

**THE CITY DELINEATED:
Aesthetic and Ideological Aspects of
Colonial Discourse in New York**

Christopher Douglas Pierce

Volume 1

**Doctor of Philosophy
The University of Edinburgh**

2002

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

(Regulation
3.9.14)

Name of Candidate: Christopher Douglas Pierce

Address: _____

Postal Code: _____

L8 7PU

Degree: Ph.D. Date: _____

Title of Thesis: The City Delineated: Aesthetic and Ideological Aspects of Colonial Discourse in New York

No. of words in the main text of Thesis: 74,196

The image has a key role to play in New York City's colonial history. Incorporating an array of unpublished visual and cartographic sources, this dissertation has two principal objectives: [i] to survey the written and graphic records of contemporary cartographers and philosophers, the West India Company, the colonists, and Patroons, with particular emphasis on their polemical aspects, and [ii] to undertake a critical review of existing scholarship's handling of this material, with a view to demonstrating its narrowness.

What was New Amsterdam, or more precisely, what has New Amsterdam been thought to have been? After the *Introduction* defining the dissertation's methodology, the first two chapters provide a broader perspective on representations of the city by analysing visual depictions of colonial New York produced between c. 1776 and 1932. Chapter 1, *Practising Peeping! New Notes and Comments on the "Collection des Prospects" of New York City*, examines the wide-ranging cultural, political and commercial effects associated with one series of eighteenth-century European images of colonial New York. Chapter 2, *The 'Wonder-Less' Image of the City: Representations of New Amsterdam in the 19th and 20th Century*, surveys the nineteenth and twentieth-century American visual and literary response to the city.

The remaining chapters discuss aspects of colonial New York from c. 1617 to 1736, the period of the dissertation's main focus. Chapter 3, *On Being In/Between: Expanding the Cultural Episteme in New Netherland*, updates the architectural terminology of recent colonial scholarship to provide a new image of the colonists' urban objectives and the spatial construction of colonial rhetoric. Chapter 4, *A Heuristic Instrument: The Directors' City*, examines how the *Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor, Cryn Fredericxsz* (etc.) (1625) acted as a key signifier of the Company's colonial teleology, and at the same time fashioned a crucial philosophical and sociological niche in the history of the ideal city. Chapter 5, *Take Four: The Pitfalls of a Classical Education*, negotiates three unlikely sources: Sebastiano Serlio's *Architettura, Libro de prospettiva* (1545), Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), and Sir Francis Bacon's *Gesta Grayorum* (1594), to construct the ideological entity of Manhattan Island. Chapter 6, *The Politics of Taste: A Short Essay Resuscitating Willem Kieft*, dismantles the unwarranted intellectual favouritism showered on Peter Stuyvesant. It illustrates how, between 1637 and 1647, Kieft, employing ideologies ranging from Aristotle to Niccolò Machiavelli and spatial strategies popularised in literary utopias, revolutionised the physical concept of the colony. Chapter 7, *Flushing Out Fecund Faces: Urbanism in New Amsterdam, 1647-1664*, challenges standard assessments of Stuyvesant's colony through a case study of *Afbeeldinge van de Stadt Amsterdam in Nieuw Neederlandt* (c. 1665-70), a flawed source which has underpinned later discussion. In conclusion, Chapter 8, *Transforming Cultural Determinacy: Early Engravings of New York City, 1651-1736*, investigates how the commercialism of engraving affected the image of the city, and transformed its representation as a Dutch settlement into a British one.

DEDICATION

To Michael Herbert Keene, Herbert George Keene, Jr., and Judith Ann Sullivan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present work's contribution to what remains the most elusive and territorialised of topics is down to the unfailing influence, patience, criticism, encouragement, and cajoling of Iain Boyd Whyte, David Dunster, Alex Kidson, and James Lawson. A conversation many years ago about the images in this project, prompting the nonchalant remark from Volker Welter that Rem Koolhaas's twentieth-century polemical model clearly had purchase in the colonial city, cemented the work's methodology. An invitation to lecture among a distinguished group of scholars at the 1997 Cornell University conference, "Constructing Identity Between Architecture and Culture," proved the benchmark for intellectual invention, rigour and sniping. Many of the chapters comprising the dissertation have benefited from a similarly combative arena. I am thankful to the Association of Art Historians, British Association for American Studies, British Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, Early Americanists in Britain and Ireland, Netherlands American Studies Association, Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Society for Netherlandic History, and the Society for the History of Technology for invitations to present work in progress. While almost passé, bridging-the-gap between at least two and at times three gargantuan disciplines—architecture, art history and history—has been a persistent challenge. I am grateful to those experts, above all Willem Frijhoff, Charles Gehring, Joyce Goodfriend, Jaap Jacobs, and Willem Klooster, who have entertained my ideas and facilitated my endeavours. A "Small Project Grant" from the University of Edinburgh Development Trust supported research in the Netherlands at the Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, and Stichting Iconographisch Bureau at the dissertation's earliest stage. A "Fellowship in American Civilization" from the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History was crucial to the work's completion.

My research was aided and abetted at every stage by institutions and individuals across Europe and North America too numerous to recount in total, many of whose contributions are acknowledged in the following pages. I am especially grateful to those organisations who forsook a pro-forma invoice for research photographs and that still figure in a large stack of unpaid bills. There are a number of individuals who contributed more prominently. In North America, Wendy Shadwell and Mariam Touba, The New-York Historical Society; Eileen Kennedy Morales and Elizabeth Ellis, The Museum of the City of New York; Elizabeth Wyckoff, The New York Public Library; Jeremy Markowitz, Swann Galleries; Kenneth M. Newman, The Old Print Shop Inc.; Walter Liedtke, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Jim Burant, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa. In the United Kingdom and Europe, Geoff Armitage, Map Library, The British Library; Julian Brooks, the Ashmolean Museum; Bob Kernkamp, Gemeentearchief Zaanstad; Gode Krämer, Städt. Kunstsammlungen, Augsburg; Anton Lotter, Augsburg; Norbert Middelkoop, Amsterdams Historisch Museum; Behrang Mousavi, Haags Gemeentearchief; Carl Nix, Stichting Atlas Van Stolk; and Karen Schaffers-Bodenhausen and Pascal Pere, Stichting Iconographisch Bureau.

Knowingly and unknowingly many others have played an important role in this undertaking. In particular, Mark Abrams, Martin Bircher, Christopher Brown, Tessa Chester, Elisa, John, Ben and Adam Clifford, Paul E. Cohen, Richard Coyne, Margaret and John Cross, Alice Crossland, Mark Dorrian, Sandrine Deguent, David Greene, Linda and Gary Grimm, Adrian Hawker, Katharine Heron, Rob van Itersen, Pam Johnson, Bill Kurland, Steve Kurland, Niklaus Largier, John Lowrey, Chris Matthews, Dirk de Meyer, Charlotte Myhrum, Sheila O'Connell, Chris Pangborn, Simon Pepper, Charles Reynolds, Jemima and Mark Reynolds, Isabelle and Adam Reynolds, Bill Spath, Dave Smith, Frans Tames, Andy Towle, Pieter Uyttenhove, Maureen Watry, Gerald de Weerd, Deborah Whyte, and Dorian Wiszniewski. It is

impossible to name all of the colleagues and students at the University of Edinburgh, University of Liverpool, and University of Westminster whose work has directly and indirectly impacted upon this project. The endless opportunity and unfettered teaching domain that these three estimable institutions provided has been instrumental in shaping the present work.

Simply put, this dissertation is for two people. My wife, Maureen, whose unfailing support for this project has been a source of inestimable inspiration, and my son, Calder, who not only taught me how to write a conclusion, eight of them in fact, but gave me an overdue lesson on how to finish early.

Christopher Douglas Pierce

London, June 2002

TABLE OF CONTENT

VOLUME 1

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP	1
DEDICATION	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
TABLE OF CONTENT	6
INTRODUCTION	10
CHAPTER 1 PRACTISING PEEPING! NEW NOTES AND COMMENTS ON THE “COLLECTION DES PROSPECTS” OF NEW YORK CITY	20

A critique of the six *guckkastenbilder* of New York City, issued in Augsburg around the time of the American Revolution by François Xavier Habermann (1721-1796) and Balthazar Frederic Leizelt (1755-1812) as part of the series titled “Collection des Prospects,” presents nearly all of the dissertation’s principal subjects, including scenography, mimicry, caricature, personae, cultural exchange, alienation, psychological idealism, rationalism, nationalism, non-conformity, compliance, copying, taste, and troping. On one hand a microcosm of the larger work and on the other an essay with its own integrity, this initial chapter establishes the thesis’s primary methodology, illustrates the range of unconventional topics called-on to investigate colonial New York, and indicates the wealth of unpublished visual material and the key role that it plays.

CHAPTER 2 THE ‘WONDER-LESS’ IMAGE OF THE CITY: REPRESENTATIONS OF NEW AMSTERDAM IN THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURY	50
--	----

What are the historiographical effects of recognising that nineteenth and twentieth-century depictions of the colonial city are the by-products of literary history? How do they impact on our perceptions of colonialism’s agenda? The conventional iconographic interpretation of New Amsterdam is a naïve caricature based on cultural generalisations most commonly encountered in children’s literature. Symptomatic of the literary form of ‘realism’ with which these images have been ultimately associated, their visual message has achieved widespread purchase. Dismantling the urban, architectural, and aesthetic legitimacy of these popular and pervasive illustrations also usefully undermines many common premises of the nineteenth and twentieth-century colonial canon.

CHAPTER 3 ON BEING IN/BETWEEN: EXPANDING THE
CULTURAL *EPISTEME* IN NEW NETHERLAND

83

Not only by questioning the authenticity of key images of New Amsterdam, but also by reading what is both verbally and graphically recorded, one arrives at an image of the colonists' urban objectives, and in particular the spatial construction of colonial rhetoric. This was an "imaginary" projection that was neither invented nor created by intention, but that evolved from a kind of Deleuzian "fold," or Derridean "in-between," and that was shared by contemporary cartographers and philosophers, the West India Company, the colonists, and Patroons. Not an amalgamation of *in situ* social processes between "diverse peoples" that Richard White defined as the "middle ground," the space 'in-between' is the resultant physical and mental landscape stemming from the commercial interests of colonial parties.

CHAPTER 4 A HEURISTIC INSTRUMENT: THE DIRECTORS' CITY 115

A survey of seventeenth-century portraits of the directors of the Dutch West India Company Amsterdam Chamber illustrate individual political and intellectual tendencies akin to the liberalism of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment *philosophes*. The ideological issues that these pictures raise and the motives that they imply, often in contrast to the director's literary corpus, have key colonial implications. The ideal pentagonal city, proposed by the directors of the Amsterdam Chamber and issued in the "Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor, Cryn Fredericxsz (etc.)" (1625), not only upstaged the entrenched taxonomy of the Renaissance 'ideal city' in Europe, but, as a key indicator of the Company's colonial teleology, fashioned a crucial philosophical, sociological, and cultural niche in the history of the sixteenth and seventeenth-century ideal city. The social hierarchies underlying its urban infrastructure set the precedent for the Remonstrants' front-line in New Netherland over the next forty years. How can so many scholars continue to favour portrayals of historiographic Dutch primitivism at the expense of such 'in-the-face' idealism?

CHAPTER 5 TAKE FOUR: THE PITFALLS OF A CLASSICAL
EDUCATION

144

Three unlikely sources—Sebastiano Serlio's *Architettura, Libro de prospettiva* (1545), Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), and Sir Francis Bacon's *Gesta Grayorum* (1594)—combine to construct the ideological entity of Manhattan Island. Alongside these three radical views of the city, Company records, individual accounts, and pertinent scientific and architectural treatises demonstrate how the general concepts of colonisation, and particular representations of city and building, were subject to an approach privileging the new, early modern science. This polemical illustration of colonial subjectivity overturns the classically-defined socio-cultural perspective that has characterised historicism's typical mode of perception.

CHAPTER 6 THE POLITICS OF TASTE: A SHORT ESSAY
RESUSCITATING WILLEM KIEFT 175

Why has it been necessary for history to create a ‘fall guy’? Not until intellectualism was replaced by authoritarianism, *i.e.* when Willem Kieft (Director-General of New Netherland from 1637 to 1647) was replaced by Peter Stuyvesant (Director-General of New Netherland from 1647 to 1664), and when the role of the Director-General took the form of a Counter-Remonstrant mouthpiece, was New Amsterdam’s ideological project watered down into a model of orthodox Calvinist urbanism. With no less idealism than the directors’ city, between 1637 to 1647 colonial objectivity did not rely on the constriction or epistemology of the European ideal city, but on ideological contributions from Aristotle to Machiavelli and a spatial strategy popularised in contemporary literary utopias. This and the following chapter dismantle the unwarranted intellectual favouritism showered on Peter Stuyvesant.

CHAPTER 7 FLUSHING–OUT FECUND FACES: URBANISM IN
NEW AMSTERDAM, 1647–1664 209

How much is present to the naïve eye engrossed in the pure pleasure of the Castello Plan’s surface? Charting the repercussions of scholarship’s entanglement with copies, the colonial and scholarly effect of illustrative gamesmanship is analysed in a single case study. Both *Afbeeldinge van de Stadt Amsterdam in Nieuw Neederlandt*, also known as the “Castello Plan” (c. 1665-70), and Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes’s *Redraft of the Castello Plan* (1916) are adopted copies impelled to legitimacy in the face of contrary literary evidence. Closer to Rosenquist or Warhol than to Braun and Hogenberg or Blaeu, how has colonial scholarship allowed its theses to become dependent on the folly of planimetric representation, entangled in the whims of an “urban fantasy” of ideal city plans, and subjected to the censorship and system of economy on which mechanical reproduction depended?

CHAPTER 8 TRANSFORMING CULTURAL DETERMINACY:
EARLY ENGRAVINGS OF NEW YORK CITY, 1651–
1736 233

All the verbal decrees, legal issues, and Acts of Parliament did not have the power of the visual image to transform the Dutch city into a British one. The graphic standard for British colonies in North America, first effected on New York, was centred around two fundamental conditions. It was derived from existing topographic conventions and was dependent on the properties and effects of mechanical reproduction. The rapidly expanding and increasingly efficient printmaking industry developed countless stylisations directed at satisfying the collective desires of the aristocracy, *nouveaux riches*, and “contemporary masses.” The commercialism of engraving affected its image: the authority of the object was in direct proportion to its marketability. What visual tropes can be exhumed from this economy? How were social modes of perception satisfied? How are these images diachronic?

BIBLIOGRAPHY 261

VOLUME 2

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS 310

ILLUSTRATIONS 358

INTRODUCTION

“Let us not forget that the discovery of America coincided with that intense agitation in European thought. As a vast continent full of unknown natural resources, peopled by men whose civilization was strange to the occidental, it was bound to stir the imagination of the Utopians. An accident of geography offered them a material opportunity to try to fulfill their longings, not entirely satisfied either with the chimerical past of the Golden Age or the opportunity to adapt the conventions of humanism to the spent and sophisticated atmosphere of Europe.”

Silvio Zavala, “The American Utopia of the Sixteenth Century,” in *The Huntington Library Quarterly* (August 1947), p. 338-339

Less than twenty-four hours after the publication, on 22nd April 1625, of the “Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor Cryn Fredericxsz and for the Director and Council regarding the building of the fort and the houses,” and only two days before the sailing of the three legendary ships—“Paert,” “Koe,” and “Schaep”—and one infamous yacht—“Macreel”—from Texel to New Netherland, Maurits of Nassau, Prince of Orange, died in The Hague. There is an uncanny coincidence between the Counter-Remonstrant Stadholder’s demise and the despatch of the colony’s wholly unorthodox city model. The repercussions of these two incongruous events inform the entire dissertation.

What was New Amsterdam, or more precisely, what has New Amsterdam been thought to have been? How does architecture enter into Manhattan Island’s colonial historiography when not a single seventeenth-century building remains, when not a single reliable image of a Dutch edifice exists, and when there are only a

handful of what might be outwardly regarded as documents with an undeniable architectural bent? To an extent, the question is redundant. Has anyone missed the recent wave of architectural rhetoric that has come to underpin North American colonial scholarship? Richard White's *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (1991), and Andrew R. L. Cayton's and Fredrika J. Teute's *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (1998) are two works that immediately spring to mind. These authors, among many others, brought architecture into the colonial debate in North America as an intellectual concept. They seize on the condition, stemming from the Renaissance architect Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472), of separating *Theorem* [theory] and *Pratem* [practice]. Their methodology, however, foists too simple a cultural technique on architecture's chief concepts. One of the principal contentions of the French philosopher Jacques Derrida is that "the philosophical tradition has used the architectural model as a metaphor for a kind of thinking which in itself cannot be architectural."¹ How does colonial historiography stand up to an assertion that might just as easily be weighed on itself? Aristotle and René Descartes were criticised by Derrida for depending on an architectural method as an organising system. Colonial historiographers commonly deploy architectural rhetoric for exactly the opposite purpose. However, their tactic of blurring conventional archetypes will not single-handedly defeat the structural hallmark of colonial discourse—its binary opposition. The use of outmoded architectural ideas to underpin this theoretical praxis is also telling. Yet one other fact looms large. There is not a single example of this fashionable practice in New York's colonial scholarship.

What about the more conventional notion of architecture as an image of place? On this score, Dutch New York has been defined almost exclusively by studies of

¹ Jacques Derrida, "Architecture Where the Desire May Live," in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, ed. Neil Leach (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 319.

domestic dwellings dotting the countryside. Who is not familiar with Maud Esther Dilliard's *Old Dutch Houses of Brooklyn* (1945), Marvin D. Schwartz's *The Jan Martense Schenck House* (1964), Kevin L. Stayton's *Dutch by Design* (1990), and Shirley W. Dunn's and Allison P. Bennett's *Dutch Architecture Near Albany: The Polgreen Photographs* (1996)? One would be excused for thinking that these disfigured rural remnants represent the epitome of culture, society and technology in New Netherland. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the unusual case that the colonial historian stumbles onto the unfamiliar terrain of New Amsterdam or Beverwijck, a comparative methodology relying on parochial spatial and aesthetic interpretations gleaned from seventeenth-century Dutch towns and villages is invariably instituted. On Beverwijck, one needs to look no further than Donna Merwick's *Possessing Albany, 1630-1710: The Dutch and English Experiences* (1990). To find even a straightforward study of New Amsterdam, one must retreat as far back as John H. Innes's *New Amsterdam and Its People* (1902). The two aspects of architecture that I have referred to make one thing clear. Architecture's role in colonial historiography must not be limited to exemplifying colonialism's cultural and social anomalies, or to operating as a generalised metaphor. One of this dissertation's principal objectives is to identify the complex, and in certain cases unique, spatial regimes inherent in visual representations of the colonial city and its landscape. A second, related objective is to demonstrate how these concepts make-up an unmistakable part of the texts, diaries, and commentaries of the colonists, West India Company officials, and Stadholder. How did the design, discovery, visual or verbal representation, usage, or perception of space contribute to the construction of identities, knowledge, ideologies, and social systems in New Amsterdam? How did spatial mentalities and practices both manifest and actively shape particular modes of thought and experience?

My methodology prioritises images over texts. After all the proselytising

pictures books published in the last few years, including Ric Burns's, James Sanders's and Lisa Ades's *New York: An Illustrated History* (1999), Gloria Deák's *Picturing New York: The City from Its Beginnings to the Present* (2000), and Howard B. Rock's and Deborah Dash Moore's *Cityscapes: A History of New York in Images* (2001), among others, the role of visual records in New York City's history may have been trivialised, but it is not exhausted. Visual representation is an important part of the city's history. As Isaac Newton [I. N.] Phelps Stokes writes: "Perhaps no other city of equal age and importance—certainly no other city of the New World—possesses so complete and rich a pictorial record of its early years . . ." ² The dissertation addresses, to varying degrees, almost all the major cartographic and topographic views of New Netherland. I think it is fair to say that to date the primary use for these images has been as dogmatic empirical records, illustrative fodder, or embellishments to sit atop Biedermeier coffee tables. By contrast, a discursive methodology (i) calls into question the authority of countless historiographic conclusions drawn exclusively from texts, (ii) frees Dutch colonialism from a classically-defined socio-cultural perspective, and (iii) raises a host of revisionist perspectives on the colonial city that have far-reaching implications for our understanding of seventeenth-century Dutch colonialism. That is not to discount recent, closely-related, visual studies operating on a broader subjective platform. In this category, Benjamin J. Schmidt's *Innocence Abroad: The Dutch Imagination and the New World, 1570-1670* (2001) is the exemplar. His is the only study to benefit from the effects of the paradigm shift caused to the cultural model, and especially the visual legacy, of the Dutch Golden Age by Svetlana Alpers's *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (1983), and to a lesser extent by Simon Schama's *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (1987). Why have the effects of this sea change been so slow to impact

² Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), I: xx.

the whole of Dutch colonial historiography? It is a clear indication of the fact that the discursive tradition is appreciably longer in art history than in general history.

In the manner of another popular twentieth-century philosopher, Michel Foucault, the present work concentrates on “problematized” contexts, privileging evidence of rupture rather than continuity, and circumstances exceptional rather than normative—those in which “the real emplacements, . . . that can be found within the culture are, at the same time, represented, contested, and reversed, . . .”³ The present work is not based on a rare discovery from an attic or archive, but on closely examining what is right in front of our eyes, and equally, looking at the way that others look. What is the intention of the visual representation? The visual material is composed of two primary groups. It is true to say that critiques on the first category—seventeenth-century cartography and topographic views—share one ignominious and outmoded quality. They are all structuralist, which means to say that no account is made for the slippage of meaning that is always at work in the process of signification. For all of its contemporary appeal in illustrious circles, the presence, let alone the effect, of the second group—portraiture—has, up until now, been largely unfelt in North American colonial scholarship. This dissertation identifies and addresses five important visual phases, spanning from the seventeenth to twentieth century, pertaining to New York’s colonial period. These include (in order of appearance)—(i) the Revolutionary phase from an European perspective, (ii) the nineteenth and twentieth-century representation of New Amsterdam from an American viewpoint, (iii) the seventeenth-century image, (iv) the twentieth-century copy, and (v) the British colonial graphic standard. Visual tropes predominate in every case. The effects of these visual records are as influenced by transformations in the art of representation and technique, as they are by political and commercial

³ Michel Foucault, “Different Spaces,” in Michel Foucault, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley (London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1998), p. 178.

processes.

Why ignore Promethean questions to concentrate on comatose-inducing facts? Seventeenth-century colonialism in New Netherland has been territorialised to the extent that its scholarship is predisposed either to delusions of grandeur in empirical minutiae, or to the folly of historical power. This is a result of failing to subjectively or objectively broaden colonial discourse beyond the finite spatial boundary of the colonial city or the coloniser's state. Such a position has preempted essential criticism. Who can fail to recognise the similarity between the hundreds of literary histories spanning from David T. Valentine's *History of the City of New York* (1853) to Edwin G. Burrows's and Mike Wallace's *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (1999)? I have significantly expanded the image's catchment to include unpublished visual and cartographic sources from across Europe, from the fifteenth to twentieth century, with the specific intention of undercutting the Dutch aspect of the colonial city, an aspect which remains an overplayed forty-year period of New York City's history. Whether to propagandise Republicanism, as was typically the case of nineteenth-century historians—most notable in David T. Valentine's *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York* (1841-1866)—or to promote a faction, as Joyce Goodfriend calls for in her article "Writing/Righting Dutch Colonial History" (1999), studies dedicated to New Amsterdam are long on the same few facts, and short on originality and an ability to see the larger picture. They are also divided into two distinct camps—literary and empirical. They are all products of boosterism. Polemicists are unrepresented. With the huge number of colonial records lost to fire, clear-outs, and the process of time, the current historiographic consensus, as it concerns the colony's identity, can only be attributed to one of two causes: either (i) the evidence of extant material is incontrovertible, or (ii) historians have failed to notice the collective effect of their politics. The prevailing image of the colonial city is a result of the second condition.

Two individuals appear in every chapter of the dissertation—Washington Irving (1783-1859) and I. N. Phelps Stokes (1867-1944).⁴ Both figures achieved tremendous notoriety in their day. They are each immortalised in portraits which confirm their position among the bourgeois and intelligentsia. Irving is portrayed by John Wesley Jarvis (1780-1840) on the eve of publishing *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty* (1809). (Figure 0.1) Stokes is pictured with his wife in a portrait by John Singer Sargent (1856-1925), *Mr. and Mrs. Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes* (1897), that hangs in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. (Figure 0.2) Their spectre in New York's colonial history is Brobdingnagian. My approach to them is contentious in order to overcome their immutable figures. The lasting influence of Irving's larger-than-life characterisations cannot be underestimated. His typecast established the template for the city's colonial historiography. Persistent references to Stokes indicate the paucity of significant material recovered pertaining to Dutch colonialism in Manhattan Island since the publication of his six-volume magnum opus, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928), much of which first appeared in Edmund Bailey [E. B.] O'Callaghan's (1797-1880) fifteen-volume collection of records, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York* (1856-1867).

The logic of the dissertation's organisation is not immediately recognisable and warrants an explanation. Writing as an architectural historian has necessitated a degree of incongruity in addressing the subject. This is a result of extending the dissertation's aim to include a recurring debate on the philological view of urban history in colonial America. A standpoint that remains defined by the abiding figure of John William Reps (1921-), and his book *The Making of Urban America: A*

⁴ There is an excellent section on I. N. Phelps Stokes, entitled "Pro Urbis Amore: I. N. Phelps Stokes and *The Iconography of Manhattan Island*," in Max Page, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999), pp. 217-249.

History of City Planning in the United States (1965). The contemporary colonial city is as much a product of three centuries of myth-making as it is a seventeenth-century construction. This is not meant to be a comprehensive survey. Instead, I propose to concentrate upon selected examples. Each of the eight chapters is a self-contained subject presenting particular aspects of the city's historical perennialism. They each aspire to locate the city in a broader intellectual context. This has necessitated a ruthless compression of the dissertation's chief subjects in order to continuously emphasise the larger theme. It has also meant frequently stepping outside of the period of the dissertation's main focus in order to show the exceptional aspects of Dutch colonialism, and the artificiality of scholarship's parameters. Major primary and secondary sources for all of the principal disciplines that the dissertation encompasses are listed in the individual chapters. Intentionally polemical, the dissertation rails against the cult of inferiority, stoicism, and conservatism governing two centuries of colonial history in New York City. Broadly speaking, the dissertation's principal topics include—scenography, mimicry and caricature, personae, cultural exchange, alienation, psychological idealism, rationalism, nationalism, non-conformity and compliance, copying, taste, and troping. There is a consistent rhetorical overtone that is traceable to the inter-related regimes of Cartesianism, machines, space, and utopia. These four subjects prove to be a fundamental aspect of seventeenth-century colonial expansion. In this respect, Joyce E. Chaplin's *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500-1676* (2001) is a model study.

It might seem unduly self-serving to dwell on the city's polemical aspects at the expense of empirical evidence; however, this dissertation intentionally distanced itself from the tendency in colonial historiography to enlist stock facts as a legitimising tool. Anyone with a general interest in the subject has a number of histories to which to turn. In addition to Stokes's *The Iconography of Manhattan*

Island, 1498-1909, these include Jaap Jacobs's *Een zegenrijk gewest: Nieuw-Nederland in de zeventiende eeuw* (1999), Michael Kammen's *Colonial New York: A History* (1975), and the colonist William A. M. Smith's *The History of the Province of New York from the First Discovery to the Year 1757* (1972), among others.

Polemics is innate to New York City. It is true to say that it was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that New York City began to self-consciously disport itself in an utopian fashion; but even so, why the only legitimate polemical tract remains Rem Koolhaas's *Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan* (1978), a late-seventies book dwelling on a twentieth-century subject, beggars belief. The documentation in New York archives alone contains enough evidence to destabilize the popular tradition that peddles New Amsterdam as a diminutive European imitation. A critical methodology centred on aesthetic discourse specifies how concepts of 'ideality' pervade the cultural development of the colony. In fact, it is plausible to assert both that colonialism in New York can produce fresh testimony to cloud the didactic relationship between the sovereign and coloniser—States General and Dutch West India Company—and that the eighteenth-century European architectural desanctification of antiquity was heralded by intellectual and physical events in seventeenth-century New York.

This work is indebted to the increasingly fashionable trend of pushing-back the Enlightenment's start-date. Jonathan Israel's *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (2001) and George Huppert's *The Style of Paris: Renaissance Origins of the French Enlightenment* (1999), among many others, are two recent examples of this. It is bemusing that the most imaginative contemporary writers addressing colonial issues are all attached to institutions in the United States, within the immediate orbit of New York, and yet the city's colonial scholarship remains an unchanging, unimaginative affair. The work of these leading lights includes Homi K. Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* (1994), Stephen

Greenblatt's *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (1988), Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism* (1994), and Gayatri Spivak's *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (1988). The recent conference, "New Netherland at the Millennium: The State of New World Dutch Studies," (19-21 October 2001) made one thing perfectly clearly—the unsatisfactory state of this scholarship.

