern not used as schoolhouse, 99.
- Tax for school purposes, Albany, 122, 202n; Bergen, 205-206; Kingston, 213; New Haarlem, 160-161, 163; New Lotts, 187; New York City, 140; proposal of 1638 rejected by States-General, 80; seldom found among American Dutch, 140, 215. *See also* Voluntary subscription for school purposes.
- Textbooks, Flatlands, 207; Latin school, 100, 108-109; must be orthodox, 23, 151; New Amstel, 131; Wiltwyck, 135.
- Tibout, Jan, court messenger and possible schoolmaster at Bergen (c1661), 137; his immoral conduct and dismissal, 173-174; schoolmaster at Flatbush (1666-1670), 167 (1681-2), 172-173; schoolmaster at New Haarlem (1685-1690, 1691-c1698), 164-165.
- Town meeting, 17, 176-178, 181, 182, 184, 187-188, 190, 193-194, 199-200; school committee, 176, 178, 181-182, 184-185, 194.
- Trivial school, change of meaning (Schenectady), 211-212; character of trivial school, 96; Netherlands, 21, 23, 35-36; New Amsterdam, 96-99. *See also* Latin school.
- Tuition. *See* Fees, school.

- Tull, Pieter, (probable) master at Flatlands (1691-1704), 208.
- Tuitor, private. *See* Luyck, Cortelyou.
- Valckoogh, Dirk Adriaensz (quoted), 25, 27, 28, 29, 31-32.
- Valentine, D. F. (discussed), 43, 111n, 114.
- Van Benthuysen, Isaac P., master at Bergen (1736-1760), 206-207; (probable) master at Schenectady (1760-1770), 211.
- Van Corlaer, Jacobus, private master at New Amsterdam, required to stop teaching, 114-116, 118.
- Van Dalsen, William, master in second school of the New York Reformed Dutch Church (1747-1757), 153, 155.
- Van der Linde, Pieter, possibly a master at New Amsterdam, 61-62, 70, 73, 78.
- Van der Sluys, Andries, voorlezer and probably schoolmaster at Esopus (Kingston), 1658-9), 133-134.
- Van der Vin, Hendrick Jansen, master at New Haerlem (1670-1685), 160-165.
- Van Ekeken, Johannes, dismissed for participation in Leisler rebellion, 175-176; master at Flatbush (1682-1692), 174-176.
- Van Gelder, Johannes, private master at New Amsterdam, 117-118.
- Van Giesen, Reynier Bastiaensen, master at Bergen (1665-1707), 205; master at Midwoud (1660-1663), 125-127, 166.
- Van Harlingen, Johannes Amsterdam, master at New Haerlem, 165.
- Van Hoboken, Harmen, master at New Amsterdam (1655-1661), 65-67, 70, 76, 90-91; master at Stuyvesant's Bowwery, 136-137.
- Van Huyzen, Harmanus, master at Tappen (1753), 214.
- Van Ipendam, Adriaen Jansz, private master at New Amsterdam, 111, 118; public master at Boverwyck, 120-122.
- Van Kouwenhoven, William Garretse, (probable) master at Flatlands (1675-1688), 208.
- Van Marken, Jan Gerritz, master at Flatbush (1670-1690), 170-173.
- Van Rensselaer, Killian, 13, 119-120.
- Van Sico, Johannes, (probable) master at Schenectady (1756-1766), 211.
- Van Siggelon, Johannes, (probable) master at Flatlands (1729-1733), 208.
- Van Spyk, Joris, master at New Lotts (c1680-1689), 188-189.
- Van Steenbergh, Peter, schoolmaster at Flatbush (c1758-1773), 183-185; of school of the New York Reformed Dutch Church (1773-1776), 157-158.
- Van Tienhoven, Cornelis, statement about schoolmasters "in hired houses," 61, 111, 117.
- Van Vleck, Paulus, master at Kinderhook (1702-1709), 209.
- Van Wageningen, Gerrit, master of the New York Reformed Dutch Church school (1732-1742), 151-152.
- Van Wageningen, Huybert, master in New York Reformed Dutch Church school (1742-1749), 152-153, 156.
- Vênema, Pieter, master of mathematics and writing in New York (1730), 226.
- Vermeule, Adriaen, master at Bergen (1708-1736), 206; master at New Haerlem (1699-1708), 165.
- Vostensz, Willem, master at New Amsterdam (1650-1655), 62-65, 70, 75-76.
- Villages (Dutch), chartered, 13; government under English, 193; municipal government, 14, 192.
- Villages (English), chartered, 13n.
- Voluntary subscriptions for school support, 133, 144, 160-163, 165, 211, 213.
- Voorhees, Abraham, (probable) master at Flatlands (1744-1747, 1768-1792), 208.
- Voorhees, Lukkas, (probable) master at Flatlands (1748-1762, 1755-1768), 208.
- Voorlezer (reader, chorke), 16, 24, 28, 54, 62-63, 66, 73, 78, 122, 125, 129, 133, 136-138, 140, 147, 151, 164-168, 174, 177, 180, 182-183, 189, 200, 202-203, 205-208, 210, -214; not necessarily schoolmaster, 130-121, 179, 219.
- Voossanger (precentor, chorister), 16, 24, 28, 63-66, 73, 75, 78, 88, 121, 123-125, 129, 137, 143, 145, 147, 151, 166-168, 174, 177, 180, 185-186, 189, 200, 209, 212, 214, 219.
- Wampum. *See* Money.
- Welp, Anthony, master at Flatbush (1773-1776), 185-186.
- Welp, Johan Nicolas, master of the New York Reformed Dutch Church school (1755-), 155-157.
- West India Company, 11, 79, 228; sources of income, 83n. *See also* Lords Directors.
- Wills, educational provisions in, 218-220.
- Wiltwyck. *See* Kingston.
- Wingaard, Lukkas Gerritse, master at Albany (1676), 202.
- Ziperus, Michael, (probably) first master at New Haerlem, his career, 132.