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Editor’s Corner

FRENCH LITERARY CRITIC Jean Baptiste Karr’s 1849 epigram, plus çà change, plus c’est la même chose, is one of the most quoted sayings of modern times. In Dutch it is cited as Hoe meer alles verandert, hoe meer het hetzelfde blijft, and in English we say “the more things change, the more they stay the same.”

This issue of de Halve Maen contains two seemingly unrelated essays, Kenneth Shefsiek on the struggles between an eighteenth-century Long Island minister and his congregations and Dr. Andrew Hendricks on the recent transport of the replica ship Half Moon to the Netherlands. Yet, a close examination of the topics suggests that the underlying impulses behind human history remain constant despite technological advances or political change.

In his essay, Shefsiek explores the tumultuous three-year relationship between Reformed pastor Johannes Henricus Goetschius and his Queens County, Long Island, congregations. Shefsiek notes that Goetschius’ troubles began in 1742, when an elite member of one of his congregations believed the minister had insulted him. The struggle intensified when later that year the legitimacy of his ordination came into question. As the dispute escalated, Shefsiek notes that Goetschius’s beliefs, speech, and sexual probity came under scrutiny. The issues at stake in this dispute were many, but the crux of matter was that Goetschius had refused to bow to the centers of power that claimed authority over him. “Within a culture that demanded authority,” Shefsiek writes, “set within a colonial world where that authority was less-than-established, the politics of status were unavoidable.” Ambiguity resulted in conflict.

At the center of the battle over Goetschius’ ministry is the very human struggle for power and authority. As in our contemporary world, deference and the protection of doctrine went hand-in-hand. Goetschius’ opponents used every opportunity to discredit him in order to assert their authority. In doing so, they followed a pattern not dissimilar to that of our own age of tabloid journalism and Internet blogs: when all else fails, rumors of sexual misconduct are spread and enhanced.

In his brief essay, Andrew Hendricks reports on the loan of the Half Moon replica ship to the Westfries Museum in Hoorn, Netherlands. Hendricks notes that in 1909, on the three-hundredth anniversary of the first Half Moon’s voyage, the Kingdom of the Netherlands presented a replica Half Moon to the United States as a symbol of the “lively relations, which unite the Netherlands and the United States of America.” The center of much attention when it arrived in the United States in 1909, this replica had become a neglected ruin by the time it burned in Cohoes, New York, twenty-five years later. In 1988, Dr. Hendricks undertook recreating a new replica ship Half Moon “to underscore the Dutch contribution to American history and culture.”

For the past twenty-five years, the current replica Half Moon’s mission has been highly successful, due in large part to the New Netherland Museum’s enlightened educational programming. But the public’s attention span is short lived, and rather than face the fate of the earlier replica ship, it was wisely decided to have the current replica become an ambassador of New Netherland to a new audience in Europe. The Half Moon will be on loan to the Westfries Museum in Hoorn for up to five years. It is hoped that in the meantime American interest can be rekindled in maintaining this valuable treasure and educational tool for understanding a pivotal period in this continent’s development.

It was Benjamin Franklin who in 1789 coined the phrase, “In this world nothing can be said to be certain, except death and taxes.” Hereditary societies were established to preserve the memory of those generations who preceded us. As the Holland Society Constitution states, the Society’s goal is “To perpetuate the memory and foster and promote the principles and virtues of the Dutch ancestors of its members.” The passing of each human being is painful to those who loved them, and no greater honor can be bestowed than to keep their memory alive. This issue of de Halve Maen reports the passing of two men who had a special influence on the development of this journal, Holland Society Fellow Dr. James Tanis and Society Trustee Dr. Charles W. Wendell. Dr. Tanis was among the first American scholars to focus on the intellectual achievements of the Dutch Republic, and to suggest that in order to understand New Netherland’s development we need look at European antecedents. He inspired me in my research and my desire to take the journal to a higher level in promoting the achievements of the Dutch in America. Dr. Wendell was for many years Chair of the Holland Society Library Committee and a member of the de Halve Maen Editorial Board. A true gentleman and committed scholar, he provided drafts for the journal’s obituaries and was a guiding light in keeping the Society on track in living up to its mission. He is greatly missed.

Kenneth Shefsiek notes in his essay, “lack of clarity created the opportunity for different centers of authority to grow, but all were not equal.” As conditions change, new centers of power will always emerge to challenge old structures. It is this struggle to achieve and maintain authority that remains constant. Hoe meer alles verandert, hoe meer het hetzelfde blijft.

Hoe meer alles verandert, hoe meer het hetzelfde blijft.

David William Voorhees
Editor

Hoe meer alles verandert, hoe meer het hetzelfde blijft.
“Make an end of my misery”: Rev. Johannes Henricus Goetschius and the Negotiation of Authority in Eighteenth-Century Dutch New York

by Kenneth Shefsiek

AFTER MORE THAN three years of fighting with members of his Dutch Reformed congregations on Long Island, as well as with senior ministers in the region, the pietistic Rev. Johannes Henricus Goetschius was at his wit’s end. He begged the Classis of Amsterdam, the ecclesiastical body that claimed authority over the colonial Dutch Reformed congregations and ministers, to “be delivered from this miserable life, worse than death itself; for my enemies care but little how they charge me, or what they charge me with.” His troubles began in 1742 when an elite member of one of his congregations came to believe that Goetschius had called him an “unregenerate man,” and in response, “threatened [him] with vengeance.”

Goetschius’ struggle intensified later that year, when the legitimacy of his 1741 ordination in America was called into question. As the dispute progressed, his pietistic beliefs, his often-aggressive speech, and even his sexual probity were reviewed and criticized. The issues at stake in the dispute were many, but the crux of his trials was that he had refused to bow to centers of ecclesiastical power that claimed authority over him. As a young zealot, he also did not seem to some to be sufficiently deferential to his social superiors, who used his struggles with ecclesiastical authority to discredit him further. Goetschius was not a man who snubbed authority, but he did question where it should be placed. Unfortunately for him, he did not defer to those with the greatest power, and he paid for that error with his reputation and his peace of mind. Within a culture that demanded authority, set within a colonial world where that authority was less-than-established, the politics of status were unavoidable, and woe to the man who did not appreciate that reality.

Johannes Henricus Goetschius, the son of the Reverend Moritz Goetschi, emigrated with his family from Switzerland to Pennsylvania in 1735 when he was seventeen. The Reverend Goetschi had arranged with the States General of the Netherlands to pay for his and his family’s passage; in return, he was to supply information on the German Reformed churches in the colony to the Synods of North and South Holland, which were providing support to those congregations. Unfortunately, Goetschi died the day after he arrived in Philadelphia. The German Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania believed that Goetschius was to be their minister, so they took his death hard. They then turned to his son Johannes, who began preaching in the region. Johannes hoped to be ordained, so he turned to the Presbyterian Synod in Philadelphia, the closest Calvinistic institution that could ordain men for the ministry. Although they found him “well skilled in the learned languages . . . they found him altogether ignorant in College learning, and but poorly read in Divinity, [such that] his ordination to the ministry must at present be deferred.” Still, they encouraged him to continue preaching and to continue studying under another minister. Johannes therefore furthered his education in Pennsylvania with the Dutch Reformed minister Peter Henry Dorsius.

Goetschius developed into a zealous pietist, who aimed to engender an experiential spirituality that eschewed formal ceremony and prescribed prayers. He wanted his auditors to turn away from an outward semblance of godliness towards an inward holiness that flowed outward into strict moral behavior. He was also willing to be aggressive and judgmental if that was what it took to bring people to God. Goetschius was soon called by four united Dutch Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania. He holds a Ph.D. in American History at the University of North Carolina, where he teaches early American history, historic preservation and museum studies and directs the graduate program in Public History. He holds a Ph.D. in American History from the University of Georgia. His book manuscript, “Set in Stone: The Creation and Commemoration of a Hudson Valley Culture,” is currently being reviewed for publication.

Kenneth Shefsiek is an Assistant Professor of History at the University of North Carolina, where he teaches early American history, historic preservation and museum studies and directs the graduate program in Public History. He holds a Ph.D. in American History from the University of Georgia. His book manuscript, “Set in Stone: The Creation and Commemoration of a Hudson Valley Culture,” is currently being reviewed for publication.
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Queens County in October 1740. The call was approved by two Dutch ministers, the Reverends Bernardus Freerman and Vincentius Antonides, both of whom had been serving on Long Island since 1705. The Reverends Dorsius, Theodorus Frelinghuysen, and William Tennant ordained Goetschius six months later. He was then installed in his congregations by Reverend Freeman.