Which brings us to the present situation. It is one thing to concentrate on the colonial subject. It is another to conduct an interrogation into the industry that has created the prevailing image of New Amsterdam, and that continues to function as powerfully today as ever. While this dissertation by far and away prioritises the former, it recognises the urgent need to address the latter. Beginning with David T. Valentine, and including the New-York Historical Society, the Museum of the City of New York, the New Netherland Project, and the Gotham Center for New York History, among others, the mission of the personalities, clubs, societies, state-funded organisations and individual enterprises that have made it their business to shape and control the city's colonial history has been largely ignored by the public and the profession. There are suitable investigative models. Intellectual territories of institutions have been the subject of two particularly engaging recent studies—Thomas Bender's and Carl E. Schorske's edited collection *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* (1997), and even more to the point, Max Page's *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940* (1999). Scholars of colonial New York would be well advised to take into consideration the historiographic perspective of these works. When will New York's approach to its colonial scholarship come in out of the Cold War?

CHAPTER 1 PRACTISING PEEPING! NEW NOTES AND COMMENTS ON
THE “COLLECTION DES PROSPECTS” OF NEW YORK CITY

“This slipshod bibliography in history is, I am sorry to say, becoming the fashion in New York and Boston. Would-be historians and ‘narrative’ writers are industriously picarooning and compiling ‘history’ by stringing together an ostentatious show of discordant authorities, relevant, irrelevant and contradictory, leaving the victimized reader to draw his own conclusions, because as historians they either are not able to form a sound opinion, or dare not express it.”

Henry Stevens, *Recollections of Mr. James Lenox of New York and the Formation of His Library*, 1886, p. 72-73

“Dr. Edgar Breitenbach on December 13, 1971, wrote a letter in which he suggested that the speakers . . . address themselves to the question of the ways in which the print could be used as historical source material ‘and to what extent the evidence of the graphic arts reveals important insights into the social life, politics, and topography of the American Colonies and the early United States.’”¹

Two points in the preceding statement caught my eye. First, the organiser’s ambition to use prints as “historical source material,” and second, the conference’s attention to the image’s revelations about the “social life, politics and topography of the American Colonies.” My ambition is not far from Dr. Breitenbach’s agenda; however, in my view, too many New York historians have believed images to be empirically unproblematic. What do images of colonial New York disclose about (i) their political and intellectual agenda, (ii) their cultural function, (iii) the intent of the inventing mind, and (iv) the role of the print trade? How the American scholar seems

¹ Frank H. Sommer III, “Prints as Documents of Early American History,” in *American Printmaking Before 1876: Fact, Fiction, and Fantasy* (Washington: Library of Congress, 1975), p. 25.

determined to see and construct New York's colonial history and how the European represented the colonial city are often divergent. Each interpretation depends on the sophistication ascribed to the city, and the economic, political, and cultural ramifications of such an investiture. In general, seventeenth and eighteenth-century Europeans exaggerated the colonial city's level of social and economic development and nineteenth and twentieth-century Americans understated it. It is undeniable that the continent manufacturing the image credits itself for North America's success.

A short time before I happened upon Dr. Breitenbach's notation, I had the good fortune to become involved in a brief epistolary exchange with Wendy Shadwell, Curator of Prints and Ephemera at the New-York Historical Society. Our exchange of letters, and the semantic division caused by each other's concept of accuracy (realism) as it related to images of colonial New York, is largely responsible for establishing the discursive agenda that underlines not only this chapter, but the entire dissertation. Namely, what are the historiographical implications of recognising that seventeenth and eighteenth-century engravings of the city are subject to visual tropes and copying, and that nineteenth and twentieth-century depictions are essentially the by-products of literary history? How do these realisations impact our perceptions of colonialism's agenda?

I

Generally speaking, one can trace the connection between artifice and urban space from the fifth book in Marcus Vitruvius Pollio's [Vitruvius] *De Architectura libri decem* (first century B.C.E.), to the second book [*Il Secondo libro (Prospettiva)* (1545)] in Sebastiano Serlio's *Tutte l'opere d'architettura* (1537-1551), to the fourth book in Andrea Palladio's *I quattro libri dell'architettura* (1570). Following closely on the heels of architecture's celebrated treatise-writers, and utilising the principles

of illusionism that they established to illustrate the city, the Netherlandish scenographers Hans (1526-1609) and Paul (1567-1630) Vredeman de Vries (Figures 1.1, 1.2), Hendrick van Steenwyck II (*fl.* 1604-1649) (Figure 1.3), and Dirck van Delen (1604/5-1671) (Figures 1.4, 1.5), and the Italians Giuseppe Galli de Bibiena (1696-1756) (Figures 1.6, 1.7), and Viviano (*c.* 1606-1670) and Niccolò Codazzi (*c.* 1642-1693) (Figures 1.8, 1.9) popularised the mechanisms of artifice as the primary means of viewing the city.² As Roberto Longhi comments:

“The origin of this specialized form of art [view painting] could well be found in Mannerism and thus date from an age which delighted in classifying and subdividing the various fields of representational art; but its ancestry was as old as the sporadic manifestations of illusionism which had for centuries been used to bridge the gap between figurative mural painting and the actual architecture to which it was attached, so as to emphasize by artifice the real existence of the latter.”³

The conspicuously similar compositions of the de Vries’s, Galli de Bibiena, and others, were adopted by many lesser contemporary artists and were ultimately revamped and transposed by the engravers of *guckkastenbilder*—the German name for the type of print known as the perspective view, produced from the early eighteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century, and intended for use in an optical diagonal machine, called *guckkasten* in Germany, *vues d’optiques* in France, “peep shows” in England, *rare-kiek* or *kijk-kastin* in the Netherlands, and *camera ottica* in Italy—in a manner that moved architectural representation from two to three-dimensional space.⁴

² See Christopher Brown, *Dutch Townscape Painting* (London: The National Gallery, 1972); Heiner Borggreffe, et al., eds., *Hans Vredeman de Vries: und die Renaissance im Norden* (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2002); Henrik Hondius, *Architectur oder Bawmeisterschafft* (Amsterdam: Jan Janszon, 1628); Giuseppe Bibiena, *Architettura e Prospettiva* (Augsburg, 1740); David Ryley Marshall, *Viviano and Niccolò Codazzi and the Baroque Architectural Fantasy* (Milano: Jandi Sapi Editori S.r.l., 1993).

³ Roberto Longhi, “Viviano Codazzi e l’invenzione della veduta realistica,” in *Paragone*, November 1995, p. 41-42. Cited in Giuliano Briganti, *The View Painters of Europe* (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1970), p. 4.

⁴ With great erudition in *Architectural Representation and the Perspective Hinge* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997), Alberto Pérez-Gómez and Louise Pelletier set out the implications of the perspective for architectural representation, and consequently, its influence and effect on the

As may be seen in François Xavier [F. X.] Habermann's (1721-1796) reworking of the Dutch traveller and artist Jan Nieuhof's (1618-1672) engravings, view-making in the second half of the eighteenth century underwent a paradigm shift with far-reaching repercussions. Altering the mechanics of the view's composition in order to accommodate the linear perspective had a twofold effect. Not only was the conventional representation of space refigured to achieve a scenographic effect, but, in the process, the city's civic ideology was lastingly reformulated. Typical to the tenets of Neo-classicism, the fact that this awkward transition was abetted by the *camera ottica* was no doubt crucial to the views' maintaining realist claims. Such a dazzling representation of the city had almost certainly never been seen since Palladio's spectacle, the Teatro Olimpico in Vicenza (1580-1584), and never in such a portable form. The average person followed this shift with an unquestioning leap-of-faith. For many, the *camera ottica* would have been the first scientific instrument that they either possessed or encountered close-up. In the hands of the *guckkastenmann*, it was as much an ontological instrument as it was a mechanical one.

II

“All objects that can be given to us can be conceptualised in two ways: on the one hand, as appearances; on the other hand, as things in themselves.”⁵

To describe the six “Collection des Prospects” of New York requires every adjective excluded from written histories of the colonial city, including histrionic,

construction of urban space. The present section does not attempt to dwell on these paradigm shifts. Rather, it aims to illustrate the unalterable relationship between these artists and architects, who, however great their intellectual strides, ultimately depended on a rationalised means of presenting the city that the engravers in Augsburg at the end of the eighteenth century inherited and transformed.

⁵ Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Judgement*, tr. James Creed Meredith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952).

captivating, comic, architecturally outré, ironic, and so on. Yet few questions regarding their content have been posed beyond those aimed at undermining their historical accuracy. However, in order to assess the views of any city in terms of realism, one would ultimately be forced to question the entire visual canon of both the European and colonial city. Is there a single scholar left to dispute the assertion that Canaletto (1697-1768) was as preoccupied with perfecting the painting's composition as with typological 'accuracy'? When looking at any of these engravings, how often has one failed to remember that the image is printed in reverse? The scene is appreciable without ever fulfilling its function. For all the contemporary deference to empiricism, we must not fail to enthuse over these prints' cinematic ambition. How can we not conduct our enquiry from this point of view? Yet their few interpreters, and this goes for almost all pre-Revolutionary illustrative material, have not displayed the will to extend the parameters of the illustration's influence. The fate of these six prints to carry the stigma of "fictitious"—having been discounted as "purely imaginary conceptions, bearing no more relation to reality than many earlier and later descriptions of the New World by Europeans who had not (and some who had) seen it"—is a consequence of the urban and architectural one-sidedness of nineteenth and twentieth-century colonial scholarship, one judiciously confining the colony to conventional cultural stereotypes.⁶ Why advocate realism's approach to a late seventeenth-century picturesque watercolour of Johannes Vingboons (1616/17-1670), in particular *Nieuw Amsterdam ofte nue Nieuw Iorx opt 'T Eylant Man* [The Prototype View] (c. 1670), rather than to one of these urbane, late eighteenth-century engravings? These six prints are enigmatic. It is not the "evidence" that the print "reveals" about the colony that is significant, but what it reveals about the maker and its intended audience. The whole notion of the "fictitious" image raises not only key questions into each printmaker's motivation,

⁶ John A. Kouwenhoven, *The Columbia Historical Portrait of New York: An Essay in Graphic History* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1953), p. 78.

but suggests a certain basis for classification that deems others authentic.

“Just as the detective story genre offers readers the consolations of an orderly narrative in which reason and logic will triumph,”⁷ so by portraying the *guckkastenbilder* as an aberration, the author of *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928), Isaac Newton [I. N.] Phelps Stokes, aimed to secure the standing of historical empiricism.⁸ Yet have we not missed the point of what these six *guckkastenbilder* might have to tell? Stokes made every effort to authenticate what, a century and a half earlier, a form of these optical instruments reputedly captured as the first view of New Amsterdam, *t' Fort nieuw Amsterdam op de Manhatans* [The Hartgers View] (c. 1626-1628), by contending that the view's compositional idiosyncrasy was due to being “carelessly engraved in Holland from the original sketch without reversing.”⁹ (Figure 1.10) Classifying the “Collection des Prospects” of New York as fictitious on the basis that they are copies of other places, the historian is placed in the awkward, though not untypical, position of authenticating other images whose sources are less obvious, but no less subject to visual tropes. Positioning colonial New York in a visual lineage dating to Vitruvius is one, among many, of the colonial city's unexplained ideal projections.

In his far-reaching and discursive essay, “Late Eighteenth-Century American

⁷ Michiko Kakutani, “The Case He Can't Solve: A Detective's Delusions,” in *The New York Times* (19th September 2000).

⁸ See I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), I: 217. Paying the *guckkastenbilder* less than scant attention, in fact allocating only one paragraph in his entire six volume, 3000-plus page *magnum opus*, Stokes mistakenly identifies only five New York *guckkastenbilder*: “Of other fictitious views of New York, the best known form part of a series issued by F. X. Habermann in Augsbourg [*sic.*] about 1776 for use in “Peep” shows. The subjects represented are as follows: 1 View of the Fort; 2 The Destruction of the King's Statue; 3 The Triumphal Entry of the British Troops at New York; 4 The Landing of the British Troops at New York; 5 The terrible Fire at New York, 1776. . . A similar series was issued, somewhat earlier, by B. Fr. Leizelt, also in Augsbourg [*sic.*].”

⁹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 134. See further comments on *t' Fort nieuw Amsterdam op de Manhatans* in Chapter 3—“On Being In/Between: Expanding the Cultural Episteme in New Netherland,” p. 104-109, and Chapter 5—“Take Four: The Pitfalls of a Classical Education,” p. 154-155.

Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton” (1985), Donald Cresswell suggests:

“We might take Robin C. Collingwood’s view of aesthetic theory at the time of these prints to see that a dichotomy existed between those who asked ‘what are the rules for composing a picture?’ and those who asked ‘what is the most effective way of composing this particular picture?’”¹⁰

His point is to assert that one should not be too rash to condemn these prints as fraudulent, and should instead consider them as engravings “by conservative artists working in older traditions,” *i.e.* that these artists were staving off modernity more than reality. In conclusion to his essay, Cresswell asks the historian to (i) “consider these prints within both traditions for traces of veracity,”¹¹ and, if that same historian was able, to (ii) “accept the analogy that thus a picture of Deptford or a continental, provincial city would provide a ‘representation’ which was true enough for an audience which would accept this convention?”¹² In both cases Cresswell’s position is dependent on the presumption that these artists were stigmatised by moral consciousness. I will demonstrate that was not the case. The *guckkastenbilder* are clearly not an accurate likeness of the colonial city, but, within the confines of the medium, they reflect the ideological intent of a large and influential group. By following the common fallacy of over-emphasising the ethical dimension of truth not only has Cresswell underestimated the commercial and political will of the engraver and publisher, but overstated the engraving’s cultural purpose. However, by intimating that the degree of fiction may be overestimated in order to bolster claims for a more notable colonial city, in fact one even more modern than the image projected by Leizelt and Habermann, Cresswell must be credited for adding much-

¹⁰ Donald H. Cresswell, “Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton,” in *American Maritime Prints*, ed. Elton W. Hall (Dartmouth: The Old Dartmouth Historical Society, 1985), p. 61, pp. 41-62.

¹¹ Cresswell, “Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton,” p. 61.

¹² Cresswell, “Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton,” p. 62.

needed momentum to Carl Bridenbaugh's conclusion in *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America 1625-1742* (1960) that the "leading American cities were as culturally sophisticated as the best provincial cities in England."¹³

Bridenbaugh's conclusion should be augmented to include the fact that they were colonised on an altogether more ideological basis.

III

Foremost among the group of seventeenth and eighteenth-century fictional views of New York City is the well-known and well-documented image, *Nowel Amsterdam en L'Amerique* (1672).¹⁴ (Figure 1.11) Less often, the historian is referred to a series of six engravings issued in Augsburg around the time of the American Revolution by F. X. Habermann and Balthazar Frederic [B. F.] Leizelt (1755-1812) entitled "Collection des Prospects."¹⁵ There are six separate subjects illustrated—(i) *Vue de la Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by B. F. Leizelt [also published by André Basset l'aîné in Paris, and Jacques Chereau in Paris] (Figure 1.12); (ii) *La Destruction de la Statuë royale a Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann [also published by André Basset l'aîné in Paris] (Figure 1.13); (iii) *Débarquement des Troupes Angloises*

¹³ Cited in Cresswell, "Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton," p. 62.

¹⁴ See Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 215-217, and Robert T. Augustyn and Paul E. Cohen, *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1997), p. 34-35. Augustyn and Cohen admirably trace the map's former incarnations—"In a rather audacious example of self-plagiarism, there is in Jollain's atlas a view of Lisbon that is nearly identical to the one of New Amsterdam. Moreover, Jollain's plan of Lisbon was copied from yet another view of that city done a few years earlier by the Dutch cartographic publisher Frederick de Wit. It, in turn, was copied from a work by Braun and Hogenberg, which appeared at the end of the sixteenth century. Therefore, the prototype for a supposed 1672 view of New Amsterdam is a view of Lisbon from about 1580." For another, well-recognised, fictional view, see *Ville de Manathe ou Nouvelle-Yorc* (1763/1764), published by Jacques-Nicholas Bellin, in the collection of the New York Public Library.

Author's note: The spelling, punctuation, and special characters that make-up the picture titles listed in this chapter follow the original's title. Here, as elsewhere in the dissertation, the original text has been followed in including or omitting accents.

¹⁵ Author's note: From the evidence uncovered in this essay, one can amend the dates assigned to Leizelt's North American *guckkastenbilder* by Donald H. Cresswell in *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints* (Washington: The Library of Congress, 1975). It can be roundly stated that each of Leizelt's images was printed after the date of the engraving it was copied from.

à *Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann [also published by Jacques Chereau in Paris] (Figure 1.14); (iv) *L'Entré triumphale de Troupes royales a Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann [also published by Jacques Chereau in Paris] (Figure 1.15); (v) *Représentation du Feu terrible à Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann [also published by André Basset l'aîné in Paris, and Jacques Chereau in Paris] (Figure 1.16); and (vi) *L'Arrive du Prince Guillaume Henry a Nouvelle York*, engraved by B. F. Leizelt. (Figure 1.17) To date, I have not discovered a single other view titled as New York that could be counted among this series. These prints are all abundantly available to the scholar and collector. The present work was largely assembled from the rich pickings in the collection of the New York Public Library Print Room and to a lesser extent from the equally replete print room at the New-York Historical Society. It may be assumed that the Parisian publishers of the same views, Jacques Chereau (1742-1794) and André Basset l'aîné, both located on the rue Saint-Jacques, copied engravings originating from Habermann and Leizelt that came into their possession.¹⁶ While vigorously copied by the French, not one of these six views has ever been discovered to have been copied by an English engraver.¹⁷ A brief look at one series—(i) *Représentation du Feu terrible à Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann, *Représentation du feu terrible à nouvelle Yorck*, published by André Basset l'aîné, and *Représentation du feu terrible à nouvelle Yorck*, published by Jacques Chereau—shows that, apart from the overall variation in print quality (which clearly favours the Augsburg engravings) and the modification of the basic

¹⁶ In *Graphic Art of the Eighteenth Century*, Jean Adhémar writes on the self-proclaimed “home to the popular print”—“From the time of Henri IV, this [rue Saint-Jacques] had been the domain of booksellers and dealers in prints.” In a passage of rare descriptive quality, Adhémar projects Mercier’s (*Tableau de Paris*) sentiments on the subject with unmistakable aplomb—“he deplores their success and the wide currency they enjoyed; he pokes fun at ‘the foolish picture-collectors’, and laments over the armies of draughtsmen, engravers, intaglio printers, illuminators, booksellers, pedlars and picture-makers who assail him on all sides ‘each with his picture in his hand.’” See Jean Adhémar, *Graphic Art of the Eighteenth Century*, tr. M. I. Martin (London: Thames and Hudson, 1964), p. 141.

¹⁷ To my knowledge, only one other engraver, Johann Bergmüller (1724-1785), also in Augsburg, published a North American *guckkastenbild*. Bergmüller published *St. Eustache une des Isles d’Antilles* of which Donald Cresswell notes: “View of Admiral Rodney’s attack on the Dutch possession of St. Eustatius, a center of contraband trade with the Americans. Rodney captured the island on February 3, 1781, but it was recaptured by the French in November 1781.” See Cresswell, *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints*, p. 117.

format of the "Collection des Prospects" (most noticeably the transposition of the image), the content of the views themselves is nearly indistinguishable. (Figures 1.18, 1.19)

Vue de la Nouvelle Yorck and *L'Arrive du Prince Guillaume Henry a Nouvelle York* are unanimously attributed to Leizelt, while Habermann is credited with executing the other four.¹⁸ It is clearly this authorial differentiation that accounts for the prints' stylistic and aesthetic differences. Leizelt's two views of New York are adaptations of engravings of other subjects by the British engraver William Woollett (1735-1785).¹⁹ One of which, *View of the Royal Dock Yard at Deptford* (1775), also yielded the prototype for Leizelt's *Vue de Philadelphie*.²⁰ (Figures 1.20, 1.21) There can be no question that Woollett's engraving, *The Fishery* (1768), derived from Richard Wright's 1764 painting of the same title, is the model for Leizelt's engraving, *L'Arrive du Prince Guillaume Henry a Nouvelle York*.²¹ (Figures 1.22, 1.23) For Leizelt to acknowledge the all but unknown Liverpool artist, Richard Wright (1720?-1775?), might be the printmaker's convention, but it is surely misplaced flattery.²²

¹⁸ It is regularly noted, without any factual evidence, that Leizelt's two views of New York are less common than Habermann's. [See the note accompanying Item 377 in Swann Galleries Catalogue 1906, "The New York Sale," September 25, 2001] To my knowledge, not a single scholar has uncovered the publication quantities of either artist's work to affirm or refute these claims.

¹⁹ See Louis Alexander Fagan, *A Catalogue Raisonné of the Engraved Works of William Woollett* (London: The Fine Art Society, 1885).

²⁰ See Cresswell, "Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton," p. 58-59.

²¹ There is a wholly misdirected, nevertheless entertaining piece of recent correspondence preserved alongside Leizelt's engraving, *L'Arrive du Prince Guillaume Henry a Nouvelle York*, at the New York Public Library. In this letter, dated 15th June 1984, Mrs. Mollie Gillen of Toronto, Canada expends no small amount of energy when she writes: "The illustration shows the landing of Prince William Henry at New York in 1781. The artist got the date wrong - - it was in September, not October 1781, as shown in the logs of both the ship he was on (which could not get over the bar until the next tide) and the smaller ship he actually arrived in. The ship here depicted is the larger HMS Prince Beorge, not little HMS Lively from which he landed: the artist has used artistic licence in his depiction of this event, but I would imagine one of the smaller ships in the background might have been the sloop Lively. Anyway, it is a 'lively' picture."

²² For a brief biographical account of Wright and an explanation of *The Fishery* and its engraved states, see Mary Bennett, *Merseyside Painters, People & Places*, 2 vols. (Liverpool: Merseyside County Council, 1978), p. 236-237. In this catalogue, Bennett, Keeper of British Art at the Walker Art Gallery, suggests that the Walker Art Gallery's holding is a "likely candidate for the original picture which gained the first premium of thirty guineas given by the Society of Arts for a sea-piece in 1764."

Had Donald Cresswell seen this view and its notation, it would not have taken “luck,” as he called it, but a routine look through Woollett’s engravings in the Department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum to make the connection he did between Leizelt’s *Vue de la Nouvelle Yorck* and Woollett’s engraving, *View of the Royal Dock Yard at Deptford*, after a painting by the English marine artist Richard Paton (1716?-1791), *The Dockyard at Deptford* (c. 1770-1775), held in the Royal Collection at Buckingham Palace.²³ (Figure 1.24) Richard Paton is again the link between two other North American *guckkastenbilder* by Leizelt—*Vue de Salem* and *Vuë de Quebeck*. (Figures 1.25, 1.26) In the same manner as with the *View of the Royal Dock Yard at Deptford*—only this time borrowing from the *View of the Royal Dock Yard at Chatham* (1775), engraved by Pierre Charles Canot (1710-1775), and based on *The Dockyard at Chatham* (c. 1770-1775) also held in the Royal Collection at Buckingham Palace—Leizelt divides the picture roughly into two halves, and arbitrarily names the right-hand side Quebec, and the left-hand side Salem.²⁴ (Figures 1.27, 1.28) Leizelt’s *Combat Memorable entre le Pearson et Paul Jones*, is based on a third Paton painting titled *The Action Between the Serapis, Captain Pearson, the Countess of Scarborough, and Paul Jones Squadron* (1779), and famously engraved by Daniel Lerpinière (c. 1745-1785) and James Fittler (1758-1835) in 1781.²⁵

²³ See Cresswell, “Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton,” p. 58. For information on Richard Paton’s seven paintings in the Royal Collection, see Oliver Millar, *The Later Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, 2 vols. (London: Phaidon, 1969), I: 90.

²⁴ It is worth noting that P. C. Canot engraved a number of North American views predating the *View of the Royal Dock Yard at Chatham*. These include—*A View of the City of Boston* (1768), *A View of Louisbourg* (1762), *An East View of Montreal* (1768), *A View of Charles Town* (1768?), *A South East View of the City of New York* (1768), and *A South West View of the City of New York* (1768). It is also easy to see that these views did not provide either the amount of detail or format appropriate to make an easy transfer to a *guckkastenbild*.

²⁵ The present essay has based its research on the Paton painting held in the collection of the U.S. Naval Academy Museum. Correspondence with James W. Cheevers, Associate Director/Senior Curator at the U.S. Naval Academy Museum has proven invaluable. He wrote on the painting as follows: “It was a gift of the American philanthropist Christian A. Zabriskie. Reputedly, this painting is the Paton work which was shown at the Royal Academy in 1780. It may have been commissioned by Jeffrey Lord Amherst (1717-1797) who had served in North America during the Seven Years’ War and who owned property near Flamborough Head off which the naval action was fought in 1779. Additional copies of the painting in oil are known to exist. One appeared for sale at the Old Print Shop, New York, in 1949. Another, oil on wood, 20 x 28 inches, is in the Franklin D. Roosevelt collection at Hyde Park, NY. A third copy owned by Webb Institute was seen at Beman

(Figures 1.29-1.31) In total, Leizelt engraved six views of North America and the Revolution. Except for one by Richard Wright, all of these are copied from engravings made of paintings by Richard Paton. While Paton is the common source, changes carried out by the original engravers leave no doubt that the prints of Paton's work, and not the oil paintings, served as prototypes for Leizelt's engravings. Was there a single sourcebook for English marine prints, or more than likely, a specialist distributor in Augsburg? Empirical facts aside, how were the prints of an indistinguished and arguably equally mis-titled marine painting, *The Fishery*, and a Royal Dockyard in the East End of London, *View of the Royal Dock Yard at Deptford*, selected from the portfolio of an engraver as prolific as Woollett to represent New York?²⁶

Habermann's four *guckkastenbilder* of New York are an altogether more complex riddle. Although the stylistic consistency of the four suggests a single source, neither I nor any of my predecessors have discovered one. The folios of Johann Andreas Pfeffel (1674-1748), Salomon Kleiner (1700-1761), Giuseppe Galli de Bibiena, Paul Fourdrinier (1698-1758), and Johann Wilhelm Baur (1607-1642)—all topographic printmakers of the seventeenth and eighteenth century—as well as the few artists Habermann acknowledged on other *guckkastenbilder* have revealed nothing.²⁷ Neither has a search of engravings on the general subjects that the prints'

Galleries, Nyack, NY, in 1987. In 1991, a pair of paintings, attributed to a follower of Richard Paton, appeared in Annapolis, MD, having been purchased the previous year in Vienna, Austria. Both entitled "Battle of Flamborough Head," one is a copy of this same work while the second was a somewhat fictitious scene showing the BONHOMME RICHARD completely dismasted and a British ship nearly engulfed in flames."

²⁶ From records in the Walker Art Gallery's paintings file on Richard Paton's *The Fishery*, there is a letter written by Mary Bennett dated 1st March, 1974 and addressed to The Information Officer at the Portuguese National Tourist & Trade Information Office. The letter asks "whether the enclosed photograph of a painting [*The Fishery*] of ours shows a view of the entrance of the Tagus, perhaps from Cascais, and if this is so, whether the lighthouse and fort at the left can be identified." In the file, there is neither information to illuminate how Bennett came to make this possible assertion, nor a reply from the Information Office.

²⁷ For an extensive list of possible sources, see Wolfgang Seitz, "The Engraving Trade in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth- Century Augsburg: A Checklist," in *Print Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 2 (1986), pp. 116-128.

depict, nor perusals of views of London in the Crace Collection at the British Museum and in the collection at the British Library.

Habermann also engraved four views each of two other North American cities—Boston and Quebec. (Figures 1.32-1.39) These prints are aesthetically consistent with his views of New York leading one to conclude that, like Leizelt, once Habermann found a model to copy he cut a swathe through the artist's portfolio. In one fell swoop, Habermann aesthetically and urbanistically homogenised three of North America's principal colonial cities, each of which fell under the jurisdiction of a separate sovereign. Their stylistic uniformity has been described generally as "Baroque," and as outlandishly as "veneto-austriaco-bavarese."²⁸ Tracing a source for the architecturally indeterminant prints of Boston and Quebec has proven as unprofitable as for the ones of New York. Moreover, what should one make of these engravings' claim to be depictions of historical events? Are the occurrences separately inserted by Habermann's hand? It is hard to see how the soldiers marching in the inconspicuously titled *Vue de la Rue des Recolets dans la haute Ville de Quebec* is any less of an event than the soldiers marching in *L'Entré triumpnale de Troupes royales a Nouvelle Yorck*, or gathering in *Débarquement des Troupes Engloises à Nouvelle Yorck*. Whether or not Habermann planted them, why has he only chosen to celebrate the arrival of British troops in New York? There is clearly a question over the prints' emphasis. Owing to the incompatible scale of the city image and the marching soldiers, and the distinct object-like status of each, I am of the opinion that these engravings are composites, satisfying the contemporary demand for visual accounts of prominent news stories, and that the regimented soldiers, monument of King George II, and raging fire are secondary inclusions to still

²⁸ See Entry 237, "Vue de Boston," in Carlo Alberto Zotti Minici, *Il Mondo Nuovo: Le meraviglie della visione dal '700 alla nascita del cinema* (Milan: Mazzotta, 1988), p. 196. Alberto Milano writes: "La veduta di Boston, senz'altro fantastica, risulta un insieme di edifici dalla composta architettura veneto-austriaco-bavarese." [The view of Boston, certainly fantastic, looks like a group of buildings made by a composition of Venetian-Austrian-Bavarian architecture.]

undiscovered tranquil street scenes. Such an argument can be supported by comparing other *guckkastenbilder* engraved by Habermann with their sources. As I shall come to illustrate, on more than one occasion Habermann manipulated the source print's background material the better to serve his illustrative purposes.