While this was not the first Dutch Reformed ordination in the American colonies, it became one of the most controversial, as it presented a challenge to the ecclesiastical structures of authority as they were developing in a colonial context. In the presbyterian system of the Dutch Reformed church, there are four levels of authority, but only the lower three are relevant in the conflict surrounding Goetschius. The structure of that authority is more regional than hierarchical. Each congregation is governed by a consistory comprised of its minister and elders. Congregations are linked together in a regional classis, in which all regional ministers and consistories are represented, which in turn are linked together into regional synods.

Much authority rests with a classis, which examines and ordains ministers and provides organizational support for and theological oversight of congregations and ministers in its region. In the Netherlands, the classis also played a role in calling a new minister for a congregation. That process began when a consistory decided to search for a new minister. Once a candidate was selected and a formal call issued by the consistory, he would be examined by the regional classis if it was his first call; if he was already ordained, the classis would just have to approve him. His name was then made public, giving the consistory and the local magistrates time to object. If there was no objection, the candidate was ordained, if not already a minister, or installed if already ordained. This would take place in his new congregation by a representative from the classis. The purpose of this process was to protect doctrinal orthodoxy, ensure proper training for ministers, and protect the church from excessive divisiveness.

The consistories of the congregations in colonial America, however, could not play their proper role in securing a minister, as they were never integrated into a local classis. Neither could they recruit in the same way as in the Netherlands because of their distance from potential candidates. An alternative process had to be developed, although it was not entirely clear to everyone what that modified process should be. This ambiguity led to changes over time. Changes were also influenced by the English conquest, as well as the overall development of the American colonies.

During the New Netherland period, the Dutch West India Company, rather than the consistories, had the prerogative of determining whether a new minister was needed. Once the Company determined that a minister was needed, the Classis of Amsterdam then selected the person who was to serve and ordained or installed the minister in his new charge. In other words, during the New Netherland period, the Classis of Amsterdam fulfilled the traditional roles of both a classis and a congregational consistory in the selection of a minister.

This process basically remained the same between the English conquest and the end of the seventeenth century, except that the company no longer played a role. However, the American consistories began to take a stronger role in recruitment by the early eighteenth century. Involvement of a classis was still necessary, at the very least because a classis was the body that performed or authorized ordinations. Yet, all were not in agreement as to whether the Classis of Amsterdam had an exclusive relationship with the colonial congregations and ministers, as the church order did not stipulate to which classis colonial congregations belonged. This ambiguity created a potential for conflict.

The Classis of Amsterdam wanted exclusive authority over the colonial congregations, as did many colonial ministers, as most had been ordained and/or sent by the Classis of Amsterdam and considered themselves part of it. The Classis of Amsterdam also hoped to have exclusive control over which ministers were sent to America or whom from America they would ordain or authorize to be ordained in its name.

This ambiguity can be seen in a situation that developed in Albany in the early seventeen-century involving Bernardus Freerman, the minister who later installed Goetschius in his Queens County congregations. In 1699, the consistory of the Albany congregation authorized their former minister and two New York merchants as agents, Willem Banckert and Livinus van Schaick, to secure a new minister, with the assistance of the Classis of Amsterdam. The classis responded by calling and ordaining Johannes Lydius. Banckert, however, was determined to secure Freerman, a Pietistic former tailor, who had previously been denied ordination by the Classis of Amsterdam because they believed him insufficiently trained. Amsterdam later described Freerman as “only just come down from his cutting-board, and who had neither ability for his own craft, much less for that demanded of a pastor.” Since the Classis of Amsterdam would most likely still have been unwilling to ordain Freerman, Banckert
gained approval from the Albany consistory to arrange for Freeman’s ordination by another classis. They turned instead to the Classis of Lingen in Westphalia. Both Freeman and Lydius made their way to Albany, such that the congregation had to select one or the other. Through a complicated process that involved an analysis of the ecclesiastical lawfulness of the calls to both ministers, the Albany congregation chose Lydius. Luckily for Freeman, the nearby Schenectady congregation was in need of a minister, so its consistory called him to serve.

As Freeman had not been ordained nor called by the Classis of Amsterdam, the Classis of Amsterdam and a number of colonial ministers understood that Freeman stood outside of the authority of the Amsterdam classis. This also placed him outside of what the Classis referred to as the “communion” of Dutch Reformed ministers in America, although precisely what that meant was not clear. The Classis of Amsterdam was even of the opinion that if a congregation called a minister who was outside of Amsterdam’s authority, then that congregation likewise became independent.13 It was just such independence that the church order was aimed to avoid, so the Classis of Amsterdam and some colonial ministers sought to bring Freeman, and hence his congregation, into the orbit of the Classis of Amsterdam. As the Reverends Henricus Selyns and Gualtherus Du Bois of New York City informed the Schenectady consistory, “We are, indeed, willing to recognize Reverend Freeman as an orthodox minister, who belongs to the Classis of Lingen. But if he, hereafter, is willing to consider the Classis of Amsterdam with us, as the one on which, in certain respects, we are alone dependent, and as the body to which we and himself belong: this would serve as a great bond of unity for all the Dutch Churches in these far off countries of America.”14 Freeman initially said he could not join the Classis of Amsterdam on his volition—he would have to get approval from the Classis of Lingen—but he eventually did make a unilateral decision to join himself with Amsterdam.

Goetschius’ ordination was even more disconnected from the authority of Amsterdam than Freeman’s, as Goetschius, unlike most Dutch Reformed ministers in America, was not even ordained in Europe, but by Rev. Dorsius in Pennsylvania. Dorsius had been serving Dutch Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania since 1737, having been recruited while at the University of Groningen to do so by a Rotterdam minister. After finishing his studies, he was received “by the Classis of Schieland at Rotterdam, as a candidate of theology . . . [and] ordained by the . . . faculty of Groningen,” the only non-classical authority in the Netherlands that had the right to ordain.15 Whether Dorsius had the authority to ordain Goetschius was questionable. Dorsius believed, or at least claimed, that he had been granted the power to ordain in the colonies by the Synod of South Holland. Besides, he told Goetschius that because they “lived in a country where there was no Synod or Classis, one minister might make another minister.”16 Dorsius’ comments to Goetschius reflect such a perspective, and it is possible that Dorsius took Wilhelmus’ opinion as authorization. Good, Reformed Church, 192.

13 ERNY, 3: 1469–70.  
14 ERNY, 2: 1385; ERNY, 3: 1469–70.  
15 ERNY, 3: 1535, 1538, 1647.  

The question as to whether Goetschius’ ordination was valid was not immediately raised, but it did not lay dormant for long after Goetschius unintentionally offended some of his church elders. One whom he offended was Cornelis Reyersen, a member of the local elite, who had participated in the call made to Goetschius.17 According to Goetschius, the devolution began rather innocently. He reported that “Reyserse once made the observation that a certain class of people in the congregations, who were despised by some, but who greatly attracted me, occupied too much of my attention. His objection to this, gave me occasion to reprove him . . . After a couple of years . . . A conference was had on this matter, at which, in good natured banter, I fell from his grace . . . People spoke scornfully of me; and sometimes, by my sharp answer to him, the gentle-
men’s disfavor was turned into positive hate.”20 This “certain class of people” of whom Reyersen did not approve likely comprised a conventicle, a “fringe” group of particularly pious people who came together to intensify their religious studies and experiences.21

The minister’s troubles grew in August 1742, when he delivered a fiercely-pietistic sermon, “The Unknown God.” Goetschius critiqued the many Christians who aimed “to please [their] Creator with superficial and habitual lip-service, in a graceless and spiritless way, without any spiritual experiencing.”22 These self-righteous “hypocrites” were not “troubled,” while the rare Christian who “knows God is . . . aware of his own insignificance, his odiousness, cursedness . . . and impotence to help himself.”23 A significance, his odiousness, cursedness “troubled,” while the rare Christian who