It is tempting to piece together the four New York events that Habermann engraved from the subjects and compositions of other *guckkastenbilder*. Though in my view, bearing in mind his professional decline, by this point Habermann would never have expended such energy. First a sculptor, turned prolific engraver of ornamental prints, it was not until the final stage of his career, and when the market for Rococo design had collapsed, that Habermann engraved prints for the "Collection des Prospects."²⁹ It is a long shot, however, bearing in mind that Habermann was appointed to the faculty of the Kunstakademie in Augsburg in 1781, could this narrow the picture of his artistic circle and with it the sources for his *guckkastenbilder*?³⁰ Other *guckkastenbilder* provide clues that it is tempting not to ignore. In scale, proportion and composition, the view of the waterfront in London—*La Douane de Londres*, engraved by Georg Balthasar Probst (1731-1801)—is compositionally similar to the waterfront illustrated in *Débarquement des Troupes Angloises à Nouvelle Yorck*. (Figure 1.40) The three engravings of the "Representation tirée de l'Apocalypse de S. Jean" are closely tied in their subject matter to three New York views—*La Destruction de la Statuë royale a Nouvelle*

²⁹ I owe my conclusion on the reason for Habermann's venture into *guckkastenbilder* to opinions expressed by Dr. Gode Krämer at the Städt Kunstsammlungen, Augsburg. On Habermann's ornamental prints, see Ebba Krull, *Franz Xaver Habermann (1721-1796): Ein Augsburger Ornamentist des Rokoko* (Augsburg: Verlag Hieronymus Mühlberger, 1977).

³⁰ See B. Bushart, "Die Augsburger Akademien," in Anton W. A. Boschloo, et al., eds., *Academies of Art between Renaissance and Romanticism* (The Hague: SDU Uitgeverij, 1989), p. 332-347. On page 343 Bushart writes: "In order to consolidate the financial structure of the academy, probably also to make it independent from the city-council, Stetten established a supportive organisation in the following year 1780, named 'Private society for the encouragement of the arts.' A third of the fees were turned into capital, the remainder and the interests were being used . . . mainly for the founding and maintenance of a drawing school for craftsmen within the framework of the academy. . . The sessions were being held by two instructors: Franz Xaver Habermann in Architectural and Perspective Drawings; Gottlieb Friedrich Riedel in other drawing fields." I am grateful to Markus Weber for translating this article.

Yorck, L'Arrive du Prince Guillaume Henry a Nouvelle York, and Représentation du Feu terrible à Nouvelle Yorck. (Figures 1.41-1.43) It is appealing to find an allegorical significance in these views of New York which might be connected with the fact that the city was the final "European" foothold in North America and these were among the last colonial representations. While atypical of Habermann's *oeuvre*, depictions of devastation to cities, military pageantry, and political activity were popular themes satisfying the geographic, journalistic, nationalistic, and fantastic ambitions of the "Collection des Prospects." Sources from outside the "Collection des Prospects" are equally suggestive, but hardly any more conclusive. For instance, the church tower in *Débarquement des Troupes Angloises à Nouvelle Yorck* and *Représentation du feu terrible à nouvelle Yorck* does not seem far removed from Trinity Church tower on William Burgis's widely reprinted view—*A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York in the Province of New York in North America* (c. 1719-1721). Coincidentally or not, Trinity Church tower was destroyed by the "Great Fire" in 1776. (Figure 1.44)

Topographical views, ostensibly of New York, in many cases lack the authority that their labelling claims. I have demonstrated that views were derived in some cases from images of different places entirely.

IV

It should no longer be a prerequisite to claim that "our knowledge of the peep-show is dim and confused,"³¹ that "little has been published on the type of print known as the perspective view,"³² or that "there is not much written about

³¹ Fred Weitenkampf, "Peep-Show Prints," in *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, vol. 25, no. 6 (June 1921), p. 366, pp. 359-366.

³² C. J. Kaldenbach, "Perspective Views," in *Print Quarterly*, vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1985), p. 87, pp. 86-104.

peepshows, and what there is, is often not in English”³³ before writing on the *guckkastenbilder*. In the last decade alone, scholarship has generated more than half a dozen books, dozens of journal and book essays, magazine articles, exhibition catalogues, and extensive individual museum catalogue entries.³⁴ An immense number of these engravings survive. The internet is awash with printsellers and auction houses looking to buy and sell them. The contemporary fascination with these prints is fuelled by their association with the history of cinematography. Long since established as one of four main publication centres for these prints—together with Augsburg, Paris and London—it was not until Carlo Alberto Zotti Minici curated the 1988 exhibition, *Il Mondo Nuovo* at the Museo Civico, that Bassano del Grappa realised the economic windfall its cultural history might precipitate following the popular rediscovery of these views. Any subject that should be so fortunate to be allied to the most lucrative leisure industry in contemporary society is bound to skyrocket.

The turn of fortune for the *guckkastenbilder* has not only resulted in an industry of burgeoning scholarship, but in a pay-off for the collector of prints published in Augsburg during the second-half of the eighteenth century. Two recent auctions support my claims. In a sale held by Auctiones AG and Moirandat

³³ Richard Balzer, *Peepshows: A Visual History* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1998), p. 9.

³⁴ This is a highly abbreviated list. See John Roger Paas and Bernd Wißner, eds., *Augsburg, die Bilderfabrik Europas* (Augsburg: Wißner-Verlag, 2001); C. A. Zotti Minici, *Il Mondo Nuovo: Le meraviglie della visione del Settecento alla nascita del Cinema* (Bassano del Grappa: Mostra, 1988); Friedrich Scheele, *Rrrr! Ein ander Bild!: Guckkastenblätter des 18. Jahrhunderts aus der graphischen Sammlung* (Oldenburg: Isensee, 1999); Richard Balzer, *Peepshows* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998); Georg Füsslin, et al, *Der Guckkasten: Einblick - Durchblick - Ausblick* (Stuttgart: Füsslin, 1995); Frances Terpak, “Objects and Contexts,” in Barbara Maria Stafford and Frances Terpak, *Devices of Wonder: From the World in a Box to Images on a Screen* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2001), pp. 143-364; Donald H. Cresswell, “Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton,” in *American Maritime Prints*, ed. by Elton W. Hall (Dartmouth: The Old Dartmouth Historical Society, 1985), pp. 41-62; C. J. Kaldenbach, “Perspective Views,” in *Print Quarterly*, vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1985), pp. 86-104; Evelyn L. Kraus, “Vues d’Optique,” in *Art on Paper*, vol. 5, no. 2 (November-December 2000), pp. 66-67; Wolfgang Seitz, “Die Augsburger Guckkasten-Verlage,” exhibition pamphlet, Galerie der Kreissparkasse, Augsburg, 1991; V. Léry, “Les Vues d’Optique,” *100 vues d’optique et curiosités*, exhibition catalogue, Pontoise Museum, 1977; E. McSherry Fowble, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1680-1880: A Selective Catalogue of the Winterthur Museum Collection* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1987).

Company AG in Basel on 4th-5th December 1997, Lot 694—including (a) *Prospect des Plazes vor dem Rath Haus zu Boston*, engraved by F. X. Habermann; (b) *Salem. Eine Stadt im Engelländischen America*, engraved by B. F. Leizelt; and (c) *Der Einzug der königlichen Völcker in Neu Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann—sold for CHF 1,600, or approximately USD 1,116. By stark contrast, in “The New York Sale” held by Swann in New York City on 14th September 2000, Lot 9—*Representation du Feu Terrible a Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann—alone sold for USD 1,200. Even allowing for a qualitative argument, and acknowledging that prints of New York published in Augsburg attain the highest price of any North American *guckkastenbilder*, in raw terms this marks an appreciation of over 300% in three years.³⁵ While this is one extreme case, auction records since 1990 indicate a clear, uninterrupted ascent in the value of these engravings, outstripping most areas of the art market, and particularly at sales in New York City.³⁶ Clearly, it does not hold water any longer to claim that the *guckkastenbild* is culturally and commercially neglected. My intention by concentrating on a selective series of *guckkastenbilder*, in and among the contemporary appeal for these views, is to pose a series of questions that broad-based historiographic and cinematic analyses have overlooked.

V

³⁵ At the same sale in Basel, Lot 695 comprising four engravings by F. X. Habermann—*Prospect der Straße gegen der Kirche der Recolecten in der obern Stadt zu Quebec*; *Plaz wo man nach dem Mühlen Cavalier gehet*; *Prospect von der unteren Stadt in Quebec gegen St. Laurenz Fluß*; and *Prospect des Hauptplatzes der unteren Stadt zu Quebec*—sold for a mere CHF 1,300 or approximately USD 906. In the sale at Swann in New York City, Lot 8—*L'Entre triumphale des Troupes royales a Nouvelle Yorck*, engraved by J. Chereau in Paris—sold for only USD 400.

³⁶ On 26th January 1991 at Christie's New York, Lot 81—*Vue de la Nouvelle York and Vue de Philadelphie*, engraved by B. F. Leizelt, sold for USD 444. On 13th January 1995 at Christie's New York, Lot 200—*Representation du feu terrible à la Nouvelle York*, engraved by F. X. Habermann, sold for USD 1,500. On 5th May 1999 at William Doyle, New York, Lot 243—*Debarquement des Troupes engloises a nouvelle Yorck* and *L'Entre triumphale de Troupes royales a Nouvelle Yorck*, both engraved by F. X. Habermann, sold for USD 900. On 23rd November 1999 at Jürg Stuker, Bern, Lot 8552—*Der Einzug der Königlichen Völcker in Neu Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann, sold for CHF 320, or USD 205. On 23rd November 1999 at Jürg Stuker, Bern, Lot 8553—*Die Anlündung der Englischen Trouppen zu Neu Yorck*, engraved by F. X. Habermann, sold for CHF 320, or USD 205.

The sense of bemusement that emanates from scholarship announcing that views labelled as New York are actually of other places stems from a lack of understanding of the eighteenth-century print trade. Little has been written on the extensive movement of engravings around Europe in this period. In his recent book, *The English Print, 1688-1802* (1997), Timothy Clayton makes a sustained effort to fill the gap from the English perspective. It was common for prints by William Woollett, Jean Barbault (1719-1762), Nicolas-Marie Ozanne (1728-1811), Alexis Nicolas Perignon (1726-1782), and Jacques Rigaud (1681-1754) to be in the hands of Augsburg printers and publishers like Leizelt. As Clayton writes:

“Copies of English prints had been published at Augsburg, one of the traditional centres of the print trade in Germany, since the 1750s. Perspective views were the first fad, produced by publishers such as Josef Carmine, . . . Dominic Fietta the Augsburg agent for Remondini of Bassano, and even the official shop of the Imperial Academy.”³⁷

By employing a “team of engravers,” Clayton notes, equally prominent publishers in England, including the Bowles family of London, “kept abreast of all publishing developments in the period and distributed or pirated most promising designs published by others.”³⁸ He adds: “They had a network of contacts in the provinces, colonies and in Europe and to an increasing extent their business was directed to the middling kind of buyer and to wide distribution.”³⁹ Louis Fagan provides an insight into the kind of money involved in these transactions when, in the *Catalogue of the Engraved Works, etc. of William Woollett* (1885), he writes:

“William Woollett’s first work of importance was ‘Niobe’ (no. 81), after Richard Wilson. It appeared in 1761. The agreement made with the publisher, John Boydell, for this plate was one hundred guineas, this

³⁷ Timothy Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 274.

³⁸ Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802*, p. 105.

³⁹ Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802*, p. 106.

sum, however, was augmented to one hundred and twenty guineas. It is said that the publisher cleared £2,000.”⁴⁰

As Samuel Redgrave notes in *A Dictionary of Artists of the English School* (1874), Woollett’s “were the first English engravings that gained notice on the Continent, while Hogarth’s were not understood out of England.”⁴¹ Not only did Augsburg printers begin publishing optical views ahead of their counterparts in London, but the city’s late eighteenth-century affluence meant that first-hand visual sources were easy to come by. Even the contemporary calling cards of English publishers, like Gerard Vandergucht (c. 1698-1777) of Grosvenor Square in London, advertised that “he sold ‘all Sorts of Italian, Dutch, French and Flemish Prints & Drawings; both of the Antient & Modern Masters.’”⁴² If London facts are anything to go by— “Between 1725 (when prints were separated from pictures) and 1732 the biggest supplier [of prints to England] was Italy, followed (except in 1729 and 1730) by France, then Holland, and by much smaller totals from Flanders and Germany. The number of prints imported between 1725 and 1730 was 31,789 from Italy, 18,841 from France and 13,648 from Holland”—and keeping in mind that it was nearly half a century later that Habermann and Leizelt were engraving views of North America, there is no doubt that they had stacks of models to select from.⁴³ On practices in Paris, Alfred Bonnardot commented that the printmakers “set about to procure or to utilize thousands of views of monuments or cities, which rested under the dust of their shops.”⁴⁴

At the time when Habermann and Leizelt were working, English prints had

⁴⁰ Louis Fagan, *Catalogue of the Engraved Works, etc. of William Woollett*, Catalogues of exhibitions, no. 36 (London: Fine Art Society, 1885), p. 6.

⁴¹ Samuel Redgrave, *A Dictionary of Artists of the English School: Painters, Sculptors, Architects, Engravers, and Ornamentists* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), p. 461.

⁴² Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802*, p. 113.

⁴³ Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802*, p. 25.

⁴⁴ Cited in Weitenkampf, “Peep-Show Prints,” p. 359. See Alfred Bonnardot, *Histoire artistique et archéologique de la gravure en France* (etc.) (Paris, 1849).

gone from being the least to most desirable. Could Leizelt's depiction of New York City as an English subject be attributed to: (i) fashion-consciousness, (ii) experience that a long-time involvement in the trade secured, and/or (iii) a taxonomy that necessitated an English colony being drawn exclusively from English sources? Habermann came to the discipline later and was arguably less exacting. Does this explain why New York City is portrayed as "veneto-austriaco-bavarese" as English? Or for Habermann, were visual tropes just that—visually not nationalistically dependent? Though it is true to say that his views are uncompromisingly not French, and not Dutch either. Unlike conventional histories, they are not constructed around the representation of one nationality's control. For his engravings of Isfahan in the "Collection des Prospects," Habermann went no further than the local artist Johann Wilhelm Baur. Just like Leizelt, Habermann renamed the views of one city those of another. Both *Vue du Pallais du l'Empereur de Perse avec la Mosquée, ou Eglise a Ispahan*, and *Vue des Logges terraines, ou des Allees du Jardin du l'Empereur de Perse avec des Fontaines en haute, a Ispahan*, include the notation, "desine d'apres Nature par Guilielm Baur et fait en Estampe par Francois Xav. Habermann." (Figures 1.45, 1.46) It did not take a superhuman effort, following Habermann's attribution, to locate two almost identical engravings in Baur's *Iconographia* (1670) that are purportedly views copied in Italy from other works modelled on the air-ducts and palace forecourt of the Persian King. (Figures 1.47, 1.48)

The engravers of the *guckkastenbilder* were fortunate enough to have first-hand work by countless other artists at their disposal. The use of topographically accurate views by local artists gave authority to the *guckkastenbilder*. In scenes as close to home and as widely known as Charles Percier's and Pierre F. L. Fontaine's architectural commission by Napoleon I, documented in Leizelt's *Vue de la Façade du Louvre du côté de St. Germain de l'Auxerois à Paris*, the engraver adopted a

journalistic role. (Figure 1.49) Local prudence afforded long-range extravagance.⁴⁵ Leizelt's authority was secured by basing views of specific places on first-hand accounts. He readily acknowledged Jean Barbault, Nicolas-Marie Ozanne, and Alexis Nicolas Perignon for topographic views of Italy, France and Switzerland respectively.

Habermann did not engrave a single European view. I have come across only three acknowledged sources in Habermann's *oeuvre*. The first, Johann Wilhelm Baur, I have already mentioned. The second is Jan Nieuhof.⁴⁶ In 1665, Nieuhof published an illustrated account of his travels in the Orient under the title *Het Gezantschap der Neêrlandsche Oost-Indische Compagnie, aan den grooten Tartarischen Cham, Den tegenwoordigen Keizer van China* (etc.).⁴⁷ It is from this collection that Habermann, along with Georg Balthasar Probst's artist P. von Blanckart, sourced material to generate the numerous views of Asia.⁴⁸ Comparing Habermann's engraving, *Vue de Tour Porcellaine a Nancking en Chine*, with Nieuhof's original, *La Tour de Porcelaine*, it is plain to see how Habermann reshaped the scene into one dramatically more intimate, with far fewer figures and an overall simplification of form and detail. (Figures 1.50, 1.51) But more significantly, by extending the foreground and reducing the height of the tower, he gained the three-dimensional space necessary to construct a linear perspective. Similarly, Habermann's *Vüe de Jamcefu* restricted the visual focus of Nieuhof's engraving of Jamcefu not only by foreshortening the entire composition, but by adding a dense, second layer of

⁴⁵ In the holdings of the Städt Kunstsammlungen, Augsburg, alone, there are more than a dozen different "Collection des Prospects" of Augsburg.

⁴⁶ Habermann acknowledged Nieuhof in a Germanised form, Johann Neuhof. I am indebted to Susan Reed, Curator German Printed Books, 1501-1850, at the British Library for tracing this connection from the few clues that I could provide.

⁴⁷ See Jan Nieuhof, *Het Gezantschap der Neêrlandsche Oost-Indische Compagnie, aan den grooten Tartarischen Cham, Den tegenwoordigen Keizer van China* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Jacob van Meurs, 1665).

⁴⁸ On the exchange of cultural information, including an account on the influence of Nieuhof's book, see Joseph Rykwert, *The First Moderns: The Architects of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1991), p. 54-75.

buildings on the print's left-hand side, having the added purpose of Europeanising the fortification. (Figures 1.52, 1.53) In the context of the present work, the engraving is an important example of Habermann's working methods, particularly his propensity to collage from prints at-hand. The prominent building framing the print's left-hand side has clearly been lifted from another Nieuhof engraving copied by Habermann, *Le Cour imperiale chinois a Peckin*. (Figure 1.54) It was no great surprise to discover that Blanckart went to even greater lengths in revising two other Nieuhof engravings. One can see the extent to which Nieuhof's *Straet van Nanking* and *Triomf-Boogh* are dramatically refigured by Blanckart's hand. (Figures 1.55-1.58) The third artist that Habermann cited, documented in the annotation of *Vuë de la Bastion de Gelderland*, was the Kassel engraver Johann Wolfgang Heyd (?-1798). (Figure 1.59) This is all evidence in support of the argument that the models for Habermann's views of New York are likely composites.

VI

A

In this study of illustrative material that attempts to describe the colonial city, we can usefully refer to the mechanisms of children's literature. Were it not for the fact that one cannot disassociate the *guckkastenbilder* from the optical device, it would be tempting to include them among folk art. Clearly these prints do not achieve the level of cultural or social sophistication with the perspective that many of their predecessors realised. However, the pictorial simplification of the *guckkastenbilder* is a consequence of their mass production and the print's transition from conventional work of art into motion picture. This functional transformation forces the suspension of the viewer's customary critical faculty. Each of the print's caricatures is readily apparent, as is appropriate to keep the viewer at least

momentarily involved; to make it worth one's while, or at least the price of the 'peep.' As E. McSherry Fowble commented on Leizelt's *Vuë de Salem*:

"Those customers who bought and enjoyed views for the perspective glass seem to have had little concern for accuracy. Rather, they contented themselves with such amusing details as the reluctant animal being pulled over a narrow board positioned uncertainly over a small ravine, or the haggling that is taking place over goods just unloaded from a boat, or the varied activities to be seen at the nearby boatyards."⁴⁹

Rather than dismissing these views out-of-hand for the fact that they were made for portable optical machines, and diminishing them by the fact that many were well-travelled by "itinerant peddlers" who "let children look into them for a small price," one is drawn to ask how these views acted as an amusement and what was the effect of their widespread appeal?⁵⁰ (Figures 1.60, 1.61) What promise or mystery did they convey? Apart from the occasional and generally inadvertent Neo-classical reference, e.g. the statue of King George III in *La Destruction de la Statuë royale a Nouvelle Yorck*, the protoromanticism of ruins in *Débarquement des Troupes Angloises à Nouvelle Yorck*, and the naturalistic tendencies exhibited by depicting the city at night in *Représentation du feu terrible à nouvelle Yorck*, the engravings could never be accused of being caught-up in late eighteenth-century style.

It is hard to believe that for a phenomenon as recent as the *guckkastenbilder* there is such an industry deciphering how they were used, what class they were used by, and why they were composed as they were.⁵¹ Once it is understood that only

⁴⁹ Fowble, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1680-1880*, p. 246-247.

⁵⁰ Cresswell, "Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton," p. 57.

⁵¹ Even the hands they fell into remains as hotly contested as their authenticity. E. McSherry Fowble, writing on one of Habermann's *Vuë de Boston*, commented that "Perspective glasses probably had their first use in France in the early years of the eighteenth century and may have been a polite mechanical device to aid far-sighted members of a fashion-conscious society in the enjoyment of engravings without resorting to unattractive spectacles." Fowble, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1680-1880*, p. 249. Adhémar writes: "They [optical views] were extremely fashionable in smart society, and eighteenth-century artists often represented L'Optique." Adhémar, *Graphic Art of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 141-142. Bonnardot similarly assured the reader that the *optique* "was not

two of the six New York views published in Augsburg, *Représentation du feu terrible à nouvelle Yorck* and *Vue de la Nouvelle Yorck*, adhere to the “Collection des Prospects” most standard format, one element of which is a narrative description written in German and French and positioned immediately beneath the view, it is clear that no single explanation as to either their use or the author’s intent is entirely sufficient. In “Perspective View,” C. J. Kaldenbach called attention to the fact that “many views have the text not only at the bottom of the print in the normal direction, but also at the top, in reverse (and often in large capitals) so that it can be read when viewed through the optical machine.”⁵² In Kaldenbach’s remark, there is a degree of ambiguity about the role of the printed text that warrants comment. In my view, Kaldenbach failed to conclude that the direction, extent, and nature of the text signals the intended audience of each *guckkastenbilder*. When the print at the bottom of the engraving took the form of a short spiel, it was not intended for the viewer’s private consumption at all. This feature promoted the viewing machine’s operator from backstage hand to “master of ceremonies.”⁵³ Given the competitive commercial arena of the city’s public spaces, the descriptive passages imparted information that the “showman” could knowledgeably impart. The authority seemed to belong to him rather than the engraving.

It is likely that the four other engravings, which have only the slightest elaboration of the print’s title, were either sold directly to the domestic market, or coupled with the other two (though arguably not published simultaneously) to form a series of six for public display, thus alleviating the necessity for an elaborate rhetorical description of each image. The fascination of the eighteenth-century observer with these views revolved around the *deus ex machina*. Once so

a toy created only for children.” Cited in Weitenkampf, “Peep-Show Prints,” p. 360.

⁵² Kaldenbach, “Perspective Views,” p. 88.

⁵³ For a complete description of the conventions governing *guckkastenbilder*, see Wolfgang Seitz, “Augsburg, capitale della grafica in Germania, come centro di produzione delle vedute ottiche,” in Minici, *Il Mondo Nuovo*, p. 69-75.

empowered, to a child, not to mention adult, these are mesmerising, fantastical tales holding their own with the very best adventure literature of the time. In the six views of New York alone, there is royalty arriving, a raging fire, public insurrection, military troops parading, big ships, gothic figures, and so on. To quote Weitenkampf, “what thrilling scenes were witnessed through those peep-holes!”⁵⁴

That the New York *guckkastenbilder* are copies of engravings of other places does not close the book on them. Looking at a single one of the six more closely, *Vue de la Nouvelle Yorck*, alongside its source, *View of the Royal Dock Yard at Deptford*, illustrates the extent of the engraver’s amending processes and the cultural intentions imposed not only by Leizelt, but adopted *prima facie* by his contemporaries. What is New York? Cresswell is unquestionably right: it is a view originating in Deptford’s dockyard. Yet the splicing of Woollett’s engraving utterly transforms the composition. As in children’s literature, *Vue de la Nouvelle Yorck*, without a specific date, is also without a specific place. The view is bustling. It contains all the hallmarks of late eighteenth-century cosmopolitanism. There is plenty to keep one tuned-in and that is after the view has undergone a visible process of rationalisation, changes that actually created the image’s accessibility. Commerce, industry, religion, cultivation, and sophistication are all present—a bourgeoisie and a proletariat—clearly appealing to an adult sensibility. Cresswell writes that the changes to this copy were motivated “with a view to the taste of the times.”⁵⁵ In my view, the expectations of adventure stories, short attention spans, and taste dictated the subject. It is an incomplete scene tempting the viewer to construct the preceding and succeeding events. The architecture and key elements are not documents, but props. The city is an aside for the nature of the conversation and activity among the twenty-four people in the foreground boats. There is an unadvertised event to this one too

⁵⁴ Weitenkampf, “Peep-Show Prints,” p. 364.

⁵⁵ Cresswell, “Late Eighteenth-Century American Harbor Views Derived from Joseph Vernet and Richard Paton,” p. 58.

and it is appealing to the chattering classes. On top of which the secondary figures are all involved in specific pursuits. These activities translate into countless tales. They combine to leave the viewer making personal associations and, as in a novel, constructing their own city.

B

Unlike the city images published by their nearest forerunners—Georg Braun (1541-1622) and Frans Hogenberg (1535-1590), Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598), and Johannes Blaeu (1598-1673)—these views were cheap, printed in large quantities, and accessible to a much broader cross-section of the population.⁵⁶ Their projections, proliferation, and popularity must make them the single most influential medium shaping public opinion on urban design and current events in the New World. The *guckkastenbilder* are the only contemporary visual statements produced in Europe of Revolutionary occurrences in New York. It was not until well after the War of 1812 that further representations appeared. Therefore, they warrant having asked of them how the idea of America was imagined in the middle of Europe? From William Hogarth (1697-1764) to George Cruikshank (1792-1878), optical views have been portrayed as a staple of public amusement, a point of view which has led contemporary scholars down a facile garden path. Why are the six views of New York, unlike all of their North American counterparts, so event-driven? Colonial New York was conservatism's stronghold; nonetheless, the grandiosity of its sovereign projection is remarkable. In Ingrid Rowland's terms, the insights of optical technology "lent strength to the Neoplatonic idea that our physical sense of sight penetrated no further than 'through a glass, darkly.' Reality clearly lay somewhere else, far beyond the capacities of the naked eye. Art, that supreme figment of sight,

⁵⁶ See Georg Braun and Frans Hogenberg, *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1572-1617); Abraham Ortelius, *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1570); and Johannes Blaeu, *Theatrum orbis terrarum* (1641-1655).

drove the point home by creating layers of meaning.”⁵⁷ Ascribing an order to these views by the dates of the individual events they reputedly depict, the six construct a short, but highly-charged political narrative. The American is consistently portrayed as a barbarian. Even in events that are now legendary in American textbooks for Revolutionary vainglory, the emphasis of these six prints is carefully constructed around European, and particularly English cultural imperialism.⁵⁸ Accordingly, the city is depicted as the site of an epic struggle over political, social, and cultural values.

The *guckkastenbilder* occupied a political role. It is insufficient to wrap the six views of colonial New York under a common cloak, like the one that Jean Adhémar used when describing the optical views published in France—“These views were a manifestation of the fascination exercised by distant lands and theatrical fantasies during the century of the *Encyclopédie*—they helped to develop a feeling for the exotic.”⁵⁹ There should be no argument in acknowledging that book publishers were doing that equally as well, if not better, and not in a European costume. For economic reasons alone, it would appear that the artists and publishers had more at stake in these views of North America, than in ones of Isfahan, Peking, and Jamcefu. Is this why the views are familiar? In “The Statue of King George III in New York and the Iconology of Regicide” (1981), Arthur S. Marks forges a compelling relationship between the subject of Habermann’s *La Destruction de la Statuë royale a*

⁵⁷ Ingrid D. Rowland, “Through a Glass, Darkly,” in *The New York Review of Books*, vol. 49, no. 3 (February 28, 2002), p. 14, pp. 10-14.

⁵⁸ While peremptory for the present essay, in “The Statue of King George III in New York and the Iconology of Regicide” Arthur S. Marks comes to the same broad conclusion, albeit from a more political position than the present essay supports. He writes: “The entire set purportedly shows several occurrences from the recently-commenced war in America, all of which had occurred in New York. Also, all were probably conceived of in support of the English or, more broadly, the royalist position, for besides the plate showing the dastardly mob in their exotic garb, which was probably intended to identify them as Americans pulling down the king’s statue . . . certainly, none of the prints celebrated any American achievements.” See Arthur S. Marks, “The Statue of King George III in New York and the Iconology of Regicide,” in *The American Art Journal*, vol. 13, no. 3 (Summer 1981), p. 74, pp. 61-82.