Reyersen soon found an opportunity to challenge Goetschius, when the Classis of Amsterdam came to question the validity of his ordination. The Classis knew that it was possible that Dorsius had the right to ordain candidates in the colonies, although they were not pleased. Still, they wanted to be sure if Dorsius’ claims were true, so the Classis planned to write to the Groningen faculty and the Classis of Schieland at Rotterdam for further information.25 Before they had learned whether either had authorized Dorsius to ordain, the Classis composed a letter in May 1741, which read: “But it seems strange to us that Rev. (J. H.) Goetschius has been installed at Jamaica, [Long Island,] on the simple ordination of Rev. Dorsius, who has really no authority whatever to provide the churches of New York with ministers; nor has he authority even from the Synod of South Holland, with reference to Pennsylvania. As regards his particular appointment by the Classis of Schieland, we shall seek further information.”26 Before the letter was sent to the colonies, the Classis learned that Schieland had not authorized Dorsius to ordain anyone.27 However, they unwisely did not update the letter before sending it, which seemed to leave the question still unresolved.28

Goetschius’ shock can only be imagined when some members of his congregations came to question the validity of his ordination after reading that letter. They then chose to seek advice from a committee of ministers and consistory of New York City and Kings County, Long Island, in November 1742, as to how to handle the questionable status of Goetschius’ ordination. Reyersen was one of those church elders who participated in the endeavor. Some members also requested advice concerning some unspecified “other differences, which may, perhaps, be brought forward by Consistories and private members,” although the core question at the time was the legality of his ordination.30

Because there was no local classis, these other local ministers could only involve themselves in other congregations if so requested, and still, their input could only be advisory. If there had been a local classis, they could have involved themselves collectively by choice, such that their lack of power was a byproduct of the lack of structures of ecclesiastical authority in a colonial context. Still, the committee was led by the most senior minister in New York, Rev. Gualtherus du Bois, whose advice typically carried great weight. According to Dirk Mowu, due to his age and attitude, Du Bois “could expect deference from nearly any person he met, particularly Dutch reformed laity and clergy. That he wielded his considerable power deliberately and gently only added to the influence he could exert within his ecclesiastical orbit—on both sides of the Atlantic.”31 Vincetius Antonides, another senior minister, was also on the committee. The committee decided there

20 ERYN 4: 2743–45.
21 ERYN 4: 2888-2889.
22 ERYN 4: 2913–16.
24 ERYN 4: 2889-2889.
27 When precisely Goetschius’ congregations learned of the letter is unknown, but it began to circulate in the fall of 1742. [The congregations in Port Jervis, Minisink, and Walpack, in the lower Hudson Valley, noted in 1743 that they had become aware of the Classical letter in the fall of 1742. It concerned them as well, because Dorsius had also ordained their minister, Johannes Fryenmooi, in 1741. If those congregations had become aware of that letter when they did, certainly Goetschius’ congregations on Long Island would have had access to it even earlier, as Arondeus served congregations very close to those of Goetschius. ERYN 4: 2801-2803.]
28 The letter from the Classis of Schieland itself is not included in the Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, but it presumably indicated that Dorsius had not been given any such authority, as Amsterdam indicated that the classical deputies were “to shape their letters to those of New York and to Rev. Dorsius in accordance therewith,” and as Amsterdam would maintain that Dorsius did not have the power to ordain, presumably this is what was indicated in that letter. ERYN 4: 2766-67.
29 Writing on November 18, 1742, to the ministers and consistory of New York City and Kings County, the Queens County consistory hoped for guidance “1. Since it appears that Domine Dorsius had not full power, (to ordain); is, therefore, the ordination of our pastor, which was done by him, equivalent to no ordination at all, etc. 2. (We wish to know) How the matter can be arranged, ecclesiastically, and in a godly way. Can this be done by letters from the Rev. Ministers and Consistorys to a Rev. Classis in the Fatherland? Or must our Pastor himself go there, (for ordination)?” ERYN 4: 2781–82.
21 Mouw, “Moederkerk and Vaderland,” 293.
was insufficient proof that Dorsius had the right to ordain, although there was also no proof that he did not. Still, they thought it more likely than not that Dorsius lacked such authority. However, because they lacked formal authority, all they could do was remind Goetschius that no one could preach or administer the sacraments unless approved and called according to the church order, implicitly suggesting that he desist from serving as a minister until the matter was resolved. The committee also received “several complaints and accusations about certain misconduct of Mr. Goetschius” at the hearing, “but it was determined to delay their consideration until they shall be further understood and confirmed.”

Goetschius did not defer to their advice, which, according to church order, was his right. This angered some members of his congregation, including Abraham Polhemius, who quickly became another of Goetschius’ fiercest opponents. Like Reyersen, Polhemius had been one of the elders who had called him, although by the time Goetschius’ ordination was questioned, he no longer served in such a capacity. Polhemius was of important local lineage, as he was the grandson of Rev. Johannes Polhemius, whom the Classis of Amsterdam had called in 1655 to serve in Midwout (later Flatbush), where he remained until his death in 1676. Disturbed by Goetschius’ choice not to desist, Polhemius and a Mr. Brinkerhoff therefore sent a request on behalf of the consistories of the Queens County congregations to the committee for a second meeting, claiming that they had the authority to speak for them, which they did not. The committee obliged, writing to Goetschius that because they had not “arrive[d] at a final decision; they will . . . at your request, meet for further consideration of the matter.”

Goetschius was puzzled, as he had not asked for a second meeting. He also believed that the committee had offered their final opinion, such that for Goetschius, their input was no longer appropriate nor desired. Goetschius refused to meet again, responding with a very aggressive letter. He noted that the committee had not provided proof “that your Reverences have any authority to interfere with me in my duties and services . . . and to set yourselves up as judges.” As, according to church order, they were his peers rather than his superiors, he was indeed not beholden to them, and he knew it. He therefore condemned both those who requested the meeting and the committee for having it, remarking, “You offer to join hands with my adversaries, and so support them in their unchristian and inhuman efforts, etc. They, indeed, would be ready as often as your Reverences might please, to assemble, to fabricate the most inhuman lies, and press them upon you . . . We will, however, pass this by, and refer it to him who will judge justly; and your Reverences will not give your final decision in my case until that day, when you, with me, will stand before His face.”

Goetschius did not explain what he meant by these “lies,” but he clearly believed that those who requested the meeting aimed to address issues beyond his ordination. He was right.

His choice not to follow the committee’s advice was not very wise, given that the senior ministers expected deference, nor was it wise to personally attack them by invoking divine judgment. Shocked by his unwillingness to defer, the committee concluded that he apparently had no “inten[t] to obey any ecclesiastical rules whatever,” although that was far from the case. The committee was not going to stand for such insolence, so they demanded that Goetschius answer several questions concerning his commitment to church order and his willingness to subordinate himself to Amsterdam.

Goetschius vigorously and correctly responded that the committee lacked the authority to demand anything of him. He also remarked that even if he wanted to, he could not subordinate himself to the Classis of Amsterdam before Classis informed him that they “would be pleased to take [him] as a member under its protection.”

Because Goetschius insolently denied them the respect and deference they felt they deserved, they sent an unsolicited report to the Classis of Amsterdam in April 1743 in an attempt to force Goetschius to...
cease performing as a “lawful minister,” presenting him to the Classis in the most unfavorable light.\(^{40}\)

While the ministers on the committee were troubled by Goetschius’ unwillingness to be humble and respectful towards them, and by extension, the Classis of Amsterdam, their concerns were not only about his social behavior. Some colonial ministers were concerned that religion would degenerate into enthusiastic piety unless the church order and the authority of Amsterdam were preserved, such that deference and the protection of church doctrine went hand-in-hand. This theological concern gave Goetschius’ opponents another opportunity to discredit him. Since Goetschius had not acted deferentially toward the senior ministers, and since they believed that lack of deference to experience and authority could be linked to the dangers of exaggerated piety, the ministers were prone to believe Goetschius’ opponents when they exaggerated or even lied about particular aspects of his pietistic religious beliefs. For example, the committee heard that he had said that “a believer ought to know the time and hour and place of his regeneration.” They were also told that Goetschius said “that no one can pray ‘The Lord’s Prayer’ except the truly regenerated; that we ought to experience and authority could be linked to the dangers of exaggerated piety, the ministers were prone to believe Goetschius’ opponents when they exaggerated or even lied about particular aspects of his pietistic religious beliefs. For example, the committee heard that he had said that “a believer ought to know the time and hour and place of his regeneration.” They were also told that Goetschius said “that no one can pray ‘The Lord’s Prayer’ except the truly regenerated; that we ought to make the children acquainted with God, and then they themselves would pray from the spirit: that a form of prayer only flowed out of the mouth.” They also were later told that Goetschius had supposedly taught “that they who would come to the Lord’s Supper must be assured of their regeneration and salvation, but that, on the other hand, the old ministers were only soft-soaping sinners (by not demanding these things).”\(^{41}\) For the committee, this was both dangerous and a personal slap in the face, as it seemed to them that he was condemning them, their religious practices, and the doctrine of the Dutch Reformed church. The committee laid all of this before the Classis in their report.

Although the Classis of Amsterdam was troubled by the committee report, they did not consider the situation dire. They therefore responded by indicating that all it would take to correct the problem would be for him to be “ordained anew, either by yourselves, in the name of this Classis, or in this country,” provided that he committed himself to the authority of Amsterdam and “manifest[ed] also a properly meek and Christian disposition.”\(^{42}\) They said nothing of his piety or his lack of formal education, suggesting that his beliefs, even in the exaggerated form as presented to the Classis, did not place him outside of established church doctrine.

Evidence presented to the committee in condemnation of Goetschius’ piety and lack of deference continued to grow. The committee later heard that Goetschius even condemned members of the Classis of Amsterdam. He supposedly remarked that if he “had to go to Holland (for ordination) [he] would not go to Amsterdam, but to the Classis of Schieland, because therein the majority of the ministers were pious.”\(^{43}\) A member of one of the New York consistories on the committee also reported that Goetschius had said that “Rev. Antonides . . . had already preached many people into hell; and that Rev. Freeman himself now lay burning in hell.”\(^{44}\) Another of Goetschius’ opponents reported to the committee that he had said that if it had not been for the Classis of Amsterdam, “This country had long ago [would have] been filled with pious ministers.”\(^{45}\)

Goetschius had likely said something along these lines, but what precisely he uttered is unclear. In his later defense to the Classis, he suggested that his accusers had either misunderstood or exaggerated. He claimed he “never felt nor taught” that one had to be assured of his salvation before participating in the Lord’s Supper, and for anyone to have said so was “an unbearable and malicious perversion.” Still, he taught that “one must have had the experience of religion before daring to come up to the table with encouragement.” He further responded to the accusation that he remarked “that the old pastors only whitewash,” that “I have never said that of the old ministers; but it may have happened that I have admitted that there are pastors who do such things.” He denied he had said that most of the ministers in the colonies were “unregenerate,” but he did report that “I may have said that among the pastors here there are some unregenerate ones.” He most definitely had never disparaged Freeman, for whom he had the “best feelings,” which is not surprising, given their shared pietism. He also humbly told the Classis that he had never spoken ill of them, and that if he commented on the piety of the members of the Classis of Schieland, “I did not deny that of the members of your Rev. Classis; for I know that the members of both Classis to be faithful servants of Christ.”\(^{46}\)

In spite of the committee’s efforts to encourage Goetschius to cease serving as a lawful minister, he continued to do so. Reyersen and Polhemius were not pleased, so they escalated their attacks.

---
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A rumor soon started circulating that Goetschius, a married man, had attempted to seduce Reyersen’s daughter, Antje Onderdonk, a married woman, to commit adultery, soon after he had arrived in Queens County. When Goetschius learned of this accusation, he took four elders and two justices of the peace to question the supposed victim. She denied that anything untoward had occurred. A day later, however, she changed her story when questioned by her father, accompanied by Polhemius, a justice of the peace. She even put her mark on an affidavit prepared by Polhemius accusing Goetschius.

While the Classis had initially responded to the growing conflict without a sense of great urgency, Goetschius’s alleged sin changed the situation entirely. The Classis therefore transformed the committee into their authorized representatives in order to provide a formal and impartial report. The committee formally questioned Goetschius between November 1745 and January 1746. However, because of his previous behavior towards the ministers on the committee, he was unable to receive a fair hearing, particularly in connection with the alleged sin. It appears that the committee proceeded from the basic assumption that the offense had occurred, possibly because of the sworn affidavit of the alleged victim. Still, they did question Antje Onderdonk, as two issues potentially undermined her credibility.

The first issue concerned the nearly two-and-a-half years between the alleged event and her accusation. When asked to explain why it had taken her so long to report the alleged offense, her husband, Isaac, replied that she had not spoken out about Goetschius’ supposed improprieties because they “lived upon land leased to him by his father,” Adrian Onderdonk, “who was a warm friend of Domine Goetschius. He had threatened that if they published the matter, or informed the Committee of it, he would order him to move off.” The committee also had to consider why she had changed her statement. The committee was told, probably by her father, that he had urged her to speak out after having exonerated Goetschius, “for the sake of her own reputation.” During the questioning, Antje further reported that when Goetschius and the justices of the peace first questioned her as to whether he “had attempted or committed adultery with her . . . Antje said, NO; but told the men who had come with the Domine what she testified under oath on the following day.” In other words, she told the committee that she told Goetschius and those with him both that he did and did not tempt her. The committee overlooked this contradiction. In total, the committee accepted her and her family’s statements as truthful in part because they had been informed “As to the honest and well known virtuous character of this woman, about twenty people unanimously gave their testimony before us.” It is also likely that they accepted her and her family’s testimony because they already thought the worst of Goetschius.

Goetschius nevertheless tried to convince the committee that the testimony of Antje and her family was untenable. He suggested that Isaac’s father, Adrian, had not threatened to evict them, and that Adrian could testify to that fact. However, by the time of the hearing, his father had moved to Rockland County, but the committee made no effort to speak with him. Goetschius also attempted to demonstrate that Antje’s and her family’s behavior after the alleged offense undermined the plausibility of the accusation. He advised the committee to “Consider the silence of the woman and her parents for more than two years, during which time she has been catechized by me, has listened to my preaching, has offered her own child for baptism . . . had often invited me to her house, and visited at my house. Consider that her parents have partaken of the communion, her father has accepted the office of elder, and served in it during the whole term without ever speaking to me of these things, yet they all pretend to have known them.” Goetschius even provided another affidavit signed by the justices of the peace who had questioned her along with him, who swore that she had indeed said that Goetschius had done nothing wrong. The committee simply ignored it. Goetschius further remarked that “If the more than twenty dissatisfied complainers were so unwise that they testified to the proper and well-known character of the women, they have had all this trouble for nothing; for this whole business examined on its merits, presents against the woman her own testimony.”

The Committee dismissed it all. Goetschius did not blame Antje for any of the troubles. He blamed her father. He said that he did indeed believe that her father had compelled her to make the accusation, because “otherwise the woman would not have known anything bad. Consequently it is all the result of Cornelius Reyersen’s rage.” Goetschius explained to the committee the origins and history of Reyersen’s animosity toward him, but again, the committee completely discounted the possibility that anyone other than Goetschius himself was guilty of anything.

Ultimately, the committee believed everyone who had claimed that Goetschius had lambasted them and the Classis, questioned orthodox practices, willingly ignored church order, and encouraged an honest woman to sin. They also never spoke with anyone who might have supported him, and indeed there were many. For example, some of his church elders wrote to the Classis that “We sincerely testify concerning him that he has behaved himself among us properly and piously, and that we have never had any cause to complain of is conduct. As his neighbors, we know him better and more intimately than those who hate him, and who are busy, day and night to rob him of his good name.” The committee claimed that they believed all of the allegations not because of his past behavior towards them, but because he was untrustworthy. They reported to the Classis that “we aimed impartially to get at the true proof of every point brought up before us. On this account, although Goetschius has more than once behaved very violently towards us, we do not desire to conceal his humble requests to be excused, and for favor in our letter. It is, however, our duty to testify that all who tried to prove anything against Goetschius, are considered by us, as far as we know, to be blameless Christians and trustworthy people.” He, however, was not, the proof being his “readily condemning and quarrel-producing character,” and his consistent “truth-mutilating talk.”