⁵⁹ Adhémar, *Graphic Art of the Eighteenth Century*, p. 142.

Nouvelle Yorck and contemporary European events. “Becoming not the portrayal of a rebellious and contemptible act, but rather a symbolic delineation of the necessary conclusion to a despotic reign,”⁶⁰ Marks shows how Habermann’s image “could be considered as the representation of what was becoming for many, an acceptable—even commendable— means for social change as the century progressed, the popular overthrow of a monarch, tinged with a cathartic touch of violence. . . . There were persons in places such as France and Germany for whom this vitality continuously gained in importance, for increasingly they saw in the American example a model for their own national aspirations.”⁶¹ The colony is an all but culturally equivalent mirror-image of the coloniser. Arguably, the only difference between *L’Entré triumpnale de Troupes royales a Nouvelle Yorck* and any one of the many views that Leizelt engraved of Augsburg at nearly the same time, e.g. *Vue de la fontaine de Mercure à la place du marché aux vins à Augsbourg*, was the ground plane. (Figure 1.62) In the former it is dirt. In the latter, two finished surfaces discriminate between the public street and sidewalk. Apart from this sole example, the spatio-temporal tradition that conventionally signalled the colonial society’s inferiority, typically by virtue of cultural history and wealth, was overturned.

But for what purpose? Was it intentional? If these views were for export to Great Britain, it is easy to suggest that the “proto-Royalist” narrative filled an economic agenda. But how could this be so when Habermann made certain that the very nationalist he was presumably courting would have to stomach an image that imitated a middle-European city. With Quebec falling to the English in 1759, all of New France by 1763, at which point North America was almost entirely in the hands of the English, these engravings cloaked the events surrounding the American Revolution and the image of the North American city in an immutable pan-European

⁶⁰ Marks, “The Statue of King George III in New York and the Iconology of Regicide,” p. 75.

⁶¹ Marks, “The Statue of King George III in New York and the Iconology of Regicide,” p. 75-76.

rhetoric.

VII

A quarter of a century after the publication of the six New York *guckkastenbilder*, the “lads of Kilkenny,” also known as the “nine worthies,” burst on to the social and literary scene in New York City, led by the hyperbolic declarations of Washington Irving (1783-1859). How have the histrionics of these six engravings not been seen as a precursor to Irving’s *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty* (1809)? From Antoine Étienne Fontaney (1803-1837) to Martin Roth, the influences on Irving’s *History* have been pronounced to be literary figures—most commonly François Rabelais (c. 1490-1553) and Laurence Sterne (1713-1768). These comparisons come at the expense of understanding the novel’s role in the wider context of colonial New York’s material history. Even bearing in mind the views’ iconographic extremism, the *guckkastenbilder* are not in Irving’s satirical class. However, seen alongside the “burlesque history” narrated by Irving’s anti-hero, Diedrich Knickerbocker, one cannot fail to see the two genres’ similarities. Most notably, to what extent is the “historian” involved in either Irving’s, Leizelt’s, or Habermann’s antithetical distortions?

They each undo the tedium that history has visually and textually wrought by accrediting the colonial enterprise a larger significance in the American psyche. Writing about Irving, Martin Roth might just as well have been writing about the six *guckkastenbilder* when he comments:

“The act of creating a festive and ceremonial America, where history had only been able to produce a solemn and industrious civilization, and where jollity again suffers the inevitable defeat in the face of gloom, would probably have forced even a lesser writer to explore in his fiction

the content and meaning of American civilization.”⁶²

Leizelt’s and Habermann’s motives are not nearly as easily deciphered as Irving’s who clearly “demanded that the historian, in order to serve his culture well, must be its mythographer.”⁶³ Nonetheless, in each a “mad solipsism” of whimsy results in grotesque images that have lasting cultural effects.

My principal intentions have been fourfold: (i) to clarify the sources of Leizelt’s and Habermann’s New York *guckkastenbilder*; (ii) to investigate the practices and motives governing this brief, but popular and influential print type; (iii) to highlight the teleology of these engravings in the canon of city views, and to investigate their role in the emergence of Enlightenment’s civic ideology; and (iv) to present the social and political agenda which make these images, like Irving’s depiction of the colonial city, irrepressible artefacts raising key questions about one generation’s comprehension of colonialism. One is up-to-date.

⁶² Martin Roth, *Comedy and America: The Lost World of Washington Irving* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1976), p. 114-115.

⁶³ Roth, *Comedy and America*, p. 147.

CHAPTER 2 THE 'WONDER-LESS' IMAGE OF THE CITY:
REPRESENTATIONS OF NEW AMSTERDAM IN THE 19TH
AND 20TH CENTURY

“He [Herman Melville] came as a lamb
to the slaughter, with no suspicion that
the city of New York was a literary
butcher shop.”

Perry Miller, *The Raven and the Whale: Poe, Melville, and the New York Literary Scene*, (1956) 1997, p. 7

“Does an old New Yorker who likes his
city, and whose sympathetic imagination
enables him to reconstruct, with the aid
of pictures, the very spirit of the city in
the days even antedating his own
experience—does he worry all too much
about the excellence of the work of the
draughtsman and engraver?”

Frank Weitenkampf, *The Eno Collection of New York City Views*, 1925, p. 7

“As we know, the great obsession of the
nineteenth century was history: themes
of development and arrest, themes of
crisis and cycle, themes of accumulation
of the past, a great overload of dead
people, the threat of global cooling. The
second principle of thermodynamics
supplied the nineteenth century with the
essential core of its mythological
resources.”

Michel Foucault, “Different Spaces,” in
Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology,
ed. James D. Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley,
(1984) 1998, p. 178

The present work is the second half of an enquiry into the visual
representation of colonial New York. In the previous chapter, the reader was asked
not only to consider the six late eighteenth-century New York *guckkastenbilder*

alongside Washington Irving's (1783-1859) *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty* (1809), but perhaps more significantly, to recognise the wide-ranging cultural, political and commercial effects of the European projection which positioned the colonial city in a visual lineage to Vitruvius. This chapter surveys the American response.

There is no shortage of exponents of the literary form of realism with which nineteenth and early twentieth-century depictions of New Amsterdam have been ultimately associated. Representations of the Dutch colonial city can be loosely divided into three categories: (i) cultural scenes informed by popular seventeenth-century imagery for widespread consumption, (ii) illustrated children's literature caricaturing primary material, and (iii) historical genre painting for exhibition and sale. The present work concentrates on the first two categories, or in other words, on the connection between published texts, whether literary or historical, and the images commissioned to illustrate them.¹ For although more renowned artists (B-list all the same), including Asher B. Durand (1796-1886), William Mulready (1786-1863), and Robert Walter Weir (1803-1889) produced literary genre scenes based on these same texts, it is the widespread consumability and dissemination of the printed word, and the connected visual image, that has been instrumental in cementing the belittling impression of the colonial city.² This condition is as much a result of the intelligentsia's deference to the binary opposition of colonial discourse as it is to the populist's exploitation of it. The images that the present work has collected to

¹ On the specific subject of historical genre painting, see William H. Truettner, "The Art of History: American Exploration and Discovery Scenes, 1840-1860," in *The American Art Journal*, vol. 14, no. 1 (Winter 1982), pp. 4-31, and the excellent list of references that Truettner cites.

² To give a general idea of publication quantities, it is stated at the front of the 1868 edition of the *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York*: "Resolved, That the Clerk of the Common Council be, and he is hereby, directed to prepare and compile the Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York, for the year 1868, that fifteen thousand copies thereof be printed and appropriated for public distribution as follows: Five hundred copies for his Honor the Mayor, Four thousand five hundred copies for the Clerk of the Common Council, and Five thousand each for the Boards of Aldermen and Councilmen." Joseph Shannon, *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York, 1868* (New York: E. Jones & Co., 1869).

exemplify the first category can be further divided into three groups: (i) those illustrating Irving's *A History of New York*, (ii) those illustrating David T. Valentine's *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York* (1841-1866), who in this informal profile emerges not only as New York City's mid nineteenth-century historiographic kingpin, but as its chief colonial fabricator, and (iii) all others, composed principally of prints in the collection of the New York Public Library Print Room and the Museum of the City of New York; together with images from six books: Mary Louise Booth's *History of the City of New York, from Its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (1859), Julia Maria Colton's *Annals of Old Manhattan, 1609-1664* (1901), Maud Wilder Goodwin's *Historic New York: Being the first series of the Half Moon papers* (1897), John H. Innes's *New Amsterdam and Its People* (1902), Martha J. Lamb's *History of the City of New York: Its Origin, Rise, and Progress* (1877-1880), and David Thomas Valentine's *History of the City of New York* (1853).³ The lion's share of images in these six books were either copies or slightly altered versions of those in Irving's *History* and Valentine's *Manual*, often with titles adapted to suit each author's particular purpose. In *The Old Booksellers of New York and Other Papers* (1895), William Loring Andrews writes: "The lithographic plates in Valentine's 'Manual,' which earlier collectors affected to despise and hesitated to use, have become Hobson's choice with the 'extra illustrator' of this fair city of Gotham of today."⁴ Besides their inclusion in both satirical and serious city histories, nineteenth and twentieth-century colonial images also found an application on magazine covers, e.g. "Winter Days in New Amsterdam" (c. 1905), postcards, e.g. "New Amsterdam becomes New York" (1914), calendars, and so on. (Figures 2.1, 2.2) In contrast to the *guckkastenbilder*, their visual message has received widespread purchase, almost as if they were historical documents.

³ Author's note: David T. Valentine is the subject of a larger research project focused on his tenure as Clerk of the Common Council (1837-1868) and his authorship of several histories of New York City, including the *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York* (1841-1866).

⁴ William Loring Andrews, *The Old Booksellers of New York and Other Papers* (New York, 1895), p. 44.

The objective of the present chapter is to undertake an in-depth analysis of this array of prints; however, that study is not without its lighter side. Who can fail to be amused by the prints' absurdity, aesthetic derangement, and self-conscious attempt at authenticity? By dismantling the urban, architectural, aesthetic, and authorial legitimacy of these popular and pervasive illustrations, my aim is to stress print culture's spatiotemporal dimensions, despite the tendency of these dimensions to be overwritten by the linearity of type and obscured by its abstraction as 'text,' and to underline the misconception surrounding many common premises of the nineteenth and twentieth-century colonial canon. Ultimately, this chapter, as with the previous one, serves to illustrate how images have consistently been the pawns of historians' theses. How does this impact upon our perceptions of colonialism's agenda?

I

What has New Amsterdam been thought to have been? Let us begin by considering one of the many culprits responsible for the aesthetic, and consequently historiographic and intellectual entrapment of New Amsterdam—*Lower Broadway in 1650* (c. 1919), painted by C. W. Jefferys (1869-1951). (Figure 2.3) The image is intent on fixing the viewer's gaze upon the painting's excessiveness. It invents a 'fictional narrative space' by intertwining specific passages from the corresponding text—"Dutch and English on the Hudson" (1919), by Maud Wilder Goodwin (1856-1935). On page 103, Goodwin writes:

"The cowherd drove the cows afield and home again at milking-time, and it was his business to sound his horn at every gate announcing the safe return of the cows. Correspondingly, in the morning the harsh summons called the cattle from every yard to join the procession toward the

meadows.”⁵

On pages 105-106, she continues:

“As prosperity increased, all conditions of living improved. Many ships from Holland brought loads of brick and tiles as ballast, and the houses began to assume the typical Dutch aspect. They were still built chiefly of wood, but with a gable end of brick facing the street. The house was supplied . . . with ‘an abundance of large doors and small windows on every floor . . . and on top of the roof was perched a fierce little weather-cock . . .’”⁶

Finally, on pages 107-108:

“It was of course the ‘great burghers’ who set the social as well as the official tone in New Amsterdam. . . It was they whose wives were bravely fitted out with petticoats, over which an upper garment was looped to display the velvet, cloth, silk, or satin which marked the social position and material wealth of the wearer. The burgher himself went clad, according to his wealth, in cloaks of cloth or velvet, embroidered or silk-lined; but he always wore wide boots and wide breeches and a coat adorned with an abundance of buttons, the whole topped by a broad-brimmed hat adorned with buckles and feathers and seldom removed in the house. The dress of farmers was simpler than that of the town-dwellers or burghers. It consisted generally of wide breeches, a *hemdrok* or shirt-coat made of wool or cotton, an overfrock called a *paltsrok*, a low flat collar, the usual wide-brimmed hat, and shoes of leather on Sundays, and of wood on week-days for work on the *bouwerie*.”⁷

On the surface, these incursions into legends, tectonics, aesthetics, fashion, and class, seem to exemplify a benign complicity between the illustrator and author in the construction of the colonial cityscape. Leaving to one side the fact that Goodwin’s description is hardly more than a short-hand version of circumstances described by Mary Louise Booth (1831-1889) in *History of the City of New York*, by working

⁵ Maud Wilder Goodwin, “Dutch and English on the Hudson,” in *Dutch and Quakers*, Volume 5: The Chronicles of America Series, ed. Allen Johnson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919), p. 103.

⁶ Goodwin, “Dutch and English on the Hudson,” p. 105-106.

⁷ Goodwin, “Dutch and English on the Hudson,” p. 107-108.

according to each other's *métier* Jefferys's and Goodwin's collaboration is a typical example of how New Amsterdam's social and aesthetic history was vigorously concocted between 1824 to 1919⁸—that is to say, from the first illustrated edition of Washington Irving's *A History of New York* (1824), not surprisingly illustrated by Irving's long-time friend, confidant, and English representative Charles Robert Leslie (1794-1859), up to and including Goodwin's "Dutch and English on the Hudson," which in the climate following the publication of I. N. Phelps Stokes's *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928) must have been regarded as an intensely outmoded essay.⁹ How was it that Irving's conservatism became the force shaping the city's colonial historiography and not 'Gibbon's Rome'?¹⁰ By the first part of the twentieth century, the trend for commissioning illustrators to embellish literary histories had waned. That is not to say that the stockpile of nineteenth-century images have not been used, or that other methods equally as insidious have not been devised: they have.

Setting to one side the profusion of proselytising pictures books published in the last few years—including Ric Burns's, James Sanders's and Lisa Ades's *New*

⁸ By comparison to the quotation cited on pages 105-106 of Goodwin's "Dutch and English on the Hudson," and a comparable passage in Booth, one also finds the following, similarly pictorial statement in Irving—"The houses of the higher class, were generally constructed of wood, excepting the gable end, which was of small black and yellow Dutch bricks, and always faced on the street . . . The house was always furnished with abundance of large doors and small windows on every floor . . . and on the top of the roof was perched a fierce little weather-cock . . ." See Washington Irving, *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty*, in Washington Irving, *History, Tales and Sketches*, ed. James W. Tuttleton (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1983), p. 477.

⁹ It should be noted that Stokes was not immune to the charms of colonial depictions. In his far less highbrow, officially approved publication for the New York World's Fair 1939, *New York Past and Present: Its History and Landmarks, 1524-1939* (1939), Stokes includes an outlandish series of dioramas, produced in 1932 by Dwight Franklin for the Museum of the City of New York, that purport to depict key colonial events. On the subject of the dioramas that Dwight Franklin and his assistant Ned Burns produced for the Museum of the City of New York, see Max Page, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999), p. 165-170.

¹⁰ As Irving writes: "And here have I, as before observed, carefully collected, collated and arranged them; scrip and scrap, 'punt en punt, gat en gat,' and commenced in this little work, a history which may serve as a foundation, on which a host of worthies shall hereafter raise a noble superstructure, swelling in the process of time, until *Knickerbocker's New York* shall be equally voluminous, with *Gibbon's Rome*, or *Hume and Smollet's England*." Irving, *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty*, p. 381.

York: An Illustrated History (1999), Gloria Deák's *Picturing New York: The City from Its Beginnings to the Present* (2000), and Howard B. Rock's and Deborah Dash Moore's *Cityscapes: A History of New York in Images* (2001), among others—can one look on the reputed empirical high-ground, as in David Steven Cohen's essay "How Dutch Were the Dutch of New Netherland?" (1981) or Oliver A. Rink's "Company Management or Private Trade: The Two Patroonship Plans for New Netherland" (1978), with anything other than suspicion while these authors reprint caricature images?¹¹ In Cohen's case, one is led to believe that the author reprinted the *Walloon landing in Albany* from Henry G. Bayer's rather more erudite history, *The Belgians* (1925), than from either Booth's or Lamb's appreciably more populist account of New York's beginning. (Figure 2.4) Rink confesses to borrowing *Commercial beginnings of New York* from "The Dutch on Manhattan," in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (1854), in which, as a point of interest, another version of the *Landing of the Walloons* featured (notably, not necessarily in Albany).¹² (Figures 2.5, 2.6) Does this signify that late twentieth-century historical empiricism in New York has been a vainglorious project to legitimise the rhetoric of the city's nineteenth-century historians?

Returning to *Lower Broadway in 1650*, the image's 'historical conspiracy' hinges on the fictional place. The implausibility of Jefferys's view is declared by the illustration's single cartographic reference, its title. In the text, each event that the image represents occurs at a different time of the day, and the sun, according to the geographical position ascribed by the view, follows an altogether unnavigable path. The appointment of a specific date, 1650, intimates Protestant industry to the

¹¹ See Oliver A. Rink, "Company Management or Private Trade: The Two Patroonship Plans for New Netherland," in *New York History* (January 1978), pp. 5-26; and David Steven Cohen, "How Dutch Were the Dutch of New Netherland?," in *New York History*, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1981), pp. 43-60.

¹² See also, Oliver A. Rink, "Private Interest and Godly Gain: The West India Company and the Dutch Reformed Church in New Netherland, 1624-1664," in *New York History*, vol. 75, no. 3 (July 1994), pp. 245-264. In this essay, Rink outdoes himself. He includes four nineteenth-century depictions—three of the colony and one of Kiliaen van Rensselaer.

extreme, but not a trace of Calvinistic piety is discernible in the individuals disporting themselves on the terrace. Perhaps appealing to arcadian stereotypes, the figures suggest an economy of leisure rather than labour, the couple in the right foreground a diminished version of Willem Buytewech's *Elegant Couples Courting* (c. 1617-1620). (Figure 2.7) The portrayal of an accelerated colonial race toward European civility, evident not only iconographically but in the painting's eastward focus, is dependent on the tempering of both discourse and figure in the nineteenth century. Using the same conventional representations of civility as European models, while guarding against prosperity, these illustrations exude a *humanitas* debased from its eighteenth-century form to denote little more than politeness or civility. If one considers the three constituent parts of the image in isolation—individual, landscape, and building—the individual is nobody, not a humanist, and not either barbarous, or divine. Likewise, the role of nature, as the measure of landscape and building, is neither divine, nor artificial. These depictions are individually and cumulatively 'speechless.' On top of the image's architectural myth-making, understandably absent is any disproportion, tension, ambiguity, or analogical precariousness that may have arisen by acknowledging the reputedly extreme natural conditions, including "forests with towering stands of walnut, cedar, chestnut, maple, and oak," "schools of playful whales, seals, and porpoises," "twelve-inch oysters and six-foot lobsters," and "blackbirds roosted together in such numbers that one hunter killed 170 with a single shot; another bagged eleven sixteen-pound gray geese in the same way;" although in general terms the waiflike geese modestly appeal to the popular idea of the territory's medicinal property.¹³

Nineteenth and early twentieth-century colonial histories not only ceded New Amsterdam to a mimetic model of the Dutch, but also to equally pedantic,

¹³ Cited in Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 3-4. See also, J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953).

stereotypical forms of utopia and the picturesque. The ‘fictional narrative space’ constructed by modern illustrators is comprised of these three typological motifs, fabricated out of the diegetic horizon between figure and discourse. In *Broad Street, 1642* (c. 1897), as in Jefferys’s view, the prototypical utopic conditions, including a population removed of all strangers, a favourable climate, and the image of the sun as an ‘elliptical metaphor,’ are all present.¹⁴ (Figure 2.8) Comparing *The River and Dock Front, about 1642* (c. 1897) with the city’s only extant seventeenth-century survey, *The Towne of New-York* (c. 1664-1668), it is plain to see that the illustrator forsook any claim to cartographic precision by grossly foreshortening and remodelling the East River cityscape. (Figures 2.9, 2.10) The ‘slippage’ produced by the ambivalence between *ichnographia* and *scenographia* does not merely rupture the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a “partial presence.”¹⁵ Less in perfecting the manner of Claes Jansz. Visscher’s (1587-1652) elaborate and sophisticated topographic views of Amsterdam, with which the city is often compared, and more like those in seventeenth-century emblem-books, the viewmaker’s intent was clearly to: (i) organise the image around a centrepiece, in this case focused on a representation of the Stadt Huys, and (ii) create an artificial density replicating an archetypal Dutch town. The production of views dating back to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, like ones of *Enckhüsen* (Enkhuizen) and *Avenna* (Avesnes) in Daniel Meisner’s *Thesaurus Philo-Politicus* (1625), can be felt to anticipate these illustrators’ emphasis on the literary syllogism. (Figures 2.11, 2.12) Views like *De Stadt van Haerlem* (1596) and *Rotterdam* (c. 1600) provide evidence for the way that

¹⁴ See “Utopian Urban Planning,” in Robert Klein, *Form and Meaning: Essays on the Renaissance and Modern Art* (New York: The Viking Press, 1979), p. 89-101.

¹⁵ According to Vitruvius: “A groundplan [*ichnographia*] is made by the proper successive use of compasses and rule, through which we get outlines for the plane surfaces of buildings. An elevation [*orthographia*] is a picture of the front of a building, set upright and properly drawn in the proportions of the contemplated work. Perspective [*scenographia*] is the method of sketching a front with the sides withdrawing into the background, the lines all meeting in the centre of a circle.” See Vitruvius, *The Ten Books on Architecture*, tr. Morris Hicky Morgan (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 14.

the nineteenth-century viewmaker adopted a seventeenth-century illustrative manner as another means of authenticating the image.¹⁶ (Figures 2.13, 2.14) As nineteenth-century views of New Amsterdam were almost always fragments concealing the absence of a centre, while continuing to substantiate the colonial association with Amsterdam as a city of abundant vistas, this topographical view is doubly unusual. The organisation of the illustration's specific parts, by a predisposed mathematicisation of cultural elements, forces them into a 'fictional space,' simultaneously upsetting their literary pretensions. Likewise, nineteenth-century illustrations are drawn from a detached position, typifying the role of the historian portraying the unrecoverable 'lost' object.¹⁷

II

If as Homi Bhabha writes: "colonialism takes power in the name of history, it repeatedly exercises its authority through the figures of farce," in New Amsterdam this mission is carried-out two centuries *post factum* by a group unconcerned with self-representation.¹⁸ In *A History of New York* Washington Irving incited the nineteenth-century historiographic cavalcade and cast the mould for the caricatured aestheticisation of New Amsterdam. If it was not for the sheer fact that at the time of his death no less than sixty-three separate versions of his work, including five

¹⁶ Author's note: *De Stadt van Haerlem* was published in 1596 by Gillis Rooman. Correspondence with Frans Tames, Conservator, Kennemer Atlas, Haarlem, uncovered the following genealogical information on Rooman—"In the birth- and death-data . . . was listed the birth of a boy named Adrianus as a son of some Gillis Roman from Gent. Perhaps the publisher Gillis Rooman was born in Gent in Belgium and came to Haarlem in the turbulent times of the late 16th century. The Adrianus can be the publisher Adriaen Rooman, who published the history of Haarlem by Samuel Ampzing in 1628 (with the illustrations by v.d. Velde and Saenredam). Some Adriaen Roman from Haarlem got at least two sons, Gillis (in 1612) and Adriaen (in 1615), so that last Gillis can be the grandson of the Gillis from Gent."

¹⁷ By lifting the viewer out of the picture plane, the illustrator removes himself from association with the *vedutisti*, "their main objective in the application of architectural perspective being—"the better to deceive him who looks." See Giuliano Briganti, *The View Painters of Europe*, tr. Pamela Waley (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1970), p. 2.

¹⁸ Homi Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," in Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 85.

different illustrators with at least double that number of engravers, had flooded bookshelves world-wide, then one should look to the effect of his statement “To the Public:”

“Like the great Father of History . . . I treat of times long past, over which the twilight of uncertainty had already thrown its shadows, and the night of forgetfulness was about to descend. With great solicitude had I long beheld the early history of this venerable and ancient city, gradually slipping from our grasp, trembling on the lips of narrative old age, and day by day dropping piece meal into the tomb.”¹⁹

He continues by declaring: “like my revered prototype Herodotus, where no written records could be found, I have endeavoured to continue the chain of history by well authenticated traditions.”²⁰ The formula for that model was famously proclaimed two years previously in the first number of *Salmagundi* (1807) when Irving and James Kirke Paulding (1778-1860) write:

“we *care* not what the public think of us . . . we write for no other earthly purpose but to please ourselves . . . for we are laughing philosophers, and clearly of opinion, that wisdom, true wisdom, is a plump, jolly dame . . .”²¹

On one hand, the gallantry of Irving’s ambition was the style of literary worldliness through which he wrote the city’s history. The facetiousness of style, however, cannot disguise his conflicting persona as a conservative *cognoscente*, and the disorientation which the intermingling of rhetorical belittling with moral certitude produced. In a manner dependent on bolstering cultural stereotypes to inflict its

¹⁹ Washington Irving, *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty*, in Washington Irving, *History, Tales and Sketches*, ed. James W. Tuttleton (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1983), p. 377. Author’s note: For a chronological bibliography of the many different editions of Irving’s *History of New York*, see Stanley Thomas Williams, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Washington Irving: A Check List* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 61-69.

²⁰ Irving, *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty*, p. 377.

²¹ Washington Irving, *Salmagundi or, The Whim-Whams and Opinions of Launcelot Langstaff, Esq. & Others*, No.1, Saturday, January 24, 1807, in Irving, *History, Tales and Sketches*, p. 52.

unrepentant conservatism, wit, and irony, abetted by an accomplished list of artists, including Charles Robert Leslie, Washington Allston (1779-1843), William Heath (1795-1840), George Cruikshank (1792-1878), and Felix Octavius Carr Darley (1822-1888), Irving “served up the result with such obtrusive grace and suavity that the . . . reader could feel culturally flattered.”²²

As a voice for contemporary metropolitan culture, the nineteenth and early twentieth-century historian did not “seek merely to describe the emerging metropolis but to manage it, to shape it according to a changing social reality,” which meant fabricating either a Herculean, accommodating, or logical history.²³ The aesthetic style hatched during this time in New York to represent New Amsterdam, from the *Landing of Hendrick Hudson* (after c. 1838) to *The Fall of New Amsterdam* (c. 1900), was a collection of generalisations of seventeenth-century Dutch material culture based on archetypes represented in children’s literature.²⁴ (Figures 2.15, 2.16) At the very centre of the mid-nineteenth century compilatory project, David Thomas Valentine (1801-1869)—“‘Old Uncle David,’ as he was fondly called”²⁵—clerk of the Common Council (1837-1868), involved himself in numerous city history projects, however, none so clandestinely profitable to the author, both financially and socially, as the annual, treasury-bankrolled, publication of the *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York* (1841-1870).²⁶ The *Manuals* became so

²² From Martin Green, *Cities of Light and Sons of the Morning* (1972). Cited in Thomas Bender, *New York Intellect: A History of Intellectual Life in New York City, from 1750 to the Beginnings of Our Own Time* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 133.

²³ Wyn Kelley, *Melville’s City: Literary and Urban Form in Nineteenth-Century New York* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 8.

²⁴ Author’s note: The engraving cited, *Landing of Hendrick Hudson*, is from the Emmet Collection, The New York Public Library. In the collection of the Museum of the City of New York, there is a nearly identical engraving, only bearing the inscription of Johnson, Wilson & Co. Publishers, New York. The acknowledgement by both engravings of Robert Weir’s same-titled painting, dated c. 1838, appears more a calculated attempt to gain unwarranted currency by association than an effort of either to realise any real likeness. See *The Landing of Henry Hudson* in Robert Walter Weir, *Robert Weir: Artist and Teacher of West Point* (West Point: Cadet Fine Arts Forum of the United States Corps of Cadets, 1976).

²⁵ See Obituary: David T. Valentine, in *The New York Times* (February 26, 1869).