---
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Regardless of what he may have said controversial colonial ministerial peers. to do so ultimately demonstrated that his position and actions. He also reiterated his commitment to its authority. He humbly wrote that “The gentlemen [of the Classis] knew my ready willingness to subordinate myself to the Rev. Classis; [and] my acknowledgement of the irregularity of my ordination.” He stressed that “I am still of the same mind, and pray for God’s sake, that the Rev. Classis will be pleased, to accept these sincere declarations of mine, as promises kept hitherto, and to treat me accordingly.” “Finally,” he implored, “I pray the Very Rev. Classis in humble submission . . . , to make an end of my misery . . . and that the dear sheep entrusted to me, now for some years expelled from the church and missing their sacramental privileges, may again be gathered . . . before they be wholly destroyed. For such benefit we will then gratefully acknowledge the Very Rev. Classis as the instrument, and God as the author of the work.”

Goetschius also explained to the Classis why he had not followed the committee’s advice, which had nothing to do with a lack of respect for church order or New York’s senior ministers. Rather, he did not follow their advice out of a commitment to his ministerial obligations and his congregations’ sacramental needs. He also made sure that the Classis did not accept as legitimate reports that did not reflect his true beliefs. This is not to downplay his pietism. He believed that formal rituals were hollow. He believed that there were many who thought themselves saved who were merely deluded hypocrites. He also saw himself as one who could separate the sheep from the goats. It also appears that he often spoke in anger. Yet, he never questioned the legitimacy and the value of authority within the Dutch Reformed church. He just questioned to which authority he was subordinate.

It is possible that Goetschius may indeed have been disseminating in his letters to the Classis. Still, his willingness to do so ultimately demonstrated that he accepted the authority of the Classis of Amsterdam as much as did his less-controversial colonial ministerial peers. Regardless of what he may have said in the past, he ultimately realized that he needed the approval of the Classis of Amsterdam if he was going to be able to continue to serve as a minister. He therefore had to accept the authority that the Classis of Amsterdam claimed. He also had to demonstrate a deferential and humble demeanor, which he did when he had the opportunity to defend himself to the Classis. He also knew that what he preached had to be acceptable within the boundaries of Dutch Reformed doctrine, even if he might push those boundaries more than others.

The Classis basically found in favor of Goetschius, although it is difficult to know how they interpreted all of the evidence. Nothing, however, suggested to them that Goetschius should be pushed out. They dismissed the “chief accusation” against him—attempted adultery—as it “cannot be fully sustained . . . according to legal methods.” As to his pietism, the Classis did not even find it significant enough to mention with specifics. They further remarked that the other accusations lodged against him were “far-fetched and not of much importance.” As long as Goetschius would submit to “the Formulae of the Church Order of the Netherlands, churches, instituted at the National Synod of Dordrecht,” which he had agreed to do, then he could be permitted to be part of the Dutch Reformed church. The Classis did note that “there seem to have been extravagant passion and great imprudence [on his part], faults which are not seldom cloaked under a zeal for God’s cause.” But as he asked for forgiveness, the Classis could graciously comply. Still, they “admonished him to conduct himself, hereafter, prudently and peacefully and edifyingly in all things . . . [and] to show by deeds that his professions were sincere.”

Finally, the Classis determined that Goetschius’s ordination was irregular but that nothing disqualified him from re-ordination under its authority. The Classis did recommend he seek a new call, as the situation in Queens County was past resolution. He soon received a call from Hackensack, which he accepted and for which he was ordained by local ministers in the name of the Classis of Amsterdam. His lay enemies might have been unable to forgive him, but his former ministerial opponents were able to, although they did not have much choice. If they wanted him to defer to the Classis, they had to do so as well. They even absolved him of responsibility for his irregular ordination, solely blaming Dorsius for having been misled.

The process by which Goetschius was accepted into the fold of the Dutch Reformed Church was bumpy. The institutional structure of the Dutch Reformed Church had not been fully replicated in the colonies, so lines of ecclesiastical authority were unclear. That lack of clarity created the opportunity for different centers of authority to grow, but all were not equal. Goetschius chose to accept the authority of Dorsius, whose power was far too limited in the face of that of the Classis of Amsterdam. The social authority, or status, of the Dutch Reformed ministers in the colonies was also much greater than that of Dorsius, but again, Goetschius chose not to defer to the claims of senior ministers, who believed that their advice should be followed. This might have particularly troubled these ministers because the colonial setting deprived them of both the influence and formal authority that their peers possessed in the Netherlands through their direct involvement in a regional classis. Finally, as a minister of the Word, Goetschius attempted to use his authority as a regenerate Christian to criticize the many church members who were not. Unfortunately for him, his ministerial authority could not overshadow others’ claims to social authority that set them above his power to rebuke them, and he paid the price. Ultimately, however, he, senior colonial ministers, and the Classis of Amsterdam, were able to negotiate their way through the conflict, and in the process, reinforced the social and ecclesiastical structures of authority that Goetschius had unintentionally challenged in an ambiguous colonial context.
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Journey to the Netherlands: Arrival of the Half Moon in the City of Hoorn

by Andrew A. Hendricks MD

Photo by Robert Gort.

Under blue skies and fair winds, the Half Moon replica ship arrived in the City of Hoorn, Kingdom of the Netherlands, on Saturday, May 23, 2015. Hundreds of smaller vessels escorted the ship with more than 10,000 people lining the ancient harbor to watch her triumphant arrival. Every Dutch newspaper, as well as television, radio, and Twitter featured the Half Moon’s arrival. The Haarlems Dagblad, the oldest newspaper in the world still in publication, dating from 1656, carried the story on its front page.

United States Ambassador to the Netherlands Timothy Broas, Hoorn burgemeester Onno van Veldhuizen, and Westfries Museum Director Ad Geerdink met the Half Moon as it arrived at the dock. This author presented the ambassador with a Special Proclamation, which in part reads:

Whereas, in 1909, on the three-hundredth year anniversary of the first Half Moon’s voyage, the Kingdom of the Netherlands presented a replica second Half Moon proclaiming the
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ship a symbol of the “... lively relations, which unite the Netherlands and the United States of America in one bond of fellow feeling in respect to Religion and Political Liberty, Commerce and Industry, Science and Art.” and as “... as an indication of the friendly feeling of the kinship and unity of interests which have ever held and still hold the Netherlands and the United States of America in one mutual bond”; the New Netherland Museum of the United States of America has agreed to loan the replica ship Half Moon to the Westfries Museum of the Netherlands where the Half Moon will, as ambassador of the people of New Netherland, remind all in the Netherlands and Europe of the “... friendly feeling of the kinship and unity of interests...” shared between us.

United States governors, Senators, Mayors, Holland Society Members, Dutch Settlers Society members, Dutch Colonial Society members, and other supporters of the Half Moon had signed the proclamation. Eduard van Breen, a member of the Board of Directors of the New Netherland Museum, then presented the ship’s papers to Westfries Museum Director Ad Geerdink.

The first Half Moon replica was built in the Royal Dockyard in Amsterdam to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the discovery of the Hudson River. Its keel was laid on October 29, 1908, and the ship was launched April 15, 1909. It became the centerpiece of the remarkable Hudson-Fulton Celebration of 1909. Unfortunately, the replica was destroyed by fire on July 22, 1934, at Cohoes, New York, where, neglected, it had deteriorated and come to serve as a shelter for vagrants.

In 1985, when I looked for a way to underscore the Dutch contribution to American history and culture, I observed how replica ships such as the Elizabeth II in Manteo, North Carolina, the Mayflower in Plymouth, Massachusetts, and the Jamestown ships in Jamestown, Virginia, could inspire and attract the attention of young and old alike. However, times had changed since the beginning of the twentieth century. I found little support for the concept of rebuilding the Half Moon and decided to construct the replica on my own initiative. I founded the New Netherland Museum, a nonprofit organization, and investigated ways to construct the Half Moon. Naval architect Nicholas S. Benton designed the new replica ship incorporating substantial new information that had become available from the Dutch archives since 1909.

The keel of the replica Half Moon was laid on July 23, 1988, and the ship was launched on June 10, 1989.


from the Snow Dock (now Steamboat Square), Albany, New York. Over the past twenty-five years, the Half Moon has more than met expectations and been successful in her mission to highlight the Dutch contribution to American history and culture. The Half Moon has sailed from North Carolina to Nova Scotia and through the Great Lakes. She has been visited by tens of thousands of children and adults and watched by millions more from the shorelines of the Hudson, Connecticut, and Delaware Rivers comprising the original area of New Netherland.

The Half Moon served as New York State’s unofficial flagship in the Columbus Quincentennial Celebration in 1992 and during the Millennial Celebration in 2000. The Half Moon was the centerpiece of the 400th Anniversary Celebration of Henry Hudson’s discovery of the Hudson River in 2009, during which H.R.H. Prince Willem Alexander and Princess Máxima, now King Willem-Alexander and Queen Máxima of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, visited the ship.

The Half Moon has also been featured in many documentaries and appeared in numerous films, including a feature role in the 1994 Walt Disney movie, Squanto: An Indian Warrior’s Tale and in cameo appearances in The Scarlet Letter in 1995 and The New World in 2005.

After so many years participating in American adventures, I felt the time had come for the Half Moon to fulfill a long-standing ambition to sail in Dutch waters. Through the great personal effort of Eduard van Breen, a collaboration between the New Dr. Andrew Hendricks, Founder and Chairman of the New Netherland Museum, American Ambassador to the Netherlands, Timothy Broas, and the Mayor of the City of Hoorn, Onno van Veldhuizen, with the Special Proclamation of Friendship from the people of the United States to the people of the Netherlands. (photo credit, City of Hoorn)
The *Half Moon* in transit to the Netherlands.

*The replica ship Half Moon on pickup in Rhode Island by the Sevenstar Yacht Transport’s Traveller on April 7, 2015. Photo courtesy the New Netherland Museum.*

*The Half Moon in transit across the Atlantic Ocean to the Netherlands. Photo credit Sevenstar Yacht Transport.*

*Left: The Half Moon arrives at its new home port, the City of Hoorn. Photo by Robert Gort.*
Netherland Museum and the Westfries Museum was arranged. In Europe, the Half Moon would have a chance to be an ambassador of New Netherland to a new audience in the Netherlands. In 1909, the Half Moon replica was moved west by ocean transport on the deck of the Holland American Line steamship, Soestdijk. This summer, the new Half Moon replica was transported west to east on board the motor-powered Traveller of Sevenstar Yacht Transport leaving from Rhode Island on April 7, 2015, and arriving in Ijmuiden, Netherlands, on April 23.

Recent research in the Dutch Archives by Eduard van Breen suggests that the Half Moon was built around 1606. A 1609 sale transaction describes the ship as “omtrent drie jaar” (about three years old); the keel was therefore laid circa 1606. In 1609 the Dutch East India Company (VOC) purchased the ship for Henry Hudson’s voyage of exploration. An investigative book, Spirit of the Half Moon, by Eduard van Breen, is planned for publication later this year. This book touches on the details of the original ship, but is mostly about the remarkable contribution of the current replica ship and how it represents a continuum of that original VOC spirit. The replica ship is full of stories. Indeed, in this book everyone that contributed and sailed on the replica Half Moon will be mentioned for posterity as the sum is the total of many.

There are strong indications that the history of the original Half Moon is closely tied to the history of the City of Hoorn, which is to be revealed in a series of forthcoming books on the vessel. This series will detail the history of the ship prior to Henry Hudson’s 1609 voyage of discovery, as the ship operated in the core bulk commodity trade in Europe. The new narratives will alter the historical perspective of that six-month 1609 voyage, as it presents the remarkable findings about its swash buckling adventures as a VOC ship sailing around Cape Good Hope to the Indies. It was a very round world in the early seventeenth century.

Since the Half Moon’s arrival in the Netherlands, she has already been active. After her triumphant arrival celebration in Hoorn on May 23, she was featured in the year-long 400th Anniversary Celebration of the Discovery of Cape Hoorn starting on June 15. Cape Hoorn, the southern trade route around South America, was successfully navigated by Captain Willem Schouten and Jacob le Maire from the City of Hoorn in 1616.

The Half Moon will be on loan to the Westfries Museum in Hoorn for up to five years. This loan is similar to how a painting such as a Rembrandt is loaned from one museum to another. The ship will be featured in Sail Amsterdam this summer from August 19 to 23. Members of the Holland Society plan to visit the Half Moon Visitor Center in Hoorn during their October Third Society trip this fall.

The replica Half Moon will continue to bring alive the story of a remarkably adventurous age for generations to come around the world.

The Half Moon at its new home port of the Westfries Museum in the City of Hoorn. Photo by Robert Gort, courtesy the Westfries Museum.

In Dutch Stories About Kingston, Theodore Dietz explores the Dutch legacy in his hometown of Kingston, New York. Dietz became an active volunteer at the Kingston Visitors Office in 2001 and has published eight other works about Kingston’s history.

Dietz arranges Dutch Stories About Kingston in a series of forty-four vignettes, a similar structure to another of his books, Dutch Esopus / Wiltwyck / Kingston Memories (Dorrance Publishing, 2012). These accounts are not presented in a linear or dependent order, so the work may be read by selecting a topical interest, or given each passage’s brevity, a smattering of interests. This book addresses a breadth of topics at only 142 pages, from immense and broad subjects such as “The Netherlands Dutch” or “The Dutch and the American Revolution,” to individual portraits such as those of “Captain Krieger” and “Christophel Davids.”

Significant archival research and conversations with local historians appear to be the foundation of the work, with some literature review as well. Narrative, description, and interpretation are not the book’s crux, but rather an assiduous compilation of facts. Dietz is particularly strong in researching physical and logistical contexts. In “The 1658–59 Esopus Stockade,” he explains, “Trees used in building the stockade were probably about eight inches in diameter, and the logs were cut to about eighteen feet in length. The logs were inserted four feet into the earth and extended about fourteen feet above ground.” In “1687–Kingston Trustees,” he notes that “Trustee grants and transfers of property were entered in books labeled A through L, which later became subdivisions of Trustee Book 1.” When writing on Dutch shipping in “Dutch Sloeps on the Hudson,” Dietz observes, “The sloep was built for trade, with a shallow draft, a broad beam, and a large fore and aft sail. English ships were made for war and were longer in length, deeper in draft, faster in speed through the water, but slower in responding to the helmsman’s wheel as opposed to the sloep’s rudder and tiller.” Such mundane matters reveal the context of Dutch life in its operational complexity. There are more striking details as well, such as a secret committee in the American Revolution ordering a powder mill built in Ulster County. Or that road signs still stand from the original King’s Highway laid in 1703.

Dietz writes in simple, conversational prose, sharing personal anecdotes or directly addressing the reader with “Next, let me tell you.” Although certainly not a turgid analysis, one still wishes for greater copy editing. References to Native Americans with the word “savages,” for example, even though Dietz is careful to almost always place this within quotation marks, grows wearisome and uncomfortable when not clearly demonstrating colonial prejudices. This is not an academic work; many claims are not cited, and the bibliography often lists older titles that may have been superseded by later research. Speculation can at times be sweeping, such as when the social hierarchy of the migration to America is relayed as, “The strong survived by stealing from the weak, and the weak survived by stealing from the weaker.” Yet, one should bear in mind that Dietz is not an essayist nor scholar, but a passionate and conscientious history buff.

And the work serves admirably the historically curious. In the passage referenced earlier, “The 1658–59 Esopus Stockade,” Dietz offers geographic markers, noting, “In today’s community, it [the stockade] extended from Clinton Avenue to just beyond Wall Street, and from North Front Street to just beyond John Street.” These indicators allow the interested to visit the original grounds of Dutch defenses. In “The Hoffman House,” one learns that a still popular tavern served as an observation point, and “There still exists a stairway that leads to the roof from a second-floor room.” “The Tennis Court” reveals that “the tennis court, located approximately at the intersection of Hone Street and West Pierpont Street, was, at times, the scene of strenuous athletic contests where Indian teams competed in a sport similar to today’s LaCrosse.” Such mapping viscerally connects readers to the past lives of familiar places.

Dutch Stories About Kingston, supported by a variety of topics and an unassuming composition, connects in these material specifics. For interested residents and visitors, Mr. Dietz proves an able reference to the Dutch particulars ingrained in Kingston.

—Joshua Smith
Independent Scholar

Book Review

Annual Holland Society Banquet

Tuesday, November 17

Mark your calendars now for our Annual Banquet at the Union Club honoring Dr. Robbert Dijkgraaf. Dijkgraaf is Director of the world-renowned Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, one of the most prestigious positions in science, whose predecessors include Albert Einstein and Robert Oppenheimer: Queen Beatrice knighted him in 2012 for his deep space discoveries and the application of science to society.
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Here and There in New Netherland Studies

Charles W. Wendell Memorial Fund

IN HONOR OF the late Dr. Charles W. Wendell’s work in New Netherland studies, as both a Holland Society of New York Trustee and as a Board Member and President of the New Netherland Institute, the New Netherland Institute (NNI) has established a Charles W. Wendell Memorial Fund to support an annual research award. Researchers in any discipline are eligible, and any project dealing with the Dutch experience in the New World before 1800 will be considered.