²⁶ Conducted by Valentine until 1866, the *Manual* was published by the newly appointed Clerk, Joseph Shannon, in 1868 and 1869, and for the final time in 1870 by Shannon’s successor, John

popular that they were said to have “become almost a necessity among New-Yorkers.”²⁷ The twenty-five copiously illustrated, serialised volumes edited by Valentine contain “a jumbled mass of historical and miscellaneous matter” (mainly an assemblage of official data), including “interesting documents,” and woodcut and lithographic reproductions of old paintings, prints, drawings, and maps that Valentine purported to rescue “from oblivion, to which they were hastening down the stream of time.”²⁸ While he was not the perfunctory rhetorician that his predecessor Washington Irving was, Valentine very similarly states the objective of his project when he writes:

“Taking into consideration the interest with which our local history has always been regarded by our community, and the present rapid progress of the city, which promises soon to obliterate all the natural landmarks of the island, . . . It is providing, for future generations, what we greatly wish had been provided for us; . . .”²⁹

Like Irving and most historians subsequent to Valentine, the majority of visual claims pertaining to Dutch colonialism in New Amsterdam were modern fabrications. It is nothing less than perjury when Valentine writes:

“by establishing a well known medium, through which the relics of the past could be presented to the public, could the many interesting memorials, hidden among the family archives of the descendants of ancient stock, be brought into public notice. It is from such individual

Hardy. These were subsequently revised and expanded under the editorship of Henry Collins Brown as *Valentine's Manual of the City of New York* (1916-1917/18) and then as *Valentine's Manual of Old New-York* (1919-1928). In Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), V: 1828, under the date May 11, 1850, the following is recorded—“The common council directs the comptroller to draw his warrant in favour of David T. Valentine, clerk of the board, for \$300 ‘for extra services in compiling and supervising the publication of the Corporation Manual for the year 1850, . . . and that he be allowed to sell numbers of the said manual, after placing one thousand copies thereof at the disposition of the members of the Common Council.’”

²⁷ See Obituary: David T. Valentine, in *The New York Times* (February 26, 1869).

²⁸ David T. Valentine, ed., *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York, 1845-1846*. Cited in Richard Hoe Lawrence and Otto Hufeland, *Valentine's Manuals: A General Index to the Manuals of the Corporation of the City of New York, 1841-1870* (Harrison, NY: Harbor Hill Books, 1981), p. xxi.

²⁹ David T. Valentine, ed., *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for 1856* (New York: McSpedon & Baker, Printers, 1856), p. 1-2.

resources that many of the views, which have never before been engraved and published, have been furnished; . . .”³⁰

How does that explain what a copy of Bartholomeus van der Helst’s (1613-1670) painting *Vier overlieden van de Amsterdamse Sint-Sebastiaansdoelen* (1653) is doing in Valentine’s 1851 *Manual* as a lithograph by George Hayward re-titled as *Hudson, on his return to Holland received with great welcome by the Merchants and Burgomasters of Amsterdam?* (Figures 2.17, 2.18) It is likely that Hayward’s lithograph was based on Julius M. Quinkhard’s (1736-1776) eighteenth-century drawing after the same painting.³¹ (Figure 2.19) In the 1857 *Manual* Valentine ‘passed-the-buck.’ At the end of “A List of Maps and Other Illustrations, which have appeared in the Manual from its commencement to the present time,” he writes: “The Compiler would most respectfully tender his thanks to William J. Davis, Esq., his antiquarian friend, for valuable pictures of ancient buildings, &c. Also, to the Honorable Francis R. Tillou, for valuable historical reminiscences.”³² Valentine is New York City’s greatest unrecognised mythographer. The sheer scale of the *Manuals*, containing more than one hundred depictions of the Dutch colonial period, makes them the colonial city’s most elaborate visual work.

As against Irving’s collection of eminent artists, Valentine commissioned all of New York’s most prominent publishers and lithographers, including H. R.

³⁰ David T. Valentine, ed., *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for 1856* (New York: McSpedon & Baker, Printers, 1856), p. 1.

³¹ For information pertaining to van der Helst’s painting, Quinkhard’s drawing, and another drawing based on van der Helst’s painting by Jacob Colijn (1614-1686), see M. Carasso-Kok and J. Levy-van Halm, *Schutters in Holland: Kracht en zenuwen van de stad* (Zwolle: Uitgeverij Waanders, 1988). On van der Helst’s painting, see also Alois Riegl, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, intro. Wolfgang Kemp, tr. Evelyn M. Kain and David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999), p 303-306. Records at the Stichting Iconographisch Bureau, The Hague, identify the five sitters in *Vier overlieden van de Amsterdamse Sint-Sebastiaansdoelen* (of the crossbowmen’s guild) as Albert Pater (1602-1659), Joan Blaeu (1596-1673), Frans Banningh Cocq (1605-1655), Jan van de Poll (1597-1678), and Pieter Blaeu (1637-1706).

³² David T. Valentine, ed., *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York for 1857* (New York: Chas. W. Baker, Printer, 1857), p. 571.

Robinson, Sarony, Major & Knapp, A. Brown & Co., Lossing-Barritt, George Hayward & Co., A. Weingärtner's Lithography, and Snyder & Black, to churn-out genre prints of the colonial city. Three of the most frequently employed divided their time between all sorts of subjects and interests—Henry R. Robinson (*fl.* 1833-1851) advertised as a “lithographer, publisher and caricaturist,”³³ and as Harry T. Peters writes: “It is clear from the mass of political cartoons Robinson must have turned out, and from the catalogue entries, that he regarded this as his chief business;”³⁴ George Hayward (*fl.* 1834-1872) advertised as a “practical lithographer, maps, drawings of factories, &c.,”³⁵ and Benson John Lossing (1813-1891), strangely absent from Peters's seminal work, together with William Barritt (*fl.* 1845-1869) advertised as “prepared to execute orders of every kind for Designs, Drawings and Engravings on Wood, such as [here follows an engraving of the Nassau Bank building], Illustrations for Books, Magazines & Circulars . . . and every other kind of Illustration adapted to the art,”³⁶ and is generally regarded, as Lawrence S. Mayo writes, as a “successful popularizer of American history.”³⁷ These were not blue-chip artists; they were commercial hacks. History texts and children's books, along with cartoons, crime prints, turf prints, and so on, were income. The authors were hardly more specialised. In addition to *The Story of the City of New York* (1888), Charles Burr Todd authored *The Story of Washington, the National Capital* (1889), Julia Maria Colton also authored, *Annals of Switzerland* (1897), Maud Wilder Goodwin, *The Colonial Cavalier or Southern Life before the Revolution* (etc.) (1894), Martha Lamb, *The Homes of America* (1879), John William Leonard *The Centennial Review of Cincinnati* (1888), and so on.

³³ See the trade card in Harry Twyford Peters, *America on Stone* (etc.) (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1931), p. 13. Also, see the clipping file for H. R. Robinson held in the Print Room of The New York Public Library.

³⁴ Peters, *America on Stone*, p. 337.

³⁵ Peters, *America on Stone*, p. 211.

³⁶ Sinclair Hamilton, *Early American Book Illustrators and Wood Engravers 1670-1870*, 2 vols. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968), II: 110.

³⁷ Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), XI: 422.

As it pertains to the subject of the present work, how did the businesses of the artists whose images have formed the colonial city's visual legacy operate? In the first instance, were the images commissioned by the author or publisher? Thereafter, were they selected 'off-the-shelf'? Was the copyright retained by the image's publisher? William Loring Andrews (1837-1920) gives a clear indication that it was, when he writes: "Valentine's Manual plates were for years a glut in the market, and so plentiful were they in the print-shops that extra-illustrators avoided them as too commonplace for their purpose . . ." ³⁸ The stock images were widely recopied. Of the Stadt Huys alone one finds no less than four separate, nearly identical editions, all unsigned. (Figures 2.20-2.23) Even more universal, George Hayward's lithograph *Dutch Cottage in New-York, 1679* for Valentine's *Manual* (1853), after an original painting by Mrs. A. M. Scudder, *A Vision of the Northeast Corner of Beaver and Broad Streets in the 1600's* (1845), and bearing an uncanny likeness to many of the Calvinist-inspired late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century prints of the rustic landscape in Holland, has been reprinted in at least half a dozen different states. ³⁹ (Figure 2.24) At the outset of the twentieth century, the local dilettante Samuel Hollyer (1826-1919) vanity published a collection of one hundred and ten etchings in two volumes titled *Old New York Views* (1905-1912), that included numerous views of New Amsterdam all copied from Valentine. ⁴⁰

As with *haute couture*, what goes around comes around. If the divisiveness

³⁸ Lawrence and Hufeland, *Valentine's Manuals*, p. xxvii.

³⁹ See catalogue entry 3112: "Dutch Cottage in Beaver Street, N.Y.C.," in New-York Historical Society, *American Landscape and Genre Paintings in the New-York Historical Society*, 3 vols. (New York: NYHS with G. K. Hall, 1982), III: 336-337. On the subject of the Dutch rustic landscape, see Walter S. Gibson, *Pleasant Places: The Rustic Landscape from Bruegel to Ruisdael* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

⁴⁰ Peters writes of Hollyer: "An engraver of portraits, landscapes, and historical subjects who was also engaged at various times, records Mr. Stauffer, in lithography, photography, and publishing. Born in London in 1826, he first came to the United States in 1851, but twice returned to England, and finally settled in this country in 1866." See Peters, *America on Stone*, p. 222. See also the reference to Hollyer's views in *The Magazine Antiques*, vol. 33 (May 1938), p. 248-249.

between self-proclaimed gentility and barbarism characterised the intellectual milieu of the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century, by the end of the century “it was thought by many that historical writing had changed greatly under the influence of ‘the scientific method,’ Winsor, Henry Adams, and the Johns Hopkins scholars being cited.”⁴¹ Instead, a tide of patriarchal revivalism overtook New York, glossing endlessly on the city’s origins. As Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace comment:

“Noting (with Frederic DePeyster) that ‘the mighty city of today knows little or nothing of our traditions,’ the old guard turned to publicly promoting them. They placed tablets at historic sites, raised commemorative statues in public parks, and in 1889 began publishing *Old New York*, a journal of city history and antiquities. Documentary reclamation projects got underway as well: in 1891 the state legislature authorized verbatim republication of the colonial laws, and in 1894 the Society of Iconophiles set out to publish both contemporary and facsimiles of early views of New York.”⁴²

Umpteen elegiac city histories were published, including Abram C. Dayton’s *Last Days of Knickerbocker Life in New York* (1882), James G. Wilson’s, *The Memorial History of the City of New York* (etc.) (1892), and Alice Morse Earle’s *Colonial Days in Old New York* (1896), on top of those already mentioned and otherwise.

Moreover, hordes of historical journals were introduced, including the Genealogical and Biographical Society’s quarterly *Record* (1870-), Wesley Washington Pasko’s *Old New York* (1889-1891), Morris Coster’s *New Amsterdam Gazette* (1883-1895), Martha J. Lamb’s *Magazine of American History* (1877-1917), the Holland Society’s *De Halve Maen* (1885-), the New York State Historical Association’s *New York History* [known as the *Proceedings* (1901-1919) and as *The Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association* from 1919 until 1932] (1901-), and the *New-York Historical Society Quarterly* [known as the *Quarterly Bulletin* until 1946] (1917-1980). Less than thirty years after the *Manual* ceased to be published, Maud

⁴¹ Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 136.

⁴² Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898*, p. 1083-1084.

Wilder Goodwin in *Historic New York: Being the first series of the Half Moon papers* (1897) incorporated large numbers of Valentine's images. Quickly on her heels came Julia Maria Colton (1848-?) in *Annals of Old Manhattan, 1609-1664* (1901), and John William Leonard (1849-1932) in *History of the City of New York 1609-1909* (etc.) (1910). Colton was the only author to acknowledge her source outright. By this point it should be clear that the nineteenth-century literary historian has been the chief architect of the enduring impression of the colonial cityscape, suggesting that the late twentieth-century academic fashion for interdisciplinarity had its roots in the popular histories of the nineteenth century, if only in the most perfunctory form.

Was the inconsistency in identifying the impression's artist and printing anonymously an attempt to disguise the image's contemporary fabrication? In many cases, particularly Valentine's, the absence of either a signatory or attribution leaves the door ajar for misreading the images as historical records and affords the *laissez-faire* historian the opportunity to take advantage of the ambiguity surrounding the image's provenance. Compliant with the nineteenth-century demand for identity, the image's 'diversion' was based on its effect, while the "ambiguity of the semiotic strategy," maintained by anonymity or concealing the authorship of the works, was complicated by a third figure—the artist's 'liminal presence.'⁴³ The illustrative medium, typically the woodcut, engraving and lithograph, acted in a 'space' between the artist and observer. As Walter Benjamin writes: "With the woodcut graphic art became mechanically reproducible for the first time, long before script became reproducible by print."⁴⁴ By employing this technique is there a purposeful intent to signify a message of antiquity; or, by inciting a rivalry between the text and illustration, is the artist calling to question logocentrism? Benjamin continues:

⁴³ This 'third figure' depends heavily on Umberto Eco's idea of the "Liminal Author." See Umberto Eco, "Between Author and Text," in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 67-88.

⁴⁴ Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, tr. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 218.

“With lithography the technique of reproduction reached an essentially new stage. This much more direct process . . . permitted graphic art for the first time to put its products on the market, not only in large numbers as hitherto, but also in daily changing forms. Lithography enabled graphic art to illustrate everyday life . . .”⁴⁵

With their changed status and ability to be freely reprinted, colonial depictions assumed a public role. As a “work of art” detached from its correlative text and produced by the technique commonly associated with journalism, the depiction gained greater authority from its new-found cultural obligation. In this sense, the nineteenth-century illustration courted the truth accorded the *veduta*, where “*veduta* means all depictions of cities, [and] their streets . . . which can be clearly identified as representing an actual place.”⁴⁶ However, the image’s authority in seventeenth-century pictorial realism was dependent on acknowledging the association between the representation and the mechanical device. The individual alone was an untrustworthy lexicographer.

Something of a cross between David Irving and Robert Moses, Valentine is the subject of irregular, but nonetheless intense debate. On the side of advocacy, it is recorded in the *Proceedings*, dated 2nd January 1852: “The common council appropriates \$250 to procure a portrait of David T. Valentine, clerk of the board, to be placed in the city hall. Valentine, for nearly a quarter of a century, has ‘devoted his superior energies and talent to the service of the city, . . .’”⁴⁷ An engraving by John Rogers (1808-1888) of Charles Wesley Jarvis’s portrait appeared as the frontispiece to the 1863 *Manual*. (Figure 2.25) Valentine’s obituary in *The New York Times* is unfailing in its fealty:

⁴⁵ Benjamin, *Illuminations*, p. 219.

⁴⁶ Rolf Fritz, *Das Stadt-und Strassenbild in der holländischen Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1932). Cited in Carry van Lakerveld, ed., *The Dutch Cityscape in the Seventeenth Century and Its Sources* (Bentveld-Aerdenhout: Uitgeverij Landshoff, 1977), p. 18.

⁴⁷ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, V: 1839.

“He was regarded as an authentic referee on all matters concerning the history of this City, . . . His love of research and accuracy of details gave to his writings on these topics a well-deserved authority. . . His honesty, as well as his urbanity, was proverbial. . . His conduct was always upright and his demeanour reserved, but not austere; although he had a kindly disposition and a heart overflowing with good nature.”⁴⁸

William Loring Andrews notes in his “Introduction” to *An Index to the Illustrations in the Manuals of the Corporation of the City of New York 1841-1870* (1906): “‘Our city’s chronicler’ is the honorable title bestowed upon Mr. David Thomas Valentine by his contemporary . . . Dr. John W. Francis.”⁴⁹ Andrews, the quintessential Renaissance man with his bibliophilic reputation intact even today, would seem to inflate Valentine’s reputation when he writes:

“It was indeed fortunate that a man of antiquarian tastes and imbued with civic love and pride enjoyed the opportunities that fell to the lot of Mr. Valentine under the patronage of our city fathers, . . . Valentine’s “Manuals of the Corporation of the City of New York” are indeed a mine of wealth to every one who is interested in the history of this great city.”⁵⁰

Yet while not explicitly stating his reserve, Andrews might have sought to save a few blushes by identifying the deceptive technique of Valentine’s historiography. He writes:

“For some unknown reason, most of these reproductions are without any indication of the sources from which they were derived. They usually bear merely the inscription ‘copied for D. T. Valentine’s Manual by G. Hayward, 120 Water St.’ et al. So uniform is Mr. Valentine’s practice in this respect that we are led to believe that it was premeditated, but this secretiveness on his part has only served to whet our curiosity, and the genesis of only a very few of the views he reproduced now remains a mystery.”⁵¹

⁴⁸ Obituary: David T. Valentine, in *The New York Times* (February 26, 1869).

⁴⁹ Lawrence and Hufeland, *Valentine’s Manuals*, p. ix.

⁵⁰ Lawrence and Hufeland, *Valentine’s Manuals*, p. xii.

⁵¹ Lawrence and Hufeland, *Valentine’s Manuals*, p. xiii.

John H. Innes was more exacting. In the "Preface" to *New Amsterdam and Its People*, he writes:

"The labors of this gentleman were severe, though not very methodical, and he is entitled to great credit for the mass of materials which he has brought together out of their original obscurity. Mr. Valentine, however, was not very well acquainted with the Dutch language, and, worse than that, he was peculiarly prone to give fanciful explanations to imperfectly understood facts. These sometimes led to the most extraordinary and absurd conclusions."⁵²

Further eroding Valentine's legacy, in *The Encyclopedia of New York City* (1995), Stephen Weinstein adds: "The other major title published under Valentine's name, *History of the City of New York* (1863), was actually the work of his aide William I. Paulding."⁵³

III

There is clearly little to no intellectualism of the colonial subject, either in terms of literature or visually. The bulk of the output from printing firms in the class of historical topographic and genre scenes imitated popular Dutch viewpoints. In comparison to the conventional image of the *Stadt Huys*, take for example *Het Stadhuis te Zaandam* and *Vuë du Doelen*. (Figures 2.26, 2.27) Consider also, George Hayward's lithograph *The Water Gate, Foot of Wall St. New York, 1679*, and his lithograph *No 120 William Street* (a copy of Henry R. Robinson's *The Rigging House, 120 William Street . . . Sept. 1846*) for Valentine's *Manual* (1850). (Figures 2.28, 2.29) In addition to indicating that Valentine collected as well as commissioned colonial depictions with equal vigour, *No 120 William Street* illustrates an

⁵² John H. Innes, *New Amsterdam and Its People* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), p. vi.

⁵³ Kenneth T. Jackson, ed., *The Encyclopedia of New York City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 1220.

architectural restraint more English than Dutch. However to the lay person, the general iconography of the gable signifies Dutch. As such, the image bespeaks Calvinist extremism. To the historian, its success is dependent upon perpetuating history's prejudice to Company policy. The similarity between the architecture represented in these two lithographs—*The Water Gate, Foot of Wall St. New York, 1679*, and *No 120 William Street*—and that of the orthodox Counter-Remonstrant town of Zaandam depicted in the *Westzijderol* should not be overlooked. (Figure 2.30) Is political affiliation the basis on which a new colonial settlement becomes the representative equivalent of a rural village? Neither Lossing-Barritt's image for Julia Maria Colton's *Annals of Old Manhattan, 1609-1664, The Governor's House and the Church in the Fort, under the Dutch* [a copy of an image featuring in Lamb's *History of the City of New York*, signed J. P. [John Parker] Davis (1832-1910)], nor George Edward Perine's (1837-1885) engraving *Nieuw Amsterdam, 1659* for Benson Lossing's *History of New York City* (1884) compromises the colony's explicit monological association. (Figures 2.31-2.33)

Robinson's *A Schepen laughing at a Burgomaster's Joke and Lawsuit Decided by Wouter van Twiller*, two more illustrations from the *Manual* published in 1850, crucially move the viewer indoors. (Figures 2.34, 2.35) The implication of the colony's cultural alliance to Dutch society is compounded by portraying the colonists from another of the Golden Age's popular vantage points—indoors. At the same time, Robinson's cartoonish, Brueghel-like images succeed in taking an adept social swipe at patriarchal society. How else can one account for a woman in each image overlooking the proceedings? These two images dovetail into the specific genre of the spectacle, which indubitably formed a part of Dutch 'everyday life.' Even today, the colony's cultural stereotype revolves around the genre pictures of Adriaen van Ostade (1610-1685), Adriaen Brouwer (1605/1606-1638), and to a lesser extent Pieter Brueghel the Elder (*fl.* 1551-1569). In line with convention, Gloria Deák

writes:

“The Dutch brought to Manhattan lusty attitudes toward life, particularly in the forms of drinking, dancing, and singing. The fair number of inns and cafes established in New Amsterdam provided venues for spontaneous performances by the population, much like those recorded in the inns of Holland by the artist Adriaen van Ostade.”⁵⁴

As the portrayers of peasantry, these three artists satisfy the essential criteria for any colonial model in the corpus of a pseudo-Marxist historian. In what are unquestionably two more scholarly works, *Possessing Albany, 1630-1710: The Dutch and English Experiences* (1990) and “The Rituals of Handelstijd: Beverwijck, 1652-1664” (1991), Donna Merwick proves to be no less susceptible to the allure of the ‘everyday’ image. In the former the author calls on van Ostade’s *The Dancing Couple in an Inn*, and in the later Brouwer’s *Five Peasants Fighting*, in order to depict the similarities of social legislation between the coloniser and colonised.⁵⁵ In a rare fit of originality, however to make essentially the same point, Burrows and Wallace entertain the reader in *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (1999) with the aptly named, *The Peasant Dance* by Pieter Brueghel the Elder.⁵⁶

Another of Robinson’s images, *The eminent Burghers Manheers Tenbroek and Hardenbroek disputing about the plan of the City of New Amsterdam* (1850), which has the added subtext: “The one insisting that they should run out Docks and Wharfs; and the other that it should be cut up and intersected by canals after the manner of Old Amsterdam. The dispute ended in high words without coming to any conclusion on a subject of so much interest to posterity and was the cause of much bad feeling between the parties and their descendants ever after,” intensifies the

⁵⁴ Gloria Deák, *Picturing New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 325.

⁵⁵ See Donna Merwick, *Possessing Albany, 1630-1710: The Dutch and English Experiences* (1990), p. 82, and Donna Merwick, “The Rituals of Handelstijd: Beverwijck, 1652-1664,” in Nancy Anne McClure Zeller, ed., *A Beautiful and Fruitful Place: Selected Rensselaerswijck Seminar Papers* (Albany: New Netherland Publishing, 1991), p. 319, pp. 317-325.

⁵⁶ See Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, p. 55.

sentiment of colonial ineptitude. (Figure 2.36) This image is a concrete example of the crossover between Irving's rhetoric and Valentine's graphic history, or as Innes put it: "Washington Irving has described New Amsterdam, not as it was; and . . . Mr. Valentine has described it, in many respects as it was not, . . ."57 As the eminent architectural historian Joseph Rykwert remarked on the venerated subject of the foundation of the town plan:

"its laying-out according to a model was hedged about with elaborate ceremonial, the words and actions of which constituted the conceptual model. . . There is nothing unusual about the combination of murderer, fratricide and town founder."58

Carrying Irving's torch, Robinson mocks the colonists. Instead of a fabled setting-out of the city plan, *e.g.* Plutarch's 'Life of Romulus,' he depicts an event more likely to result in the popular scene portrayed by Francisco de Goya, *El albañil borracho* (1786). (Figure 2.37) Above all others, nineteenth-century writers and artists focused on one colonial event to elevate to ritual status, the purchase of Manhattan Island in 1624 by Peter Minuit. There is no question that it was in the myth-maker's interest to aggrandise one event. By choosing the ephemeral over the infrastructural one, not only is Rome left in the lurch, but the literary historian becomes the spokesperson of an exclusively oral tradition. Similar to Benjamin West's depiction of *William Penn's Treaty with the Indians* (1771), in portrayals by Alfred Fredericks and Dwight Franklin and unsigned images from Alexander Johnston's, *A History of the United States for Schools* (1889), Martha J. Lamb's *History of the City of New York*, and Charles Burr Todd's *A Brief History of the City of New York* (1899), a distinct iconology and strict geometry governs the department of the transaction's two parties. (Figures 2.38-2.43) In the Native American the colonists found their cultural inferior. The unwritten supposition depicted by these two events, the town's

57 Innes, *New Amsterdam and Its People*, p. vii.

58 Joseph Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1988), p. 27-28.

founding and the island's purchase, is that the modern metropolis is not the product of outworn European romanticism, but of cold, hard cash.

To add weight to my claim of the images' child-like quality, compare Robinson's lithograph for Valentine's *Manual* (1850) titled *Nieuw Nederlandt* with the title page to *Uncle Philip's Conversations with Young Persons: History of New York* (1834) and the untitled view from the children's stories, *Rollo's Tour in Europe* (1864-1867). (Figures 2.44-2.46) There is no differentiating the architecture of the three images. If anything, *Nieuw Nederlandt* is the least sophisticated. None of these, however, compare to the travesty depicted as *Fort Amsterdam and Village, New York* in John Fanning Watson's *Annals and Occurrences of New York City and State* (etc.) (1846). (Figure 2.47) Flanked by a folly on the left and an UFO on the right, Watson's depiction of *Gov. Stuyvesant's Old Mansion, in Bowery*, is no less unique. (Figure 2.48) In this context, it is easy to see how Valentine, who published *The residence of Governor Stuyvesant at the time of his death, situated on his farm or Bowery* six years later, gained his authoritative position. (Figure 2.49) Comparing Todd's *Foot of Wall Street, 1674*, with Colton's *The Blockhouse and City Gate (Foot of the present Wall Street), 1674*, both originating from a lithograph of the same title in Valentine's 1862 *Manual*, and *New York City Hall in 1679* with *Stadthuys*, both signed [J. T.] Speer, confirms the fact that these images were as applicable to 100-page children's books as to 1600-plus page city histories. (Figures 2.50-2.53) New Yorker's were not the sole portrayers of picturesqueness. While hardly Dutch-inspired, the unsigned and undated view titled *Neyjork* is certainly child-like. (Figure 2.54)

IV

A

While the illustrations all depict New Amsterdam in imitation of the United Provinces, the images' authority is diminished by temperance (conservatism) and cartoonist imitation. The illustrations' absurdity has not only dissuaded critical judgement, but has proven an important characteristic contributing to their unassailability.⁵⁹ These depictions, not any unanimous cultural capital recorded in the colony, have engendered the subsequent comparisons to genre painters of the Golden Age. Their repeated use has played a crucial part in establishing and maintaining their image in the popular psyche. The reiterated theme is a clear indication of the intense rivalry over cultural identity between nineteenth-century American cities. The iconography that these images share had a more far-reaching effect, one that in my view would not have passed unnoticed by the perpetrators and that cannot continue to be simply dismissed as examples of "nineteenth century nostalgia brought on by the erasure of New York's past,"⁶⁰ what Max Page recently fancifully repackaged as "a response to the turbulent creative destruction of New York."⁶¹ Simplification is a trope representative of colonial naiveté, nascency, and inferiority. The diminutive scale creates a doll-like community, which is always a shadow of another self. Can the reader fail to see the lesson for the subject at hand, when in his amusing critique of French toys Roland Barthes writes:

"All the toys one commonly sees are essentially a microcosm of the adult world; they are all reduced copies of human objects, as if in the eyes of the public the child was, all told, nothing but a smaller man, a homunculus to whom must be supplied objects of his own size."⁶²

As Barthes elaborates: "The fact that French toys *literally* prefigure the world of

⁵⁹ Contemporary reviews of the books published by Mary Louise Booth, Julia Maria Colton, and Maud Wilder Goodwin fail to even mention the illustrations, let alone pass judgement on them.

⁶⁰ See Jan Seidler Ramirez, ed., *Painting the Town: Cityscapes of New York* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 71.

⁶¹ Page, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940*, p. 237.

⁶² Roland Barthes, "Toys," in *Mythologies*, tr. Annette Lavers (New York: The Noonday Press, 1993), p. 53.

adult functions obviously cannot but prepare the child to accept them all, by constituting for him, even before he can think about it, the alibi of a Nature which has at all times created soldiers, postmen and Vespas”—one can similarly argue that by fostering a diminutive Dutch stereotype in New Amsterdam, something on the order of the Herengracht in Zaandam or the binnendijks in Cadoele (Kadoelen), not only is the colonial city undermined, but it is done so in a manner leaving no alternative, except to brand the nonconformist a traitor to the democratic idealism of the post-Revolutionary city.⁶³ (Figures 2.55, 2.56) Nineteenth-century histories of New York City were written in a turbulent period, when culture “was redefined in the context of emerging political democracy and expansive capitalism,” and the city historian sought a mantle on which to bolster the ideology of the emergent, though at this point hardly apothecic, Democratic society.⁶⁴

Fictional mimicry is stricken by an indeterminacy. The representation of the Dutch, as a recognisable Other, *that is almost the same, but not quite*, produces a ‘difference’ visually appropriating its own power, conflicting with the representation of a purposefully unassuming archetypal model to satisfy the cultural and political agenda of the nineteenth-century city historian. The ‘difference’ in these illustrations articulates both power and helplessness, illustrating the paradox of conceiving a diminutive legend.

In mid nineteenth-century New York, literature followed the “literary nationalists”—the Young Americans, Walt Whitman (1819-1892) and Herman Melville (1819-1891)—while the city’s colonial history came under the influence of an increasingly social sentiment. Mid-century historians escaped the confines of the

⁶³ Barthes, “Toys,” p. 53.