Research studies eligible for the Charles W. Wendell Memorial Fund award should draw attention to the rich collections of primary and secondary sources in Dutch colonial history in America at the New Netherland Research Center, the New York State Archives, and the New York State Library.

For further information see www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/programs/research-grants/charles-wendell-memorial-fund/

Craiovo State Historic Site
Exhibit on Slavery

CRAIOVO STATE HISTORIC Site is hosting an exhibit on the role that slavery played in the Dutch colonial empire in the early modern era. The exhibit, entitled “A Dishonorable Trade: Human Trafficking in the Dutch Atlantic Word during Harvest Faire,” is the result of a two-year collaboration among Craiovo, the Gilder Lehrman Center, and the Yale Public History Institute. Divided in two parts, the exhibit examines the role that slavery played in the creation and maintenance of the Dutch trading empire and then delves into the lives and stories of the people affected by the trade.

“A Dishonorable Trade” opens Saturday, September 10, at Craiovo State Historic Site, 9 ½ Riverside Avenue, Rensselaer, New York, and will run through October 2016. For further information, call 518-463-8738.

The New Amsterdam History Center Conversation

THE NEW AMSTERDAM History Center in collaboration with the Consulate of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and the Collegiate Churches of New York is holding a conversation, “New York City and Water: A Historical Perspective,” on Monday, October 26, 2015, from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. in Room 9110 at the Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York (CUNY), in Manhattan. The panel discussion will feature author Russell Shorto on the Dutch as pioneers of water management, historical painter Len Tantillo on New Netherland’s waterways, Henk Ovink, Special Envoy for International Water Affairs, Kingdom of the Netherlands, on water management issues now and in the future, and Gerard Koeppel, author of Water for Gotham: A History, on the evolution of New York City in its struggle for clean water. A question and answer period will follow the discussion.

The New Amsterdam History Center explores the early and diverse history of New Amsterdam and New York City and its global legacy, and is home of the Virtual New Amsterdam Project. The CUNY Graduate School and University Center is located at 365 Fifth Avenue, between 34th and 35th Streets, in Manhattan. RSVP to: info@newamsterdamhistorycenter.org. Space is limited.

Montclair State University Program

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY is hosting this fall a month-long program, “The Rising Tide: What we can learn from the Dutch and their Relationship with Water.” The program consists of a series of lectures, discussions, and multimedia events from October 7 to November 19, 2015. Nearly a dozen lectures and discussions are planned along with film screenings, an art exhibition, and a concert that all explore the Dutch and their uneasy relationship with water in an attempt to learn what New Jersey can do in the wake of Hurricane Sandy. To better comprehend the Dutch mindset, the program will address related themes such as the Dutch Republic and its legacy in New Jersey and New York.

The series is organized by Montclair State University’s College of Science and Mathematics (CSAM), Harry A. Sprague Library, Global Education Center, College of the Arts, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, WMSC Radio, and the Office of Civic Engagement and was made possible by a grant from the New Jersey Council for the Humanities, with additional support provided by The Netherlands Consulate General in New York, the Montclair Public Library, the Montclair Historical Society, Greener Bloomfield, the Montclair Environmental Commission, the MSU PSEG Institute for Sustainability Studies, the Jacob Leisler Institute, and Montclair TV34.

For further information see www.montclair.edu/csam/rising-tide/
Society Activities

Rocky Mountain Branch Meeting

THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN Branch of the Holland Society of New York met on March 28, 2015, at the residence of Lieutenant Colonel Adrian Bogart and his wife Susan in Colorado Springs. On this beautiful Colorado day, eleven members, friends, family, and fellows had opportunity to reunite and discuss our Dutch heritage and contributions to our Nation.

Holland Society National President Dr. Robert Schenck attended the Branch meeting, which prompted engaging discussion on the Holland Society’s future and allowed an update by the President of the progress of the Society. Additionally, LTC Bogart gave a presentation on the 380th anniversary of Harman van den Bogaert’s journey into Mohawk and Oneida country. LTC Bogart discussed his retracing of his ancestor’s expedition in 1634 to reestablish the fur trade and the consequences of that journey as well as had it not happened.

Mid-West Branch Meeting

MEMBERS OF THE MID-WEST BRANCH gathered on May 8 through May 10 to attend the Tulip Time Festival in Holland, Michigan. Midwest Branch Members Dr. Robert Schenck and his wife Marcia Whitney-Schenck, David Ditmars and his wife Nina, and John Lansing and his fiancé Billie Wegler attended. The event was organized by Branch President John Lansing.

Although the weather did not fully cooperate, the festival parade marched down 8th Street in Holland without rain. Young people in traditional Dutch costumes danced down the street in wooden clogs, junior high and high school bands played. And, as advertised, six million beautiful tulips of every type, were in full bloom in every part of the city. Following the parade, the group toured the Holland City Museum with its excellent exhibits of Holland’s Dutch heritage from the middle of the nineteenth century to the present. The art museum on the second floor featured paintings from Old Dutch Masters to the impressionist period, including an etching by Rembrandt.

Dining highlights of the visit included a German themed lunch at the Alpen Rose Restaurant, two breakfasts at de Boer Bakery and Restaurant, and an excellent dinner at the Piper Restaurant overlooking a yacht club. The weekend concluded with a visit to Veldheer Farm, which offered acre after acre of blooming tulips. The farm had more the 400 tulip varieties for sale as well as Delft china and wooden shoes made on site.

Back row: David and Nina Ditmars
Front row: Marcia Whitney-Schenck, Dr. Robert Schenck, Billie Wegler and John Lansing.
ON SATURDAY, April 25, 2015, the New Amsterdam Branch of the Holland Society of New York organized a walking tour of the footprints of the seventeenth-century Dutch settlement of Lower Manhattan. Despite unusually cold weather, twenty-four Members, Friends, and their families gathered at Trinity Church at 10 a.m. to enjoy tour guide Joyce Gold’s informative visit to key historic Dutch sites across Lower Manhattan and meditations on the influence of the Dutch settlement on the development of modern-day New York City. Among the sites visited, the group enjoyed learning about the history behind the origins of Wall Street and viewing the location on Stone Street of the city’s original Stadt Huys, or City Hall, dating from 1641. Although the city has greatly changed in three and a half centuries, the original street plan of New Amsterdam is still evident underneath the towering skyscrapers of twenty-first century Manhattan.

Following the tour, the group joined New Amsterdam Branch President Eric Delamarter for luncheon at the popular Financial District tavern Ulysses Folk House, named after Irish author James Joyce’s well-known novel.

New Amsterdam Branch Members, Friends, and their families pose in front of the Trinity Church in Lower Manhattan on April 25, 2015.

Old Bergen-Central New Jersey Branch

ON SATURDAY, May 17, 2015, the Old Bergen-Central New Jersey Branch of the Holland Society of New York organized an afternoon program at the Beacon Hill Club in Summit, New Jersey, with a lecture by Holland Society Fellow Dr. Firth Haring Fabend. Dr. Fabend’s presentation, entitled “Patroons and Plowmen, Pietism and Politics: Dutch Settlers in the Hudson Valley in the 17th and 18th Centuries,” gave an excellent overview of the Dutch settlers in the colonial Hudson Valley and their influence in shaping the region.

Dr. Fabend is the second woman to be made a Fellow at the Holland Society of New York. She holds a Ph.D. from New York University and is the author of numerous works on the Dutch including the prize-winning *A Dutch Family in the Middle Colonies, 1660-1800* (1991), and *Zion on the Hudson: Dutch New York and New Jersey in the Age of Revivals* (2000), both published by Rutgers University Press.

Following the lecture, Holland Society National President Dr. Robert Schenck, spoke about carrying out, in a better way, the purposes of the Holland Society. Following his talk those in attendance enjoyed a reception with cheese, hors-d’oeuvres, and drinks.

From left to right at the Summit, New Jersey, Lecture: Kip Durling, Dr. Firth Haring Fabend, and Dr. Robert Schenck.

de Halve Maen
In Memoriam

Erskine Blauvelt Van Houten Jr.

Holland Society of New York Life Member Erskine Blauvelt Van Houten Jr. passed away on April 9, 2015, at Cedarbrook in Richmond, Virginia, at the age of ninety. Mr. Van Houten had been a Trustee of the Society and founded the Virginia-Carolina Branch, serving as the branch’s first president. Mr. Van Houten was born on November 25, 1924 in Nyack, New York, son of Erskine Blauvelt Van Houten and Sarah Margaret MacLeod. He claimed descent from Roelof Cornelisz, who came to New Netherland in 1637 from Houten in the province of Utrecht. He joined the Holland Society in 1972.

Mr. Van Houten graduated from Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Massachusetts, in 1943. Upon graduation he entered the United States Navy, serving on PT Boats in both the Pacific and European Theaters. During his service he earned the American Campaign Medal, the European-Africa Medal with two stars, the Asiatic-Pacific Medal with one star, the Philippine Liberation Medal, and the Victory Medal. Following his honorable discharge in 1946, Mr. Van Houten earned a B.A. from George Washington University and an M.B.A. from the University of Richmond School of Business.

Mr. Van Houten enjoyed a successful business career with Pitney Bowes, where he was a member of the Million Dollar Club, and later with Cummins Allison Corp. He worked as manager, active in sales, advertising and promotion.

Mr. Van Houten married Harriet Lawton Waring in 1949, and later with Cummins Allison Corp. He worked as manager, active in sales, advertising and promotion. Mr. Van Houten married Harriet Lawton Waring in 1949, and later with Cummins Allison Corp. He worked as manager, active in sales, advertising and promotion. Mr. Van Houten married Harriet Lawton Waring in 1949, and later with Cummins Allison Corp. He worked as manager, active in sales, advertising and promotion.

Mr. Van Houten married Harriet Lawton Waring in 1949, and later with Cummins Allison Corp. He worked as manager, active in sales, advertising and promotion. Mr. Van Houten married Harriet Lawton Waring in 1949, and later with Cummins Allison Corp. He worked as manager, active in sales, advertising and promotion. Mr. Van Houten married Harriet Lawton Waring in 1949, and later with Cummins Allison Corp. He worked as manager, active in sales, advertising and promotion.
Reformed Church of New Paltz on May 30, 2015.

Charles Warner Wendell

Holland Society of New York Member, Trustee Emeritus, and former Archive and Library Chair Charles Warner Wendell, died on June 29, 2015 in Summit, New Jersey, at the age of eighty-five. Dr. Wendell was born on February 11, 1930, in Schenectady, New York, son of Simpson Barney Wendell and Anne Elizabeth Maue. He claimed descent from Evert Jansen Wendell who came to New Netherland from Emden in East Friesland in 1640.

Dr. Wendell graduated salutatorian from Carlisle, Pennsylvania, High School. He earned both his bachelor’s and master’s degrees from the Catholic University, Washington, D.C. From 1952 to 1955 he served in the counter intelligence service of the United States Army as an interpreter of Russian. In 1964 he received a Ph.D. in comparative literature from Yale University, after having studied for a year at the University of Grenoble, France.

Dr. Wendell spent his more than thirty-year career as a professor of French, first at St. John’s University, New York City, from 1960 to 1965, at Rutgers College, New Brunswick, New Jersey, from 1965 to 1969, and then Kean College, Union, New Jersey, from 1969 until his retirement in 1995. From 1972 to 1975 he was the chair of the Kean College Foreign Languages Department. He was named Graduate Teacher of the Year in 1995.

Dr. Wendell married Franca Maria Summa on October 17, 1955, at Waterbury, Connecticut. They had a daughter, Melissa Anne Wendell, born on December 20, 1956, in Bad Cannstatt, Germany. Dr. Wendell’s wife predeceased him on September 21, 1982, and his daughter predeceased him on April 10, 2006.

Dr. Wendell served on the board of trustees of the King’s Daughters Day School from 1985 to 1999. He was awarded the school’s Service Citation. He was a member of the board of trustees of the Historical Society of Plainfield, New Jersey, and a member of the Yale Club in Manhattan. He was also a member of the New York State Historical Society, the Society of the First Settlers of Albany, and the Schenectady County Historical Society. For many years he wrote program notes for the Plainfield Symphony and worked with the Friends of the Plainfield Public Library. He was a proprietor of the Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Athenaeum.

An annual member of the Holland Society of New York since 1989, and later an honorary member, Dr. Wendell served the Society in numerous capacities. He was a member of the Board of Trustees from 1993 to 2014, Chairman of the Library Committee from 2005 to 2014, a member of the Genealogy Committee from 1990 to 2014, Chairman of the Endowment Committee from 2002 to 2005, and a long standing pivotal member of the de Halve Maen Committee, providing the first drafts for the obituaries and contributing book reviews to the journal.

Dr. Wendell was also active with the New Netherland Institute in Albany, New York. He joined the board of the New Netherland Institute in 2000, served as Vice President from 2000 to 2006, and as the Institute’s President from 2006 to 2012. Under his leadership the Institute flourished as never before. He was also a member of the grants committee and was the chairman of the policies and procedures committee. Charles was also active with the New Netherland Museum, which operates the replica of Henry Hudson’s ship, Half Moon.

Dr. Wendell is survived by his brother, Robert Wendell, eight nieces, one nephew and many grand-nieces and grand-nephews. A Memorial Service was held at his home in Plainfield, New Jersey, on August 2, 2015. Interment was private.

John Lansing, who has taken on Dr. Wendell’s role in providing obituaries for de Halve Maen, wrote: “Charles was always a gentleman whose face carried a broad smile. I count myself fortunate to have counted Charles as a friend.”

James Robert Tanis

Holland Society of New York Fellow the Reverend James Robert Tanis, died on July 19, 2015, of respiratory failure at Shannonell in Audubon, Pennsylvania, at age eighty-seven. He had lived at the senior community for more than a decade.

Dr. Tanis grew up in Phillipsburg, New Jersey, where he was born. He earned a bachelor’s degree in history from Yale University, a masters in divinity from Union Theological Seminary, Manhattan, in 1954, and a doctor in theology from Utrecht University, Netherlands, in 1967.

Dr. Tanis was both a minister and a scholar. From 1953 to 1955, he served as co-pastor at Greystone Presbyterian Church in Elizabeth, New Jersey. Over the years, he was also a parish associate for Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, Presbyterian Church, conducting weddings or preaching when the senior pastor was away. In addition, Dr. Tanis served as the curator of rare books and manuscripts at Union Theological Seminary. At the same time, he progressed from librarian and lecturer at Harvard Divinity School to the same roles at Yale University in the mid-1960s, and finally to Bryn Mawr College in 1969.

Dr. Tanis was Bryn Mawr’s Director of Libraries and Rufus M. Jones Professor of Philosophy and Religion from 1977 to 1992, the Constance A. Jones Director of Libraries from 1992 to 1997, and named Director Emeritus of Libraries and Professor Emeritus of History after retiring in 1997. In 2001, he pulled together “Leaves of Gold,” an exhibit of eighty manuscripts that were displayed at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. The title derived from the gold leaf used to illuminate the manuscripts.

Dr. Tanis’s intellectual interests were wide-ranging. He wrote or collaborated on numerous books about the Dutch Reformed church in America, the history of bookbinding, and the history of costume, and widely published in scholarly journals. He also served on numerous boards of museums and library associations, both in America and the Netherlands.

Dr. Tanis received many honors including the Order of Orange-Nassau, conferred in 1993 by Queen Beatrice of the Netherlands, an honorary degree of doctor of literature from Dickinson College in 1994, and the Netherlands Society of Philadelphia Gold Medal Award in 1997. His hobbies were enjoying books, art, and postcards.

Dr. Tanis is survived by sons James and Justin, and two grandchildren. His wives Tracy Tanis and Florence Elaine Borgmann Tanis predeceased him. A memorial service was held on September 26, 2015, at the Reformed Church of the Ascension, United Church of Christ, Jeffersonville, Pennsylvania. Interment was private.
I wish to thank all our Benefactors who have made a contribution for 2015. At this time about 65 percent of our Members have made generous contribution for the current year. As always, I strongly encourage all Benefactors to forward their contribution to our Executive Secretary at Society headquarters.

— Charles Zabriskie, Jr.
Past President