⁶⁴ See Thomas Bender, *New York Intellect: A History of Intellectual Life in New York City, from 1750 to the Beginnings of Our Own Time* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 172.

literary gentry; however, they fell prone to employing their devices, falling into what John Richard Dennett famously pronounced in the *Nation* (5th December 1867) as the “essentially imitative and colonial” mode of “Knickerbocker literature.”⁶⁵ The “Rabelaisian” tone was disguised by political humility, accompanying an ever-increasing soliloquy on the eclipse of the historic city. The effects and form of what Thomas Bender describes as Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s “dream of a national clerisy” became inextricably entwined with the city’s colonial historiography.⁶⁶ In *Melville’s City: Literary and Urban Form in Nineteenth-Century New York* (1996), Wyn Kelley observes: “Literature promised to defuse middle-class anxiety over urban growth by imaging it in manageable ways.”⁶⁷ New York’s colonial ‘town’ is a historical construct that acts to inflate the ante-bellum definition of ‘city.’ With time, the historical city’s abstract form became an increasingly regressive one. In the nineteenth century, innocence, organicism, and manageability are so closely tied to scale that portrayals of the colonial city are unsurprisingly apportioned a pastoral, diminutive aesthetic to match shifting intellectual emphases and their associated values. In effect the authors, none more than Innes, exaggerated the feeble model that survives in seventeenth-century Dutch renderings of the colony by Johannes Vingboons and Jasper Danckaerts to recreate the area below Wall Street, fictionalising it as an ‘old town’ with a view to propagandising colonial failure, as much as acting as a ‘reminder of the city’s heart.’⁶⁸

All of the writers share the claim of professing such a prejudiced project as the product of truth, including the future President Theodore Roosevelt who writes

⁶⁵ Cited in Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1865-1885* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 28.

⁶⁶ See Bender, *New York Intellect*, p. 172.

⁶⁷ Kelley, *Melville’s City*, p. 9.

⁶⁸ Of J. H. Innes, J. Franklin Jameson writes: “Upon the map itself [Buchellius Chart] the editor sought the counsel of Mr. J. H. Innes, author of *New Amsterdam and Its People* (New York, 1902), whose authority in such matters is of the highest.” This is the same author whose aforementioned text is underlined with six caricatured views of New York in an unusual cartographic, close-up view. See Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. vii.

in *New York* (1891):

“It has been my aim less to collect new facts than to draw from the immense storehouse of facts already collected those which were of real importance in New York history, and to show their true meaning, and their relations to one another; . . .”⁶⁹

In a *History of New Amsterdam; or, New York as It Was, in the Days of the Dutch Governors* (1854), Asahel Davis writes: “In our research, we have not resorted to the shadowy realms of imagination for information, but to the pure fountains of truth;”⁷⁰ Booth writes: “Especial care has been taken to verify facts and dates by the best authorities, and nothing has been admitted which has not first been authenticated by reliable testimony;”⁷¹ Lamb writes: “I have never lost sight of the magnitude and importance of the task before me, . . . nor have I in any instance indulged fancy at the expense of historical exactness and symmetry. My first aim has been to reach the truth, in which pursuit I have spared no pains;”⁷² Leonard writes: “Accuracy has been regarded as the first and highest essential of the volume, and wherever the authorities or documents have seemed to be in conflict, there has been an earnest endeavor to get at the truth;”⁷³ and Colton loftily intones:

“Whether ‘Norumbega’ the mythical was the Penobscot or the North River, or, indeed, whether the name represented a river or dry land, cannot be stated with assurance, and, therefore, reaching forward unto the things that are beyond, this book attempts only to present, as clearly and concisely as it may, the true story of the Dutch in Old Manhattan.”⁷⁴

⁶⁹ Theodore Roosevelt, *New York* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891), p. viii.

⁷⁰ Asahel Davis, *History of New Amsterdam; or, New York as It Was, in the Days of the Dutch Governors* (New York: R. T. Young Publisher, 1854), p. 10.

⁷¹ Mary Louise Booth, *History of the City of New York, from Its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York: W. R. C. Clark & Meeker, 1859), p. xvii-xviii.

⁷² Martha J. Lamb, *History of the City of New York: Its Origin, Rise, and Progress*, 2 vols. (New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1877-1880), p. iv.

⁷³ John William Leonard, *History of the City of New York 1609-1909* (etc.) (New York: The Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, 1910), p. ix.

⁷⁴ Julia Maria Colton, *Annals of Old Manhattan, 1609-1664* (New York: Brentano's, 1901), p. ix-x.

Returning to Barthes to summarise, he perceptively writes: “It is not so much, in fact, the imitation which is the sign of an abdication, as its literalness . . .”⁷⁵

B

Following the seventeenth-century Dutch prototype, in the pageant of nineteenth and twentieth-century ‘city views,’ New Amsterdam was allegorised street-by-street, building-by-building, outside and inside, and the colonist’s activities, material possessions, customs, morals, and views of life, were directly or indirectly represented. These illustrations reflect the ‘symptoms of fabricated Romanticism’ beguiling colonial discourse, and are accountable for the aesthetic impasse continuing to overshadow New Amsterdam. Since the publication of Svetlana Alpers’s *The Art of Describing* (1983) and Simon Schama’s *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (1987), the currency of the conventional cultural model of the Dutch Golden Age has been discredited. Why have the effects of this paradigm shift been so slow to impact Dutch colonial historiography? Borrowing Lewis Gaylor Clark’s damning judgement of Herman Melville’s *Typee* (1846)—these representations and their literary equivalents are “a piece of Munchausenism.”⁷⁶ As Perry Miller adds: “had it [*Typee*] been put forth openly as a ‘romance,’ it might be read for relaxation, but as a statement of fact, it has no merit.”⁷⁷ In attempting to construct an image of American civilisation and establish nineteenth-century New York’s cultural primacy against the aristocracy to the North and South, these authors and illustrators reverted to the “figures of farce” not to either legitimise or sentimentalise the city’s colonial history, but to propagandise Republicanism, align New York to the notion of progress, and fix the

⁷⁵ Barthes, “Toys,” p. 53.

⁷⁶ Cited in Perry Miller, *The Raven and the Whale: Poe, Melville, and the New York Literary Scene* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), p. 6.

⁷⁷ Miller, *The Raven and the Whale*, p. 6.

contemporary city as the centre of sophistication. In this way, ante-bellum New York not only exercises its authority, *i.e.* power, over the conventionally dominant European subject, but by depicting its colonial phase as culturally stunted and socially homogenous, the heterogeneity of the immigrant city would have represented a cultural exemplar in the eyes of Federal officials doling-out lucrative government resources. As Roosevelt sums-up: "In short, the most important lesson taught by the history of New York City is the lesson of Americanism."⁷⁸ "The spirit of civic boosterism that prevailed in nineteenth-century America" was no less applicable to the *post factum* colonial representation as it was the contemporary lithographic city view.⁷⁹ Is it any wonder that Irving's depiction of a "pack-donkey" colonial city in *A History of New York* appeared on the scene exactly between the appointment of the three commissioners in 1807 (Gouverneur Morris, Simeon DeWitt and John Rutherford) and their publication of the "Map of the City of New York" in 1811, what the twentieth-century's pre-eminent architect and city planner Le Corbusier (1887-1965) boldly described as "man's way"?⁸⁰ Neither is it surprising that the city's historians have constantly called on images of architecture to legitimise their texts. Beside the ultimately restrictive, monological association of this technique, and as Michel Foucault pointed out, buildings are *statements* exercising an almost unassailable discursive authority.⁸¹

V

In an article widely circulated among historians of colonial New York, "Writing/Righting Dutch Colonial History" (1999), Joyce Goodfriend writes:

⁷⁸ Roosevelt, *New York*, p. xi.

⁷⁹ John W. Reys, *North American Views and Viewmakers: A Union Catalogue of Lithographic Prints of Cities and Towns, 1834-1926* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984), p. 67.

⁸⁰ See Le Corbusier, *The City of To-morrow and Its Planning*, tr. Frederick Etchells (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1987), p. 5-12.

⁸¹ On the relation of Foucault's thought to architecture, see Paul Hirst, "Foucault and Architecture," in *AA Files* 26 (Autumn 1993), pp. 52-60.

“The Anglocentric rendering of the history of New York and adjacent regions reduced the Dutch to comic figures, relics of a remote past, instead of portraying them as actors in a drama of empire. . . . Rehabilitating the colonial Dutch, then, involves stripping away the layers of misinformation and misrepresentation that still endure and returning to the original sources for evidence.”⁸²

Evidence of what? What is at stake? To every cultural exponent, the unspoken agenda is to make New York more competitive. The fact that the mission of this generation’s scholars is to relentlessly pursue “Dutchness” through texts, where the preceding generation was satisfied to represent the city through archetypal iconography does not distinguish the two projects. The beguiling coherency of the city’s colonial history stems from the failure of historians to take into account the collective effect of their own politics. As a consequence, the political motives of the nineteenth-century historian are continually reinforced. This is never more apparent than at present.

In addition to outlining the intentions behind nineteenth-century images of New Amsterdam, which are essentially the same as those of its northern and southern neighbours (Boston and Philadelphia), what purpose does the present work serve? First, it amends the popular view of the city’s literary and intellectual history in the long nineteenth century. The city historian was not a guileless figure. The consensual colonial model was the product of a coercive, self-obsessive nationalism. Second, it illustrates the paradigm that nineteenth and early twentieth-century images represent. Symptomatic of the literary form of realism with which they have been associated, the witless popular depiction has been taken to signify architectural and urban form. The viewer’s eye is transfixed through the lens of moral sensibility holding to the producer. The city’s historicism, in particular its civic representation,

⁸² Joyce D. Goodfriend, “Writing/Righting Dutch Colonial History,” in *New York History* (January 1999), p. 6, pp. 5-28.

is partial to the ramblings of the converted. The present work has demonstrated the prejudice in nineteenth-century discourse, but how and why does the architectural and urban mafia continue to function? Colonial records are largely incongruous with one another.

Finally, the second half of the twentieth century witnessed a rise in an empirical form rejecting the stockpile of visual images of the colonial city. Along with the repudiation of these depictions has come a clear-cut objective among the city's historians to downgrade the subjective. Yet under the empirical veneer, picturesque illustration, following the literary form of the spectator sketch, derived from the eighteenth-century essay form popularised by Addison and Steele in the *Spectator* papers, continues to be the sum total of aesthetic discourse. Nearly two hundred years ago in New York a particular cultural model gained currency. The same plagiarised architectural model that Irving invented and that Valentine elaborated continues to form the cumulative aesthetic conscience. Only the twentieth-century image dating from Stokes is more insidious. The contemporary exponents of empiricism have all succumbed to 'word pictures,' what Jean-François Lyotard described as the visibility of language.⁸³ These literary images are the equivalent of nineteenth-century representations. Their predecessors were driven by the fever of Americanism. Besides unseating Anglocentrism's dominance, what motivates the contemporary historian?

⁸³ See Jean-François Lyotard, *Discours, Figure* (Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1978).

EPISTEME IN NEW NETHERLAND

“Arche-writing, at first the possibility of the spoken word, then of the ‘*graphie*’ in the narrow sense, the birthplace of ‘usurpation,’ denounced from Plato to Saussure, this trace is the opening of the first exteriority in general, the enigmatic relationship of the living to its other and of an inside to an outside: spacing. The outside, ‘spatial’ and ‘objective’ exteriority which we believe we know as the most familiar thing in the world, as familiarity itself, would not appear without the grammè, without difference as temporalization, without the nonpresense of the other inscribed within the sense of the present, without the relationship with death as the concrete structure of the living present.”
 Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, tr. Gayatri Spivak, 1998, p. 70-71

It will appear that I have come to this subject backwards. But if I had not, I would have ended up where Donna Merwick did. It is not as though I have not seen the legitimacy of her work. Only everything Donna Merwick extracts from the so-called “dark ages of American urban geography” comes up Dutch.¹ Such an historiographic deference to power is august. It is another example of the “conflictual economy of colonial discourse which Edward Said describes as the tension between the synchronic panoptical vision of domination—the demand for identity, stasis—and the counter-pressure of the diachrony of history—change, difference.”² My

¹ See Donna Merwick, *Possessing Albany, 1630-1710: The Dutch and English Experiences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), the earlier essay “Dutch Townsmen and Land Use: A Spatial Perspective on Seventeenth-Century Albany, New York,” in *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 3rd series, vol. 37, no. 1 (January 1980), pp. 53-78, and more recently *Death of a Notary: Conquest and Change in Colonial New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

² See “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse,” in Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 85-86, pp. 85-92.

recognition of certain spatial modes preceded my analysis of immigrant patterns. This is only problematic if we adhere to the popular historiographical alliance between power and representation. For the present study, I have looked in parallel at six separate ‘exhibits-of-evidence’—(i) the seven articles composing the “Petition of Walloons and French Concerning Virginia” (1621), (ii) the twenty articles making-up the “Provisional Regulations for the Colonists adopted by the Assembly of the Nineteen of the West India Company” (March, 1624), (iii) the “Instructions for Willem Verhulst, Director of New Netherland” (January, 1625), (iv) the “Further Instructions for Director Willem Verhulst and the Council of New Netherland” (April, 1625), (v) cartographic plans and topographic views of sixteenth and early seventeenth-century towns and cities in the Netherlands and the Counties of Hainault and Namur, and (vi) extant visual documentation of New Netherland.³ Who could fail to see the wide-ranging spatial rapport and ideological opposition between these six?

Alongside the first two texts’ testimony to rights and the third and fourths’ colonial doctrine, all six bear on realms that are identifiably spatial and make crucial contributions to concepts of civilised space. But then they would, would they not? In all of its varying forms, the articulation of space has always been civility’s measure. Conjoining space and civility serves two purposes. On one hand, I mean to draw attention to the fact that colonial scholarship has foreclosed the meaning of these two terms to a pithy summation of Lewis Mumford’s reductionist city history, and on the other, to highlight the present chapter’s intention to expand the

³ Three of these documents—ii, iii, and iv—will be widely familiar to readers as Van Rappard Documents A, C and D (the first official regulations and instructions issued) from Arnold Johan Ferdinand [A. J. F.] van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626* (San Marino: The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1924). Author’s note: Of the six Van Rappard Documents published by van Laer, Van Rappard Document B—“Letter from Jan van Ryen to the Directors of the Zeeland Chamber of the West India Company, Fort Nassau, Wiapoco, April 25, 1625 [1627?]”—was deemed irrelevant to the present essay, and Van Rappard Document F—“Letter from Isaack de Rasière to the Directors of the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company, Fort Amsterdam on Manhattan Island, September 23, 1626”—is intermittently referred to, however, has been excluded from the list on account of de Rasière’s intermediary position.

meaning of the two expressions, as necessitated by the complex political, administrative, economic, and social stratagems underlining the Dutch entry into North America.⁴ The same methodology informs all of the work's key concepts. One further 'exhibit,' the "Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor Cryn Fredericxsz and for the Director and Council regarding the building of the fort and the houses" [Van Rappard "Document E"] (April, 1625), completes the primary material crucial to the comprehension of the city in New Netherland's earliest colonial period. Of the seven 'exhibits,' the five items of correspondence are unquestionably conditioned, and to a certain degree compromised, by their interconnectedness. They are, nonetheless, crucial to understanding the objectives cherished by at least two separate beneficiaries—the Walloon and French colonists and the Dutch West India Company. It is also true, as Frederik Caspar Wieder wrote, that the 1924 publication of the Van Rappard Documents revealed "the birth of legislation, law, and administration in the Dutch Colony."⁵ However, one cannot deny either their one-sidedness, ambivalency, and contradictoriness. The hesitancy to rile the Documents' 'forked tongue' can only be attributed to the oppression of historiographical empiricism.

Comparing the spatial rhetoric of these registers to the practices and informal epistolary records of the colony under the stewardship of Peter Minuit (c. 1580/85-1641), the Director-General of New Netherland from 1626 to 1632, and Wouter van Twiller, the Director-General of New Netherland from 1633 to 1637, makes two points abundantly clear. First, the political, religious, and utilitarian efficacy of space is not only exhibited in the colony's management of the landscape and settlement, but is prevalent in the "micro-geographics" that constitute social and cultural

⁴ In particular, see Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1938), and Lewis Mumford, *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (San Diego: Harcourt, Inc., 1961).

⁵ Cited in I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), VI: 12.

perceptibility, and “whose itinerary would include, among other things, the body in its formation, deportment, sexuality, clothing, and conduct.”⁶ Second, the ideological spatial practices set out in the discourses issued between 1621 to 1625 are distinctly separate from the practices and rhetoric effected in the twelve years between 1626 to 1637. The inclusion of at least one ‘unwarranted voice’ in the colonial dialogue created a schism of incomprehensible compass to the Company before the “Remonstrance of New Netherland” in 1649. This is clearly owing to the Company’s practice of equating economic fallibility with administrative corruption. How else could such proselytising policies fail? In my opinion, a far too macro-cosmic reading and monological concept of colonisation has resulted in confining the discourse on spatial practice to governments (at the expense of individuals) and to the tenure of Peter Stuyvesant (1647-1664) (during which period it mistakenly appears that all the coherent hallmarks of settlement are abundantly available). Such a predetermined classification invites the crucial question that Hubert Damisch poses of René Descartes’s *Discourse on Method* (1637): “From what moment in this process of becoming can we rightly speak of a ‘city,’ large or small, as opposed to a village or a town?”⁷ To the question’s quantitative absurdity, Damisch summons the Eleatic philosophers and asks: “At what point, when a man is losing his hair, can he be described as ‘bald’? How many trees must there be before we can speak of a ‘forest’? Similarly, from what point, and until what upper limit, can we speak of a ‘city’?”⁸

By contrast to the historiography of French colonial development in North America, which has attributed vast influence to individual personalities, scholarship of New Amsterdam has, generally speaking, over-emphasised the Company’s

⁶ I borrow the term ‘micro-geographics’ from Mark Dorrian. See his essay, “On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland,” in *The Journal of Architecture*, vol. 6, no. 1 (Spring 2001), p. 28, pp. 27-51. Dorrian’s is an essay of exceptional acumen. It has been invaluable in helping me to outline this chapter’s critical arguments.

⁷ Hubert Damisch, *Skyline: The Narcissistic City*, tr. John Goodman (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), p. 10.

⁸ Damisch, *Skyline*, p. 10.

influence. In the colony's earliest development, Peter Minuit and Wouter van Twiller played even more crucial roles than the Amsterdam intelligentsia—as much by what they did not do as by what they did. The first has not so brutally come under the satirical knife of Washington Irving as the second, whose reputation, even in spite of his being the nephew of Kiliaen van Rensselaer, is in need of major restoration.⁹ It is my intention to elevate the individual psychological profile to a parity with the colony's spatial strategies. In most cases, the “ship of fools” is to be found berthed in the old, not New Amsterdam. As long as logic is the spokesperson for historical systems of power, and Washington Irving is the benchmark for historiographical analyses, the influence of minority voices will remain cut off. There are epistemological advantages to analysing colonialism from the margins. By delineating the traces of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Francophone spatial concepts, among others, in the colony's aesthetic, political, religious, and commercial interests, the present chapter intends to promote the Walloons from their historical consignment as merely “adjuncts to the Company.”¹⁰ It also intends to upend the prevailing emphasis on material evidence as the sole, or at least primary, means of spatial investigation in the North American colonies.

I

Comprehension of any colonial spatial construction must invariably address and frame the essential concept of the frontier in relation to the colony.¹¹ In this case, the condition demonstrates a conceptual duality. Not only is the Francophone influence accountable for the paradigm shift in seventeenth-century Dutch

⁹ On the subject of rescuing Wouter van Twiller's reputation, see A. J. F. van Laer, ed. and tr., *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts: being the letters of Kiliaen Van Rensselaer, 1630-1643, and other documents relating to the colony of Rensselaerswyck* (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1908), p. 70-72.

¹⁰ Merwick, *Possessing Albany, 1630-1710*, p. 7.

¹¹ See “Spatial Stories,” in Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, tr. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1988), p. 115-130.

cartography that aimed to essentialize the geographic unification of Europe and North America, to obvious commercial and political advantage, but at New Amsterdam itself, the colony infiltrated its localised frontier in the cause of civility and with recourse to economic gain, not, as is generally portrayed, in a compromise to its hegemony—resulting in “mutual concession, adaptation, and cultural borrowing”—or in a fall to barbarism.¹² The West India Company’s insertion into North America was scarcely different to the geographical condition vacated by the Huguenots and Walloons in Europe. The Company found itself in an unknown, but similar political and religious position to its own reformist colonists. All three groups occupied territories whose boundaries were subject to incursion. In the case of the Huguenots and Walloons, sandwiched between two early Modern military powers, and in the Company’s, sandwiched between two colonial authorities.¹³ This ontological state had widespread effects. Both the Company and its earliest colonists were motivated by the shared condition of operating ‘in-between’ opposing external forces. In essence, the “Petition of Walloons and French Concerning Virginia” is neither a colonising nor architectural document. As easy as it is to read for its monasticism, estrangement and xenophobia, its crucial spatial mode is as an instrument acting in the interstices. Having been perilously ‘in-between,’ the rhetoric of the Walloons’ “Petition” is profitably ‘in-between.’ When the signatories write: “Whether it would please his Majesty to permit fifty to sixty families . . . to go and settle in Virginia, a country under his rule, and whether it would please him to undertake their protection and defence from and against all, and to maintain them in their religion,” they are manumitted by linguistically positioning themselves ‘in-between’ the natives and English civilisation.¹⁴ When they write: “Whether his said

¹² See Daniel J. Herman, “Perspectives: Romance on the Middle Ground,” in *Journal of the Early Republic*, no. 19 (Summer 1999), p. 280, pp. 279-291.

¹³ To add insult to injury, the colonists also found themselves lying between two hostile Native American tribes—the Mohawks and the Mohegans.

¹⁴ “Petition of Walloons and French Concerning Virginia,” tr. J. W. de Forest. See J. W. de Forest, *The de Forests of Avesnes* (New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, 1900), p. 190, pp. 190-195. De Forest writes: “The translation in the New York Documents being very loose, I have made my

Majesty would furnish them cannons and munitions for the defence of said place, and grant them right in case of necessity to make powder, fabricate balls and found cannons, under the flag and arms of his said Majesty,” they similarly, if not somewhat ironically, made the King of England their servant.¹⁵

In colonising the New World, theories to justify the right to appropriate land already claimed were at the heart of colonial debates. The process of colonial positioning depends on demythologising romantic traditions. New Netherland was at no point predicated on discovery, but from the outset on politics—what the States General inauspiciously claimed as “unfrequented” and “uninhabited” passages, countries and islands. There was not ever a question that the territory was land already claimed *a priori*. Long-standing Spanish claims to the eastern coast of North America were well known. Descriptions, moreover, consistently refer to the territory as “New Lands situate in America, between New France and Virginia.”¹⁶ By definition, this land possessed a political figure. From 1621, the English ambassador to the Hague, Sir Dudley Carleton, repeatedly pronounced English sovereignty, proclaiming that the Dutch had “entered upon some partes” of what the English called Virginia “and given new names to severall partes appertaining to that part of the cuntry.”¹⁷ Another onlooker “claimed that the Dutch had squeezed themselves ‘as Interlopers’ between English settlements in Virginia and New England.”¹⁸ Theories of property were not only used against the American Indians’ claims of occupancy, but, as the Dutch jurist and notable proponent of Arminianism Hugo

own. For the French original see Baird’s ‘Huguenot Emigration,’ I, 348-351.” See Charles Washington Baird, *History of the Huguenot Emigration to America*, 2 vols. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1885).

¹⁵ De Forest, *The de Forests of Avesnes*, p. 191.

¹⁶ In particular, see “Grant of Exclusive Trade to New Netherland,” in Edmund Bailey [E. B.] O’Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, 11 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, Printers, 1856), I: 11.

¹⁷ Cited in Benjamin Schmidt, “Mapping an Empire: Cartographic and Colonial Rivalry in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and English North America,” in *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 3rd Series, vol. 54, no. 3 (July 1997), p. 573, pp. 549-578.

¹⁸ Schmidt, “Mapping an Empire,” p. 574.

Grotius (1583-1645) asserted, included rights to land held as colonial acquisitions by European countries and not yet settled. Grotius, as John Locke (1632-1704) was later to do, argued “that lands which still lie ‘unoccupied’ are open to appropriation in accordance with natural law.”¹⁹

The *Pascaert van Nieuw Nederlandt Virginia, ende Nieuw-Engelandt* (etc.) (c. 1630), most often attributed to the colony’s first real effectual Director-General Peter Minuit, is the first of many examples illustrating how the Company used the full armoury of nature as an instrument to sanction their presence. (Figure 3.1) It is, at the same time, an indication of the gap between Grotius’s judicial theory of property and its colonial application. New Netherland is only permissibly ‘in-between,’ *i.e.* the States General is only able to assert sovereignty over a territory in North America “between the fortieth and forty fifth degrees in Latitude,” on account of cartographic shenanigans.²⁰ I. N. Phelps Stokes keenly observed the engraver’s telling omission when he writes of the *Pascaert*: “The ‘new’ river (the Susquehanna) . . . coincides pretty well with its real position, although the author dared not connect it with Chesapeake Bay.”²¹ Having abandoned the ‘marks of intellect’ as indicators of sovereignty, *i.e.* the settlements north and south of Manhattan Island, the colony’s broad territorial boundary was spatially reconfigured, and ultimately unsuccessfully defined, through printed matter. It is a worthy diversion to note, particularly as we seek informally to establish a character profile of the prolific Dutch draughtsman, cartographer, engraver and printer Johannes Vingboons (1616/17-1670), that in about 1665 he produced a copy of the *Pascaert van Nieuw Nederlandt Virginia, ende Nieuw-Engelandt* (etc.).²² (Figure 3.2) Only in this case,

¹⁹ Barbara Arneil, “John Locke, Natural Law and Colonialism,” in *History of Political Thought*, vol. 13, no. 4 (Winter 1992), p. 592, pp. 587-603.

²⁰ New Netherland’s outermost latitudinal coordinates are regularly documented in correspondence dating from 1614. See O’Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*.

²¹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 112.

²² Johannes Vingboons hailed from the eminently successful Vingboons family of Amsterdam—son of David Vinckboons the Elder, brother of Philips, David the Younger, Justus and Pieter Vingboons.

Vingboons made substantial editorial amendments, including linking the Susquehanna with Chesapeake Bay. Hardly tallying with C. J. Zandvliet's assertion that "they [Vingboons's plans] can be considered plain reproductions of plans drawn overseas," this grossly foreshortened, *post factum* plate ultimately reshapes, both ideologically and geographically, the entire colony as it is viewed from the earlier version.²³

Assessments of the colony have too often succumbed to the conventional "empire builder's perennial fear"—that to move in-between is the outcome of losing reason—and certainly not, as the present work suggests, to facilitate reason's march.²⁴ The opportunity for such spatial expansionism was presented by both the inviolable natural boundaries repeatedly mapped and the rhetoric of spatial independence that permeated the Company "Instructions"—"giv[ing] each family as much land as they can properly cultivate"—within the largesse of a controlled framework.²⁵ By drawing the seventh *Oration* of Dio of Prusa from the *Aeneid*,

²³ C. J. Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and Their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion During the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Amsterdam: BV Uitgeverij De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1998), p. 230. In the conclusion of his text, Zandvliet would seem to make a u-turn on Vingboons, although he restricts his comments to topographic views and not plans. He writes: "Despite their apparent attention to accuracy, it should not be forgotten that neither wall maps nor topographic paintings are 'true-to-life' representations. The draftsmen on the spot produced images which reflected their interests and those of the local Governors, explaining, for instance, why a division was made between 'friendly' and 'unfriendly' Indians in the Americas; a division not apparent at first sight. The locally made drawings also sometimes went through a long process in which artists and patrons changed, combined, improved and 'polished' the original drawings. Bird's-eye views of entire towns were in some cases based on a horizontal view from a ship, together with a schematic plan. In this process, houses were invented and the appearance of buildings was altered: instead of the two wings which actually existed in reality, Vingboons gave the New York windmill four wings. The same process even led to the creation of false 'true-to-life' views. Vingboons produced two topographically identical views—one is titled 'Surat' and the other 'Bijapur'!" See Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money*, p. 262-263.

²⁴ I borrow the phrase 'empire builder's perennial fear' from Dorrian, "On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland," p. 30. By contrast to Richard White's description of the "middle ground"—defined as "the area between the historical foreground of European invasion and occupation and the background of Indian defeat and retreat"—that is caught-up in the *in situ* social processes between "diverse peoples," this examination of the distinct space identified as 'in-between' is dependent on the clerical, philosophical, and political legitimacy of the colonists' and administrators actions. To be 'in-between' is to clarify existing models, not, as White wrote of the "middle ground," an adjustment of differences "through what amounts to a process of creative, and often expedient, misunderstandings." See Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Also, see Section IV in the present work.

²⁵ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 7.

Tacitus's *Annals*, and Livy into the equation, Grotius, like Locke, demonstrated "that uncultivated land ought not to be considered occupied."²⁶ That Verhulst was instructed to "first of all [make] a map or plan . . . by pacing off or measuring [the land], in order that then the allotment may be more properly made,"²⁷ and to "carefully note all places where there is any appearance of tillable or pasture land . . . having the length and breadth paced off and put down and having here and there holes dug to see whether the soil below is different from that on top,"²⁸ demonstrated the Company's subscription to Grotius's theory that the occupation of vacant land not yet cultivated is only legitimate "when the property is soon to be divided into private parcels."²⁹ Indicating plans for private ownership protected the land from the encroachment of other European powers. This process, moreover, transformed an inanimate object into a corporeal subject warranting possession. The "colonist-physician" is a prevalent trope in contemporary accounts, but, as Wieder's surgical diagram—*De wegen op de Manatus-kaart 1639*—demonstrates, an even more elaborate one in colonial historiography.³⁰ (Figure 3.3) Once in North America, however, neither Minuit nor van Twiller were inclined to maintain recalcitrant Company positions. The ideals of a new world happily coincided with the realities of self-interest. In a letter to the governor of the "Englishe Collonye att the Massachusetts Baye" (1633), van Twiller indicated a crucial, and not uncommon, shift in his position from Company organ to fellow colonist. When he writes: "It seems very straunge unto mee, who for my owne paret coulde wishe that his Matie

²⁶ Cited in Arneil, "John Locke, Natural Law and Colonialism," p. 592. See Hugo Grotius, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*, Chapter 2: Section 17, tr. Francis W. Kelsey, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), II: 202-203.

²⁷ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 7.

²⁸ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 7.

²⁹ Arneil, "John Locke, Natural Law and Colonialism," p. 593.

³⁰ I borrow the term 'colonist-physician' from Dorrian, "On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland," p. 32. The "colonist-physician" is a derivative of the ruler-doctor from Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1439-1501) which, to quote Simon Pepper, "is of course closely related to the idea of the doctor-architect formulated by Alberti (Book X), and Filarete (Book XV) and, in 'real life,' entered directly into the common currency of diplomacy when subject addressed ruler." See Simon Pepper, "Body, Diagram, and Geometry in the Renaissance Fortress," in George Dodds and Robert Tavernor, eds., *Body and Building: Essays on the Changing Relation of Body and Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002), p. 115-116, pp. 114-125.

of England and the Lords of the States Generall concerneing the limitts and parting of theis quarters, would agree. And as good neighbors wee might live in these heathenische countryes,” the entire colonial paradigm came to be viewed essentially as a single space and his role is as one of many in the common salvation from the “Pope’s donation.”³¹ There is no question either that with “an eye on his uncle’s interests,”³² van Twiller was disposed to the inevitable fraternity imputed in the “Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions” (1629).³³ In a climactic challenge to the colony’s superstructure writ large, on 29th September, 1636 van Rensselaer wrote to his nephew: “I hope that we shall come to a good agreement, which will be more profitable for you than to stay at the *manhatans*.”³⁴

The colonists’ broadly-shared religious convictions precipitated the way that the colony briefly altered perceived models of political and military operation. This was owing, in my opinion, to cartographic and *belles-lettres* diplomacy based on supplanting the conditions attached to the ‘cultural in-between,’ including vulnerability, “identity-effects,” and placelessness, among others.³⁵ Besides its obvious spatial implications, recognising the state of that which is ‘in-between’ offers scope for reassessing the contribution of the Company’s constituent parties and their affiliation in the Amsterdam Chamber’s ‘forked tongue.’ It is not hard to see that the Chamber spoke in a tongue that was forked, not false, and that was more ideologically-motivated than the prevalent explanation that “one [faction] was in favor of promoting colonization and the other was opposed and favoured

³¹ See the entry dated 4 October 1633, “Wouter van Twiller, governour of New Netherland, writes a letter to the governour of the ‘Englische Collonye att the Massachusetts Baye,’” in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 79.

³² Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*, p. 69.

³³ For the “Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions,” see van Laer, ed. and tr., *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*, p. 136-153.

³⁴ Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*, p. 321.

³⁵ I borrow the term ‘identity-effects’ from Homi Bhabha. See his essay “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse,” p. 90. The expression was first brought to my attention by Mark Dorrian in his essay “On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland,” p. 28.

economy.”³⁶

II

Any study of spatial discourse in New Netherland cannot, moreover, fail to acknowledge the predominant role of the commercial cartographic and publishing industry in the Netherlands, not only as a tool of legitimisation and coercion, but also as the repository of countless spatial models. The particular involvement and exclusion of both industries—cartographic and publishing—warrants comment. It was not until Benjamin Schmidt published his discursive tour-de-force, “Mapping an Empire: Cartographic and Colonial Rivalry in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and English North America” (1997), that the objectivist trajectory spanning from I. N. Phelps Stokes’s monumental cartographic lexicon *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928) to Robert T. Augustyn’s and Paul E. Cohen’s *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995* (1997) was finally upended.³⁷ For all of Schmidt’s insight and historiographical parlance, however, his work failed to recognise and address the highly-charged spatial effects purloined by the cartographic industry.

What is the compulsion for asserting that the agency of mapping the New World facilitated cultural reproduction alone? The earliest commercial maps of the colony were not restricted within the terms of reference of an individual cultural *episteme*. Gilles Deleuze’s and Félix Guattari’s familiar declaration highlights cartography’s mutable subjective perspective:

³⁶ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 18.

³⁷ Robert T. Augustyn and Paul E. Cohen, *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1997). See also Gloria Gilda Deák, *Picturing America, 1497-1899: Prints, Maps, and Drawings Bearing on the New World Discoveries and on the Development of the Territory that is now the United States*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988). While not exclusively a record of New York City’s maps, this detailed catalogue of the holdings in the New York Public Library includes many of the most important maps from the city’s colonial period.

“What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real. The map does not reproduce an unconscious closed in upon itself; it constructs the unconscious. It fosters connections between fields . . . The map has to do with performance, whereas the tracing always involves an alleged ‘competence.’”³⁸

The influential co-operation of cartography and the regimes of space should not be accorded a benign neutrality. The omissions, codifications, projections, and frame set the conditions for a whole host of manipulative consequences.³⁹

More than just fulfilling its generally accepted role as “patriotic cartography” legitimising the Company’s sovereignty, Willem Jansz. Blaeu’s *Paskaart van Guinea, Brasilien en West Indien* (c. 1617) made an essential statement about how New Netherland was to be viewed.⁴⁰ (Figure 3.4) In the most conventional colonial discourse, colonies are typically identified both rhetorically and cartographically by their peripherality, commonly connoted by an edge condition. In this way, the coloniser unequivocally retains the hand of reason. In Blaeu’s map, the colony occupies a crucial geographic position in the Company’s larger portfolio eliminating the frontier as the basic conditioning factor. New Netherland is drawn as part of an ahierarchical circuit that has at its centre the Atlantic Ocean.⁴¹ This structure was re-emphasised by the movement—of ships, following the course they steered between the Netherlands and New Netherland—of people, in particular the importation of blacks from the southern colonies that began as early as 1626—of objects, including the bells captured at San Juan by Admiral Boudewyn Hendricksz—and of waybills,

³⁸ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, tr. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), p. 14-15.

³⁹ On “hidden agenda[s]” in the discipline of cartography, there is no finer writer than John Brian [J. B.] Harley (1932-1991). In particular, see J. B. Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essay in the History of Cartography*, ed. Paul Laxton (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

⁴⁰ Schmidt writes: “The process of patriotic cartography begun by [Adriaen] Block continued over the ensuing years, primarily through the voluminous output of Blaeu.” See Schmidt, “Mapping an Empire,” p. 557.

⁴¹ See Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, tr. Sian Reynolds (London: Collins, 1973).

by Kiliaen Van Rensselaer's intention, following the publication of the "Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions," to make New Netherland a station for ships from the West Indies and Brazil. It should be no surprise that this cartographic form, which prioritises the cultural indices of spatial integration, originated from maps drawn by cartographers in Dieppe and Havre de Grace, or that those same cartographers were in the employ of the Dutch West India Company.⁴² It is, moreover, impossible to overlook the entrance of Blaeu's map into the religious and constitutional fracas that currently absorbed the Netherlands. Hugo Grotius's distinctive theory of property, *Mare liberum* (1609), "provided a useful ideology for competition over material resources in the non-European world, and had clearly begun the intellectual process that was to culminate in the competitive rights of the Hobbesian state of nature."⁴³ It is an indication of Arminianism's move away from a humanist and Aristotelian moral theory. In the apportionment of land and sea, and the relative position of each in the image's composition, Blaeu promotes Grotius's argument for the right to ownership of the former and the "common property" position of the later.

Space was increasingly foreshortened by climatic similarity—"He hath found the climate of the said Country very temperate, judging it to be as temperate as that of this country, Holland"⁴⁴—and rendered divine by causes and descriptions sounding like a conflation of Biblical sources and Ovid. Here again in the New World as in the Old, the area physically 'in-between' is the chosen one. The land is vestal.

⁴² As Stokes acknowledges: "There are, for instance, preserved in the Archives du Dépôt des Cartes de la Marine, in Paris, two manuscript charts of this kind one by G. Levasseur, dated 1601, the other by Pierre Devaulx, of Havre de Grace, dated 1613." See Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 78.

⁴³ Richard Tuck, *Natural Rights Theories: Their Origin and Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 62. See also Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

⁴⁴ See "Captain Hendricksen's Report of his Discoveries in New Netherland," in O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 13-14. Also, see the remark in the "Remonstrance of New Netherland" (1649): "We have heard the Indians also frequently say, that they knew of no other world or people previous to the arrival of the Netherlanders here. For these reasons, therefore, and on account of the similarity of Climate, Situation and fertility, this place is rightly called New Netherland." See "Remonstrance of New Netherland" in O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 275.

The rhetoric is an inflation of Grotius's essential proclamation that the land is "God's original grant."⁴⁵ In Nicolaes van Wassenaer's *Historisch Verhael* (1621-1631), there are numerous thoughts in this vein. The colony's formation is legitimised by recalling the legacy of "the patriarchs of the Old Testament, finding themselves altogether too many in their countries, sent some of theirs into the uninhabited valleys and cultivated these."⁴⁶ Invoking Genesis, Wassenaer continues this allusion:

"The worthy Pieter Evertsen Hulft, who undertook a ship thither . . . to wit; one hundred and three head of live stock . . . besides all the hogs and sheep that they thought expedient to send thither . . . Each animal has its own stall, with a floor of three feet of sand . . . [and] its respective servant who attends to it . . ."⁴⁷

The Company went so far as to demand "by every ship that returns to the fatherland there is to be sent us by the Council . . . an explicit report about the animals."⁴⁸ The provocative appeal of "minerals . . . mines of gold, silver, copper . . . as well as of precious stones, such as diamants, rubies and the like, together with the pearl fisheries," infiltrated the "Provisional Regulations," and "since we must all have no other object than the glory of God in the building up of his kingdom,"⁴⁹ the Reverend Jonas Michaëlius recounted its almighty power: "what the land possesses in all kinds of birds, game, and woods, with vegetables, fruits, roots, herbs and plants, both for eating and medicinal purposes, and with which wonderful cures can be effected."⁵⁰ Not only was the land prosperous and fertile, but "their women, also, have borne children there."⁵¹ As E. B. O'Callaghan remarks: "the women and soil

⁴⁵ Arneil, "John Locke, Natural Law and Colonialism," p. 603.

⁴⁶ J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), p. 74.

⁴⁷ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 79.

⁴⁸ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 9.

⁴⁹ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 125.

⁵⁰ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 131.

⁵¹ From a letter dated 5/11/1626 that was written in Amsterdam, by Pieter Jansen Schaghen, deputy in the States-General from the States of Holland and West Friesland, and addressed to the States-General, in session at The Hague. Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-*

were both fruitful.”⁵²

Having been attributed such a venerable status, it would follow that acerbic descriptions of the colonial wilderness were tantamount to heresy. Any such a characterisation could only serve to drive a wedge between the two continents. Censorship was not unknown, in fact it was a common practice of both the East and West India Companies, though it is a rarely discussed characteristic of the States of Holland.⁵³ To cite an example, on 29th July 1617 and again on 2nd August 1617, resolutions were passed interdicting the cartographer Willem Jansz. Blaeu (1571-1638) “from proceeding any further with the composition and printing of the Journals, Maps and Charts of the Voyage lately made on the part of the aforesaid [Australian] Company, from the North into the South Sea . . . on pain of other proceedings against his person.”⁵⁴ In one caveat after another, Wassenaer’s text masterfully navigates between vituperative and laudatory descriptions of the landscape. When he writes that “poisonous plants have been found there, which those who cultivate the land should look out for,” in the very next paragraph he counteracts his criticism by remarking on the fact that “very large oysters, sea fish and river fish are in such great abundance there . . . and in rivers so deep, as to be navigated upwards with large ships.”⁵⁵ In a similar vein, a couple of pages further on, he writes:

“these cattle . . . being put out to pasture here [Manhates], they throve well, but afterwards full twenty in all died. The opinion is, that they had

1909, IV: 67.

⁵² E. B. O’Callaghan, *History of New Netherland; or, New York Under the Dutch* (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1845), p. 104.

⁵³ Two examples of the Dutch East India Company—the case against the Company map-maker Hessel Gerritsz. pertaining to a map of Batavia in 1629, and the 1634 case against Pieter van den Broecke’s publication of a view of Batavia in his *Korte Historiae*, are commented on in Bea Brommer and Dirk de Vries, *Historische plattegronden van Nederlandse steden. Deel 4: Batavia* (Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto, 1992), p. 16.

⁵⁴ See “Interdict to print and publish a Journal of Voyages” and “Interdict to correct existing Maps,” in Brodhead, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 15-16.

⁵⁵ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 81.

eaten something bad from an uncultivated soil. But they went in the middle of September [1625] to meadow grass, as good and as long as could be desired.”⁵⁶

Colonial records relating to New Netherland are strewn with accounts of similar temperance.

Moving from the macro to the micro-scale, from the wilderness to the population, colonial commentators made a bare-faced about-turn. New Netherland adopted the tone of contemporary literature across Europe and the British Isles appertaining to the resident population of colonised lands.⁵⁷ Prurient, bovine, and heathen descriptions abound. In a letter to the ultra-Calvinist clergyman Reverend Adrianus Smoutius (1628), under whose charge he served, Michaëlius wrote that the natives were “entirely savage and wild, strangers to all decency, yea, uncivil and stupid as garden poles, proficient in all wickedness and godlessness; devilish men, who serve nobody but the Devil . . . and in cruelty they are altogether inhuman, more than barbarous, far exceeding the Africans.”⁵⁸ Neither Michaëlius’s descriptions of incivility, nor others’ portrayals of barbarity and iniquity were exclusively reserved for the Native Americans. Uncommonly, many defamatory remarks were directed at the character and station of the Company’s own colonists. The entire colony, Michaëlius writes to D. Joannes Foreest (1630), is a “nefarious enterprise of wicked men,” led by “a slippery man [Peter Minuit], who under the treacherous mask of honesty is a compound of all iniquity and wickedness . . . not free from fornication.”⁵⁹ In a letter to Kiliaen van Rensselaer, Councillor Symon Dircksz. Pos

⁵⁶ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 83.

⁵⁷ On the subject of the ‘alien’ in European literature, one could not do better than to consult Stephen Greenblatt, *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). See also Stephen Greenblatt, ed., *New World Encounters* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) and Lorraine Daston and Katharine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150-1750* (New York: Zone Books, 1998).

⁵⁸ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 126.

⁵⁹ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 17. Of the three extant letters authored by Michaëlius, the passage cited is from the second letter that Michaëlius wrote to D.

showed equal contempt for the colonists by writing that “there is much land ploughed everywhere daily by the peasantry.”⁶⁰ Michaëlius similarly surmised that “the people, for the most part, are rather rough and unrestrained,”⁶¹ and intimating their Icarian ‘fall,’ added that “many of our common people call it [the Natives’ language] an easy language, which is soon learned, but I am of a contrary opinion.”⁶² To Wassenaer’s description that the Natives’ dwellings are “made mostly of the bark of trees,” Michaëlius’s retort that the colonists lived in “hovels and holes” was clearly defamatory by intent.⁶³ Such a reference is a clear indication of their proximity to incivility. Wassenaer’s description that the ramparts of the fort “crumbled away like sand,” anticipates Descartes’s use of the architectural model to convey an emending philosophical message.⁶⁴ With the “rejection of shifting ground and sand in order to find rock or clay,” Descartes, like Wassenaer, intimates the futility of any enterprise wanting for a solid foundation.⁶⁵ From Reverend Michaëlius’s indignant point of view, which is in itself testimony to his outmoded Biblical dogma, the colony is an ethical catastrophe for failing to settle in this ‘kingdom’ according to the Prince of Orange’s, *i.e.* the “Fatherland’s,” terms.

Two commercial maps published subsequent to Blaeu’s *Paskaart* turn their back on exaggerated literary accounts of the ‘alien’ in the New World in favour of establishing a distinct physical and ethical differentiation from other European colonisers. It was not until 1630, when Johannes de Laet (1583-1649) published the first of these, *Nova Anglia, Novum Belgium et Virginia*, in the second edition of *De*

Joannes Foreest. The first letter to D. Joannes Foreest is dated 8th August 1628. For abridged remarks, see Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 72-73. For the complete text, see Dingman Versteeg, *Manhattan in 1628, as described in the recently discovered autograph letter of J. Michaelius written from the settlement on the 8th of August of that year and now first published* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1904).

⁶⁰ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 77.

⁶¹ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 123.

⁶² Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 128.

⁶³ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 70.

⁶⁴ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 88.

⁶⁵ René Descartes, *Discourse on the Method and the Meditations*, tr. F. E. Sutcliffe (London: Penguin Books, 1968), p. 50.

Nieuwe Wereldt ofte Beschrijvinghe van West-Indien, that a larger scale map of the Dutch colonial territory in North America was widely circulated. (Figure 3.5) As one of the directors of the Amsterdam Chamber, for some time a member of the *Heren XIX*, and co-patroun of Rensselaerswyck, “De Laet was exceedingly well read in both Spanish and Portuguese sources, and equally at home in compiling treatises on geography, natural history, or ethnology.”⁶⁶ (Figure 3.6) In a very different capacity, he is one candidate for the Enlightenment role in New Netherland, Kieft is the other, that Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen held in Brazil.⁶⁷ De Laet’s map delineates the localised frontier with an even greater purpose than his predecessors, placing it in an equivalent geographic condition to the one that the Walloons and Huguenots fled at the end of the sixteenth century from the persecution of Charles V. It is the first map to identify New Amsterdam. While the decision to select “‘the hook of the Manattes,’ suggested by the Amsterdam Chamber as a ‘second choice’ for the settlement, was entirely unsuited to the tentative plan,” it is hardly a surprise seen in this context of self-preservation.⁶⁸ Such a geopolitical move prudently maximised the physical distance between the English colonies on either side. As David Pietersz. de Vries wrote in his *Korte Historiae, ende Journaels Aenteyckeninge* (etc.) (1655), “to venture to the English in Virginia . . . the distance is not more than thirty miles from the South river or Cape Hinloopen.”⁶⁹ Communication between the colonies was one thing; spatial proximity was another. Yet for all its practical purpose, the colonists’

⁶⁶ C. R. Boxer, *The Dutch in Brazil, 1624-1654* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 293.

⁶⁷ See Chapter 6—“The Politics of Taste: A Short Essay Resuscitating Willem Kieft”—and in particular the speculation on a connection between Kieft and Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen, p. 188-189.

⁶⁸ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, V: 67-b. The original “Instructions” clearly refer to the ‘hired-farmers and the cattle to be sent thither in the ship ‘Den Orangeboom,’ and the following ship. As this reference occurs in a paragraph dealing specifically with the South River, it seems clear that at the time when those “Instructions” were prepared it was the intention to establish the principal settlement there, and not on the Hudson River.” The “Further Instructions” contradicted the earlier move to the South River, recommending instead that “if the west side of the Hudson, near the mouth, were not found suitable for a settlement, the ‘hook of the Manattes, north of Noten Island,’ should next be considered.”

⁶⁹ From the *Journal* of David Pietersz. de Vries dated 5th March 1633. See David Peterson de Vries, *Voyages from Holland to America, A.D. 1632 to 1644*, tr. Henry C. Murphy (New York: Billin and Brothers, printers, 1853), p. 46.

application of mensuration and geometry in the configuration of the physical world basked in contemporary anthropocosmological meaning. In the theoretical universe of these sciences, this process crucially manoeuvred an indeterminate location into one fixed and operating under Divine license. Even more so than the architect and craftsman, the cartographer played a key role in transforming the topography of the New World into ‘God’s text.’

Willem Blaeu’s *Nova Belgica et Anglia Nova* (1635), introduced another crucial feature to support this position. (Figure 3.7) The colony’s authority is bolstered by Blaeu’s image of an easy and fruitful alliance between the Dutch and Indians. As Schmidt writes:

“In the context of early Americana, these images . . . insinuated a distinction between the Dutch experience in the New World and that of other colonial powers—notably England and Spain—who suffered notoriously from their poisoned relations with the Indians.”⁷⁰

Schmidt attributes these “favorable and frankly optimistic renderings of the native population [to] a long history of republican propaganda predicated on the idea of a Dutch-American alliance to challenge the hegemony of Spain.”⁷¹ Whether ‘optimistic’ or not, in this period the colony shed colonialism’s conventional associations with imperialism. Fundamentally, while the Spaniards and English, both of whom are too often the colonial model writ large, were exercising an imitation of their European machismo, the uncontrollable dissemination of power in New Netherland relied on a misdressed saint and sinner to disguise the colony’s ontological position.

III

⁷⁰ Schmidt, “Mapping an Empire,” p. 561, n. 21.

⁷¹ Schmidt, “Mapping an Empire,” p. 576.

The Dutch West India Company was established to physically appropriate the territory “situate in America, between New France and Virginia.” To describe as “situate . . . between” was at the same time to describe as ‘situate-on-top-of.’ This transfigures an essentially two-dimensional cartographic nomenclature into three-dimensional questions of occupation. If we recognise the land’s “conceptual duality of surface and depth,” and follow this as movement from cartographic to architectural space, we pass from the land’s horizontal to vertical axis—from the realm of governments to colonists.⁷² In *Noort Rivier in Niew Neerlandt* (c. 1630), a second map arguably contemporary to Minuit’s administration, the conceptual duality of the colony is counterpoised. (Figure 3.8) On one hand, adopting the technique of drawing Manhattan Island in conventional triangular abstraction, in this case placing a four-bastioned fortress at its tip, maintained the land mass and settlement in an indeterminate position. Taken at face value, it is a creative reply to the ambivalence of the “Instructions” and “Further Instructions” pertaining to the settlement. On the other, the intricate delineation of the North [Hudson] River into “soundings” and navigable sections is the ultimate process of ownership by reformulation. As comparison with Steven Pietersz. van Broeckhuysen’s (?-1661) *Kaart van het Zuider-Buitenspaarne* (etc.) (1646) makes clear, *Noort Rivier in Niew Neerlandt* followed and even outdid the practices of contemporary Dutch surveying. (Figure 3.9) This crucial differentiation cannot be put down to economic necessity. Order and power, which in colonialism’s terms are always directly attributable to overcoming “formlessness,” were herewith confined to the domain of cartography. This technique is not commonplace. Knowing that the occupation of land was dependent on cultivation, what was the surveyor doing on the river? When Dutch overseas colonies followed recognisable models there are volumes of planimetric,

⁷² Dorrian, “On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland,” p. 31.

axometric, and topographic evidence.⁷³ The Hudson River was measured with a technical proficiency reserved for architectural walls, suggesting that the operative scale of the colony's boundary adhered more closely to the spatial intent of the Walloons' "Petition," to a "circuit or territory of eight English miles radius,"⁷⁴ than to Fredericxsz's "Special Instructions." A second, not unrelated, cause for consternation stems from the fact that this map is a copy. Its striking similarity to the *Caert Vande Rivier Powhatan Geleg in Nieuw Nederlandt* (c. 1638?), attributed to none other than Johannes Vingboons, whose topographic depictions of colonial outposts adorned the walls of the East India Company offices in Amsterdam and represented the apogee of their conquerors and surveyors, suggests the possibility that we are simply being taken for a ride. (Figure 3.10) Are all of the beautiful maps that Vingboons published anything other than 'cartographic whores'?

Viewing Manhattan Island and New Amsterdam before *Afbeeldinge van de Stadt Amsterdam in Nieuw Neederlandt* [The Castello Plan] (c. 1665-70) has always been problematic. (Figure 3.11) Ambivalence is the crucial issue. The level of indeterminacy surrounding the extant engravings ought to estrange, not, as has typically been the case, unite conceptual analyses straining to establish cultural priority. The first of these images, *t' Fort nieuw Amsterdam op de Manhattans* [The Hartgers View], published by Joost Hartgers in *Beschrijvinghe van Virginia, Nieuw Nederlandt, Nieuw Engelandt* (etc.) (1651), is reputed to depict New Amsterdam c. 1626-1628, or in other words, just at the outset of Minit's administration. (Figure 3.12) It is insufficient to jump on the populist bandwagon, label this engraving a "fantasy," and, as is typically the case, place all one's stock in legitimising the Castello Plan. The Hartgers View emphasises an European foothold on Manhattan Island. However, while publicising European supremacy—there is not a single

⁷³ For a general overview, see Ron van Oers, *Dutch Town Planning Overseas during VOC and WIC Rule, 1600-1800* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2000).

⁷⁴ De Forest, *The de Forests of Avesnes*, p. 191.

reference to a Native American settlement and the token indigenous population is placed in a marginal and vulnerable position—there is the disconcerting reality that the conqueror is not Dutch. The print's superficial iconography, *e.g.* the windmill, crowstepped gable, and tri-band flag, is a foil. Only aestheticism links “the drawing of the canoes and Indians in this view and those on *Nova Belgica et Anglia Nova* in Blaeu's *Atlas* of 1635.”⁷⁵ If it is a “fantasy,” why is it not a Dutch, Counter-Remonstrant inspired one? In the context of Hartgers's corpus, the visual tropes gracing this engraving are atypically polysemic.

The engraving reflects the fact that all the interested parties—the petitioners, Company, and *Heren XIX*—were always set on making a fortress. It is recorded in every document listed. In the “Petition,” “whether, having secured the said spot, they might build a city for their protection and furnish it with the necessary fortifications . . .;”⁷⁶ in the “Provisional Regulations,” “they shall take up their permanent residence at the place to be assigned to them by the Commander and his Council and use all diligence to fortify the same by common effort . . .;”⁷⁷ in the “Instructions,” “he shall . . . indicate and write to us where it would be most suitable to build a fort for defense,”⁷⁸ and in the “Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor Cryn Fredericxsz . . . regarding the building of the fort and the houses.”⁷⁹ Each of the built features described in these documents were hybrids of separate, though distinctly not Netherlandish, cultural antecedents. They each affirm Homi Bhabha's maxim: “If colonialism takes power in the name of history, it repeatedly exercises its authority through the figures of farce.”⁸⁰ Only in the “Further Instructions” is there a concession to withhold from constructing “so strong a

⁷⁵ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 135.

⁷⁶ De Forest, *The de Forests of Avesnes*, p. 191.

⁷⁷ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 56.

⁷⁸ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 7.

⁷⁹ Cited in Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 10.

⁸⁰ Bhabha, “On Mimicry and Man,” p. 85.

fortification,” but in this case, it is roundly stated that only a “temporary settlement” could be the result.⁸¹ How can one explain the eclipse of the monumental ideal city plan in the “Special Instructions” by one tangential paragraph in the concurrently-issued “Further Instructions”? Authorship is the most likely way; it is also another indication of the Company’s ‘forked tongue.’ The former is signed by Albert Coenraets, S. Godin, Kiliaen van Rensselaer, the latter by S. Goddyn and Kiliaen Rensselaer. Albert Coenraets is the odd one out. That Werner Jacobsz van den Valckert’s (c. 1580/85-c. 1627) Company portrait of one of the West India Company’s most influential early directors, *Company of Captain Albert Coenrat Burgh and Lieutenant Pieter Evertsz.* (1625), should fix the viewer’s attention on the plan of an ideal pentagonal fortification from one of the military books published by Prince Maurits’s *krijgsschool*, and redouble the Company’s Counter-Remonstrant sympathy to the Prince of Orange by outfitting the figure standing “like a ceremonial jewel in the centre of the group” with an orange standard on his right shoulder bearing the arms of Prince Maurits, corroborates Coenrat Burgh’s allegiance to Maurits and makes a strong case for recognising him as the principal author of the “Special Instructions.”⁸² (Figure 3.13) The Lieutenant’s profile is appreciably heightened by the painting’s intent to represent a moment in time. Caught between two acts, his right-hand is the repository of one of the military engineer’s principal tools, while his left is the destination of the well-armed interloper’s Company list. It is, moreover, no surprise to find the portrait’s other dominant accessory to be an open copy of Jacob de Gheyn II’s (1565-1629) *Wapenhandeligh: van roers musquetten ende spiessen*

⁸¹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 9.

⁸² Besides the two principal figures, the painting includes two other Company directors—Joris Adriaensz. and Rombout Jacobsz. This is the last known dated work by the artist. For a brief biography of the largely unknown artist, Werner Jacobsz van den Valckert, see Ger Luijten and Ariane van Suchtelen, eds., *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1993), p. 320. For a further description of the painting, see M. Carasso-Kok and J. Levy-van Halm, eds., *Schutters in Holland: Kracht en Zenuwen van de Stad* (Zwolle: Uitgeverij Waanders, 1988), p. 252-253. For a further description of Valckert, this painting, and others, see Alois Riegl, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, tr. Evelyn M. Kain and David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999), p. 229-235. The central figure referred to is identified in this volume as Officer cadet Van Buijl. I am grateful to Sandrine Deguent for her translation of this catalogue entry.

(1607) that describes infantry exercises and the use of weapons according to Prince Maurits's theory of war.⁸³

For as long as the prototype of the centrepiece in Hartgers's engraving remains 'at-large,' there are at least two supplementary explanations—the first epistemological and the second ontological—each of which promote the power and influence of the proverbial 'Other.' In the first instance, the fortification's shapes are absolutely typical of the *schantzen* introduced in Italy from the mid-sixteenth century and designed primarily for local defence by means of hand-held firearms. Such a fortification was never the repository of a city's principal institutions, but formed an outer-ring in defence of the primary city.⁸⁴ (Figure 3.14) In such a context, one is viewing the colony's edge. On that basis the engraving is the sign of a double articulation. By illustrating one fortress and suggesting that the landscape bristles with others, the view is an important addition to the collection of geographical constructions defining the colonial territory through printed matter; the engraving exercises its authority through absence, by the natural and built features that are not visualised. It was another weapon to deter English forces incited by the 'effrontery' of Dutch colonisation of English property. At face value, substituting a *schantzen* for an ideal pentagonal fortress has extreme Platonic connotations. The *schantzen*'s planimetric footprint does not remotely incorporate the ideal cosmic structure specified in the "Special Instructions." Suggestions that the view was drawn by the engineer and surveyor Cryn Fredericxsz are foolhardy.⁸⁵ Attempting to authenticate the print on the settlement's terms is misinformed. The engraving is predominantly a political, not architectural, tool. To imagine that a Company representative

⁸³ See Carasso-Kok and Levy-van Halm, *Schutters in Holland*, p. 252-253.

⁸⁴ See Simon Pepper and Nicholas Adams, *Firearms and Fortifications: Military Architecture and Siege Warfare in Sixteenth-Century Siena* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986).

⁸⁵ "It is quite possible, and even probable, that the view from which this plate was made was drawn for Minit by Kryn Fredeycks . . ." See Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 133-134.

specifically commissioned and despatched to the colony with the latest ideal city fashion would return to Amsterdam with the depiction of a schantzen would be like Columbus setting-out in search of China and coming back with America.

In the second instance, there is a case of authorship to be made for Isaack de Rasière—chief commercial agent of the West India Company and secretary of New Netherland. The print's frame makes up for the fortification's Platonic shortfall by figurally isolating the island. Emulating a prevalent position among early fortification theorists and in the wake of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), de Rasière wrote to the Company director Samuel Blommaert: "The small fort, New Amsterdam, commenced to be built, is situated on a point opposite to Noten Island . . . This point might, with little trouble, be made a small island, by cutting a canal through Blommaert's valley . . ."86 Unlike Utopia, Manhattan's isthmus is a natural condition, though this did not preclude de Rasière from promoting a second, artificially constructed one. As Françoise Choay put it, such a "technological operation" is "evocative of Plato's Atlantis."⁸⁷ Commenting on the physical portrait of More's Utopia, Choay writes:

"While the form of the capital of the Atlanteans is very different from that of Amaurotum, its initial core, an island isolated by three surrounding bodies of water, is also the result of a violent operation performed on nature by its founder, Atlas."⁸⁸

De Rasière's proposition has a lot in common with More's Utopia, but perhaps nothing more significant than "preserv[ing] the account of an ancient contact with the Old World."⁸⁹ In this context, who is not to look at de Rasière as the heir apparent of

⁸⁶ "Letter of Isaack de Rasieres to Samuel Blommaert, 1628 (?)," in Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 104-105, pp. 102-115.

⁸⁷ Françoise Choay, *The Rule and the Model: On the Theory of Architecture and Urbanism*, ed. Denise Bratton (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997), p. 139-140.

⁸⁸ Choay, *The Rule and the Model*, p. 354, n. 11.

⁸⁹ Choay, *The Rule and the Model*, p. 354, n. 11.

Atlas, rather than a lowly Dutch dike-builder.

It is typically argued that the inset view *Nieuw Amsterdam op t Eylant Manhattans* [The Visscher View], from the map issued by Nicolaes Visscher (1618-1709) titled *Novi Belgii Novaque Angliae nec non Partis Virginiae Tabula* (etc.) (c. 1655-1656), depicts the colony between 1651 to 1655.⁹⁰ (Figures 3.15, 3.15 (a)). For reasons apparent enough, this inset view has been extensively connected with Johannes Vingboons's often-praised view, *Nieuw Amsterdam ofte nue Nieuw Iorx opt 'T Eylant Man*, which I. N. Phelps Stokes first suggested was issued c. 1670 and which likewise depicts the colony sometime between 1650 to 1653. (Figure 3.16) It is widely presumed "that both were made from a common original as yet undiscovered or no longer in existence."⁹¹ The composition of the two views is hardly untypical of either Visscher or Vingboons. Among Visscher's engravings, one finds countless examples of bisected images, including a ship or two in the foreground and a land line horizontally traversing the print, with a nominal view of a named settlement above. His are clearly the products of an unnamed formula of urban gradation. As the case required, Dutch draughtsmen adopted pastoral or cosmopolitan affectations. This judgement determined the view's position—orthographic if it was classified provincial, and topographic if it was cosmopolitan. All of which is just another method of qualifying form and formlessness in the

⁹⁰ Stokes writes: "The state here reproduced was probably first issued by N. J. Visscher in an Atlas containing maps all of which bore his imprint [*Atlas Contractus* (Amsterdam, c. 1655-1677)]. No copy, however, of the N. J. Visscher Atlas has been found." See Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 147. There have been enough scholarly arguments over the many finely-altered states of this view to send even the surest mind into delirium. "Mr. William G. Kelso, Jr., who has made a special study of this subject, lists . . . twenty-six maps as belonging to this important series." For a complete list, see I. N. Phelps Stokes and Daniel C. Haskell, *American Historical Prints: Early Views of American Cities, etc. from the Phelps Stokes and Other Collections* (New York: The New York Public Library, 1932), p. 10-11. Also, Tony Campbell, "New Light on the Jansson-Visscher Maps of New England," in *Map Collectors' Series*, 24 (1965). Most recently, E. McSherry Fowble wrote that "a recent counting ascribes twenty-eight states, including known proofs, to the Jansson-Visscher series." See E. McSherry Fowble, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1680-1880: A Selective Catalogue of the Winterthur Museum Collection* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1987), p. 33.

⁹¹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 121.

Platonic tradition. It is clear that Salomon van Ruysdael (1601-1670), in his painting “Marine” (1650) and countless similar others, transferred Visscher’s printing convention to oil. (Figure 3.17) It is even more readily apparent that Vingboons copied the lot. The application of such obvious conventions, however, does not foretell the intricacies of the image’s manipulation and its teleological implications under Vingboons’s brush. Even at this *post factum* point, when any image of the colony was arguably solely for posterity, one should not be lulled into underestimating its political intent. Vingboons portrays New Amsterdam even more diminutively, picturesquely, and neutrally than Visscher, whose view mocked the colonists’ inability to overcome a lapsarian state of formlessness. There is no expressed formalism to Vingboons’s view, it reintroduces the more conventional water-laden foreground, punctuated with ships identical to his earlier views *Amboina* and *Malacka*, and inhabitation is passive, and again uncannily similar to the dwellings depicted in *Malacka*. (Figures 3.18, 3.19) The natural island is almost undisturbed. Buildings follow the topography’s pattern, with only the most modest differentiation, based on material iconography, discernible between the colonists’ buildings and the Company’s. There exists a facile relationship between the settlement and the landscape which would not be one’s first way of qualifying any seventeenth-century Dutch building enterprise, certainly not a civilised one.

The particulars of this view are, however, Company-orientated ones. Taken from further to the west, the colony would have appeared significantly more advanced. Still, taken from its present position, the Company’s omnipresence is guaranteed by the fact that the three major built features—the fort, storehouses, and city tavern—which create the drawing’s three vertical divisions, are all Company structures. Within this order, the left-most division is exaggerated to make *t’ Gerecht* the watercolour’s focus. Puritanical historiography has whitewashed Vingboons’s erasure of the hanging human figure. From the second state, this figure is an integral

aspect of Visscher's view. Its position ensured its association with the Company. Visscher loved a good hanging. His engravings attest to that fact. Is the gibbet's inclusion a commentary on the Counter-Remonstrants' assumption of the settlement's administrative direction? On more than one occasion this structure has been conveniently discounted as an instrument for "the weighing or display of merchandise."⁹² Others contemporary to Visscher frequently used the gibbet, most notably Esaias van de Velde (c. 1590-1630), but none of these other artists used it with the same political intent. Excepting of course the unknown engraver of *Acht maets Gerecht* in Joost Hartgers's *Oost en Westindische Voyagien* (etc.) (1648). (Figure 3.20) Why else does one of the two bystanders in Visscher's engraving point at it so demonstratively?

The Company's meretricious ways, which is indicative of their infirmity, goes a long way to explain Vingboons's removal of the corpse from the gallows, the housekeeping of the landscape, and the proliferation of Dutch flags on the ships. This is just one more misdressed colonial image. The only difference is that less than sixty years earlier it had been the uncultivated Native American pair, Orson and Valentine, who were rebranded; now the *maquillage* was being applied to the colonial city. Although it is acknowledged in the print's title that the colony is now New York and the flagpole atop the fort has been deleted, the flag-flying ships have clear symbolic intentions directed at the viewer and that construct a picturesque form of nostalgic nationalism. These are more than a "few slight variations," which is how Stokes described the differences in the two views. Acting as a Company propagandist, *i.e.* by portraying the city as a monolithic construction in the Dutch tradition, Vingboons more than obscured the other factions in the colonial enterprise—he erased them. At the scale of Manhattan Island, it is clear that our

⁹² I. N. Phelps Stokes, *New York Past and Present: Its History and Landmarks, 1524-1939* (New York: New York World's Fair, 1939), p. 5.

formal conceptions of the colonial city are sorely wanting.

IV

In “On the Connection of Frontier,” the introduction to *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (1998), Andrew R. L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute, draw on a whole host of terms coveted by the academic architectural establishment as their privileged reserve in order to present the state of ‘frontier’ theory in North American studies.⁹³ For the last quarter of a century, colonial scholarship has witnessed an ever-increasing number of works fashionably adopting a contemporary architectural syntax as a means of expanding our comprehension of North America’s colonial project. Such rhetoric is, however, always at least one step behind the current usage of its source. In the very same year that Richard White’s seminal work, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (1991), was published and in which he introduced the by now infamous concept of the ‘middle ground’ to colonial historiography, the New York-based architect Bernard Tschumi was utilising an almost identical term, ‘in-between,’ to describe Le Fresnoy—the National Studio for Contemporary Arts that he designed in Tourcoing, France. While White naively rejoiced over what he described as the cultural mixing between the Indians and Europeans, Tschumi, clearly aware of the terms conceptual fatigue in the architectural arena, distanced himself from its use as either a concept or image, preferring to describe it as “the foundation, because it serves as a new plane organizing everything above and below. It is less a matter of a foundation than of an indispensable inversion of the system, of a will to see what another fundamental or

⁹³ See Andrew R. L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute, eds., *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).

foundation might be in the recent history of architecture.”⁹⁴ As it is applied to colonialism, contemporary definitions of frontier are not different to ones of liminal space that architecture has arguably applied since the completion of Sir John Soane’s house at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London (1812-1813) and indisputably since Le Corbusier’s tour-de-force, Villa Savoye (1928-1931), at Poissy, France. It is not my intention to rain on anyone’s parade, least of all on the long list of acclaimed historians that have adopted this fashion, only the revisionist exaltations of these colonial historians must come to be understood in a wider context. For all the commentaries on this recent phenomenon, it comes as a surprise that none have identified, not to mention investigated, the concept’s phraseology or spatial consequences outside of the historian’s microcosm.⁹⁵ This is why I have avoided its momentary purchase, followed an alternative trajectory with Tschumi’s expression—‘in-between’—and attempted to expand the application of architecture’s semantic bias to North American colonialism. It has been my intention on the one hand to revert to what initially seems a conventional teleological spatial concept of the colony at New Netherland—the one consolidated in seventeenth-century cartographic constructions—and on the other to illustrate just how delimiting this so-called traditional framework might be. The present work points the fashionable set seeking “new cultural forms”⁹⁶ in a “territory or zone of interpenetration between two previously distinct societies,”⁹⁷ described as “multiple sites of exchange,”⁹⁸ to view the entire colonial space as an interstitial one. One

⁹⁴ Bernard Tschumi, *Le Fresnoy: Architecture In/Between* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 1999), p. 42.

⁹⁵ Among others, see Colin G. Calloway, *New Worlds for All: Indians, Europeans, and the Remaking of Early America* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997), Cayton and Teute, eds., *Contact Points*, and shorter essays on this subject, including Herman, “Perspectives,” Colin G. Calloway, “Native American History and the Search for Common Ground,” in *Reviews in American History*, vol. 20, issue 4 (December 1992), pp. 447-452, and Catherine Desbarats, “Essai sur quelques elements de l’écriture de l’histoire amerindienne,” in *Revue d’histoire de l’Amerique francaise* 53 (Spring 2000), pp. 491-520.

⁹⁶ Cayton and Teute, eds., *Contact Points*, p. 5.

⁹⁷ From Leonard Thompson and Howard Lamar, *The Frontier in History: North America and Southern Africa Compared* (1981). Cited in Cayton and Teute, eds., *Contact Points*, p. 5.

⁹⁸ Cayton and Teute, eds., *Contact Points*, p. 5.

feature of colonial historiography must be to distance itself from the conventional binary opposition of colonial discourse. Blurring two archetypes will not defeat this time-honoured structure alone. In New Netherland, where the cultural hegemony was always retained by the European, the complex make-up of the Dutch colonial enterprise warrants an extensive revision of the European's cultural *episteme*.

“It is obvious that the new Citroën has fallen from the sky inasmuch as it appears at first sight as a superlative *object*. We must not forget an object is the best messenger of a world above that of nature: one can easily see in an object at once a perfection and an absence of origin, a closure and a brilliance, a transformation of life into matter (matter is much more magical than life), and in a word a *silence* which belongs to the realm of fairy-tales.”

Roland Barthes, “The New Citroën,” in *Mythologies*, tr. Annette Lavers, (1957) 1993, p. 88

“It seems reasonable to shift the focus of inquiries into the origins of the Enlightenment from a catalogue of martyrs, of men said to be ahead of their times who were persecuted for their advocacy of unorthodox ideas, to a far broader constituency. Having graduated from colleges where they had read the standard pagan moralists and where they had been invited to consider the proofs of geometry as models for unobstructed thinking, the most conventional of men became candidates for enlightenment.”

George Huppert, *The Style of Paris: Renaissance Origins of the French Enlightenment*, 1999, p. 120

For nearly two centuries historians have disputed whether the fortress proposed by the directors of the Amsterdam Chamber of the Dutch West India Company in April 1625 was ever built in New Amsterdam?¹ How large and what

¹ See “Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor Cryn Fredericxsz and for the Director and Council regarding the building of the fort and the houses” [Van Rappard “Document E”] (April 22, 1625) in Arnold Johan Ferdinand [A. J. F.] van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626* (San Marino: The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1924), p. 132-169.

type of fortification was supposed to have been erected? If even a fortification was constructed, in what position, and whether any such postulated edifice was of earth, rubble, or stone? The list of questions goes on almost indefinitely. It is not my intention to become embroiled in this stultified and increasingly polarised debate.² Such bickering is blind to the more important issue.

On those rare occasions when the directors' city is addressed in scholarship on New Amsterdam it is treated with little regard. There is hardly anything of note since John W. Reps's *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States* (1965). The definitive work remains Frederik Caspar Wieder's *De Stichting van New York in Juli 1625*, published in 1925.³ No doubt, in part, the "Special Instructions" are overlooked on account of the loss of the document's accompanying images and the pull of that "magical strength which city plans have," and for the added fact that there are not any exquisite drawings for a prince.⁴ That does not, however, account for why historians have turned their back on this crucial document? What is the reason for its neglect? The novelist James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851) speaks for the lion's share of historians when he writes:

"It is true, certain forts, most of them of very doubtful necessity, have been constructed for defence; but no attack having ever been contemplated, or, if contemplated, attempted, they have been dead letters

² It is hardly surprising, given the distinctive legacy of fortifications in Vienna (Ringstrasse) and Paris (Périphérique), that the most significant study of the directors' city, Frederik Caspar Wieder's *De Stichting van New York in Juli 1625* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1925), and one of the most recent, Elva Kathleen Lyon's "The Transfer of Technology from the Dutch Republic to New Netherlands: Forts, Factories and Cities as a Beginning," in J. Everaert and J. Parmentier, eds., *International Conference on Shipping, Factories and Colonization* (Brussels, 1996), pp. 333-342, both spend a great deal more time testifying to the traces of the fortification in the city's existing street pattern than they do acknowledging the extraordinary nature of its existence and its broader, more significant implications to seventeenth-century colonialism.

³ In addition to Lyon's essay, there are two other recent, short studies of the directors' city. One that deals with the subject directly—Paul Meurs, "Nieuw-Amsterdam op Manhattan 1625-1660," in P. J. J. van Dijk, et al., eds., *Vestingbouw overzee: Militaire architectuur van Manhattan tot Korea* (Zutphen, 1996), pp. 19-32—and one indirectly—Frans Westra, "Lost and Found: Crijn Fredericx—A New York Founder," in *de Halve Maen*, vol. 71, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 7-16.

⁴ Robert Klein, *Form and Meaning: Essays on the Renaissance and Modern Art* (New York: The Viking Press, 1979), p. 89.

in the history of its [Manhattan's] progress.”⁵

Pronouncements that the “plan was neither artistic nor grandiose; to the mind of the Seventeenth Century designer, it was just practical,”⁶ downgrade the proposition to a “neat symmetrical pattern conceived in the security and comfort of the company’s offices in Amsterdam [that] never governed the development of the little colony.”⁷ Let me state my ambition in the form of a question. How can so many scholars continue to favour portrayals of historiographic Dutch primitivism at the expense of such ‘in-the-face’ idealism? Do not forget, the elaborate design that sailed from Texel with the military engineer and land surveyor Cryn Fredericxs on 25th April 1625 was the directors’ first and only complete building proposal for New Amsterdam. This design is significant enough for the fact that it was ever effected (likely owing, in the most general terms, to the overhanging influence of Willem Usselinx [1567-1647]), but one survey of the “Special Instructions” is enough to recognise its unique characteristics. Largely as a result of the extenuating political circumstances surrounding the proposition’s conception, this theoretical scheme occupies a key philosophical, sociological, and cultural niche in the history of the sixteenth and seventeenth-century ideal city.⁸ Without a doubt, the directors’ proposal upstaged

⁵ James Fenimore Cooper, *New York* (Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1973), p. 5-6.

⁶ Fred Roy Frank, *The Development of New York City, 1600-1900*. Unpublished Master’s thesis (Ithaca: Cornell University, 1955), p. 17.

⁷ John W. Reps, *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 148.

⁸ Scholarship on the interrelated subjects of the ideal city and military construction in the sixteenth century is exponentially expanding. This essay has benefited, in particular, from the following works: Jim Bennett and Stephen Johnston, *The Geometry of War, 1500-1700* (Oxford: Museum of the History of Science, 1996); Horst de la Croix, “Military Architecture and the Radial City Plan in Sixteenth Century Italy,” in *Art Bulletin*, vol. 42 (1960), pp. 263-290; J. R. Hale, *Renaissance Fortification: Art or Engineering?* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977); Paul Hirst, “The Defence of Places: Fortifications as Architecture,” in *AA Files* 33 (Summer 1991), pp. 13-26; Hanno-Walter Kruft, *A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present*, tr. Ronald Taylor, et al. (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994), p. 109-117; Simon Pepper and Nicholas Adams, *Firearms and Fortifications: Military Architecture and Siege Warfare in Sixteenth-Century Siena* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Alberto Pérez-Gómez, *Architecture and the Crisis of Modern Science* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994), p. 204-235; Martha D. Pollak, *Military Architecture, Cartography and the Representation of the Early Modern European City: A Checklist of Treatises on Fortification in the Newberry Library* (Chicago: Newberry Library, 1991); Martha D. Pollak, *Turin 1564-1680, Urban Design, Military Culture, and the Creation of the Absolutist Capital* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991); and Helen Rosenau, *The Ideal City: Its*

the entrenched taxonomy of the Renaissance 'ideal city' in Europe. The social hierarchies underlying its urban infrastructure set the precedent for the Remonstrants' front-line in New Netherland over the next forty years.

I

There is a historiographic debate, some might call bickering, that goes back decades and is centred around the political tendencies of the Dutch West India Company directors. By implication, these political associations have always been taken to imply the directors' broader ideological inclinations. And yet, every version of this debate is an equally narrow assessment of nearly the same empirical material, from one of two perspectives. Is it not imaginable that this seventeenth-century hotbed of political motivation fostered despotism, or at least a degree of duplicitousness? By contrast to interpretations of the directors' literary corpus, what might a study of each director's persona by his visual representation through portraiture reveal?⁹ It is true to say that these are as much assumptions by association as the former; yet in light of the fact that (i) the discursive tradition is appreciably longer in art history than in general history, and (ii) all existing scholarship tends to fall under the umbrella of Ferdinand de Saussure's (1857-1913) structuralism, it is a sea change, quoting Roland Barthes, to "enact a certain liberation of 'the significant.'"¹⁰ I will restrict myself to briefly considering the Company's two key protagonists in the development of New Amsterdam, the *Heren XIX* and the sixty-six directors of the Amsterdam Chamber that Johannes de Laet lists in *Histoire ofte Iaerlijck Verhael van de Verrichtinghen der Geoctroyeerde West-Indische*

Architectural Evolution in Europe, 3rd ed. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1983).

⁹ Author's note: The portraits included in this chapter are but a small part of a much larger research project, entitled "Portraiture as an Instrument of Examination: The Company Directors as *Philosophes*," that traces the connection between portraiture and colonial policy and politics. This project takes the form of a museum exhibition of nearly seventy seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish portraits.

¹⁰ Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, tr. Annette Lavers (New York: The Noonday Press, 1972), p. 9.

Compagnie (1644).¹¹ The very fact that nearly all these directors are documented in either an individual or group portrait, executed by the finest portrait painters of the day, is in itself evidence to their self-conscious attentiveness to seeking immortality, and at the same time attests to their prestige, cosmopolitanism, and financial clout.

To date, the debate around the Company's political tendencies, and whether one can establish a collective ideological character of the group, has been argued largely on the basis of categorising the directors as one of three types—South Netherlanders, Counter-Remonstrants, or Remonstrants. My intention is not to rebuke either this methodology or the material it has compiled, but to call into question the authors' summations by introducing a separate model. It is important to note that while the Company's charter advocated the enterprise's global ambitions, constituting the territory of the West India Company as "all that part of the world which was not specifically included in the charter of the East India Company," this was not a cohesive Company administering identical principles across half the globe.¹² Each of its five chambers—Amsterdam, Zeeland, the Maas, the Northern Quarter, and Friesland together with *Stadt ende Landen* [province of Groningen]—was unique, managing separate geographic areas with contrasting colonial ambitions. There is, however, no limit to the number of sweeping assumptions about the entire Company. As George Michael Asher writes:

"When considering the history of the West-India Company, one should never for a moment forget its political position: It was one of the most powerful organs of the Gomarian party; and therefore in full and open opposition to the States of Holland, to the national Dutch party and to

¹¹ See Johannes de Laet, *Histoire ofte Iaerlijck Verhael van de Verrichtinghen der Geoctroyeerde West-Indische Compagnie* (Leiden: Bonaventuer ende Abraham Elsevier, 1644).

¹² Cornelis Ch. Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580-1680* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1971), p. 90. Author's note: The full Dutch text of the West India Company charter, with an English translation by A. J. F. van Laer, appears in A. J. F. van Laer, ed. and tr., *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts: being the letters of Kiliaen Van Rensselaer, 1630-1643, and other documents relating to the colony of Rensselaerswyck* (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1908), p. 86-115.

the East India Company.”¹³

This rhetoric reached a watershed when Cornelis Ch. Goslinga wrote of the Company’s charter: “With its issuance, Contra-Remonstrantism rose like a young David in pursuing an energetic resumption of hostilities against the foreign Goliath.”¹⁴ Could the spokesman for the States General have put the words in his mouth any more explicitly? It would not be untimely to point-out that as the subject of this “bellicose” Company’s aggression, the Spanish had scant interest in the area of the New World comprising New Netherland. Goslinga cites the assertion that the Company’s motivation was “to remove the resources which Philip IV, King of Spain and Portugal, drew from his American and African possessions.”¹⁵ While this policy might somehow be applicable to the motives of the Zeeland Chamber in the West Indies and Brazil, it can hardly be suggested to account for the actions behind the Amsterdam Chamber’s development of New Amsterdam.

The most recent substantive round of this historiographic argument, and on which Goslinga was commenting, was between W. J. van Hoboken, then Director of the Amsterdam Municipal Archives, and the economic historian J. G. van Dillen.¹⁶ Besides Goslinga, summary commentaries by George L. Smith and Pieter Emmer have added nothing in substance and little more in criticism to this early-sixties confrontation.¹⁷ I have two sweeping suppositions to make from my analysis of

¹³ Georg Michael Asher, *A Bibliographical and Historical Essay on the Dutch Books and Pamphlets Relating to New-Netherland* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Frederik Muller, 1854-1867), p. 183-184.

¹⁴ Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580-1680*, p. 89.

¹⁵ From Charles de Lannoy and Herman van der Linden, *Histoire de l’expansion coloniale des peuples européens*, 3 vols., *Volume 2: Néerlande et Danemark* (etc.) (1911). Cited in Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580-1680*, p. 89.

¹⁶ See W. J. van Hoboken, “The Dutch West India Company; the Political Background of its Rise and Decline,” in J. S. Bromley and E. H. Kossmann, eds., *Britain and the Netherlands: Papers delivered to the Oxford-Netherlands Historical Conference, 1959* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1960), and J. G. van Dillen, “De West-Indische Compagnie, het Calvinisme en de politiek,” in *Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis*, vol. 74 (1961), pp. 145-171.

¹⁷ See Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580-1680*, George L. Smith, *Religion and Trade in New Netherland; Dutch Origins and American Development* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973), and Pieter Emmer, *The Dutch in the Atlantic Economy, 1580-1880*

these portraits. First, by comparison to the *Heren XIX*, these illustrations uphold my claim that the Amsterdam Chamber promulgated a vastly different, individually self-motivated ideological agenda. This had key colonial implications. In contrast to common portrayals of streamlined efficiency, it is my assertion that corporate divisiveness pervaded the Company's entire organisational structure. This was the cost of the Company's overzealous dependence on political accountability to overcome the East India Company's internal corruption. The *Heren XIX* was the public face of a Company whose charter ultimately detailed sovereign prerogatives. Even if their portraits did not foretell their sympathies, common sense would tell us that being accountable to the States General, under the Counter-Remonstrant leader Prince Maurits, meant the *Heren XIX* would always be ideologically compromised. Is it the case that the crux of this whole debate originated from one scholar's attempt to justify the assertion of ramrodding this Counter-Remonstrant line of power through the entire organisation? It would be unseemly to turn the same blind-eye to the ulterior exclamations of these portraits.

Second, by contrast to the conservatism of the *Heren XIX*, the directors of the Amsterdam Chamber comprised a self-conscious conglomerate of individualists who were neither wholly Counter-Remonstrant, nor Remonstrant, but advocates of a political liberalism akin to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment *philosophes*. If we accept the definition of Counter-Remonstrantism as a follower of orthodox Calvinism and Remonstrantism as asserting the authority of the State over the Church, each group subscribing to the respective corollary tenets of Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641) and Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609), then these portraits, taken in concert with the directors' actions in New Amsterdam, attest to a liberalism which defies collectively branding the sixty-six directors as Counter-Remonstrants. The visual evidence causes this telescopic classification to become untenable. With its

(Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998).

discrediting, so go all the exaggerated portrayals of theocratic harmony between the Chamber and the *Heren XIX*. An example of each of the three predominant portrait types—individual, family group, and Company—cements these claims.

Ferdinandus Schuylenburgh (1597-1652) certainly spared no expense to have himself portrayed in aristocratic splendour, topped-off by an almost mocking grin. (Figure 4.1) In this jest, he is the city watchman sporting a massive weapon. Painted by Adriaen van Nieulandt (1586/87-1658) (*c.* 1622), following the group portrait *Tocht naar Zwolle onder aanvoering van kapitein Abraham Boom* (1622) executed by van Nieulandt and Claes Pietersz. Lastman (1586-1625), Schuylenburgh is an obvious sportsman, wealthy landowner, and no fashion slouch.¹⁸ (Figure 4.2) Something like a prop shop, the carpetbag of the artist's *oeuvre*, comprising landscapes, still lifes, architectural painting, figure scenes, and portraits, has been emptied into this painting. The director is painted in the foreground between a city on the left and a fortification, bearing a similarity to later depictions of New Amsterdam, on the painting's right. Both of these align with his groin. Are we therefore to assume that this is the extent of his estate and the breadth of his Renaissance-inspired influence? The classical stance and sheer scale of Schuylenburgh's figure is an unassailable representation of his self-confidence and superiority. By comparison, just look at the scale and fashion of the lone, retreating peasant boy in the background, on the right.

Painted by Dirck Dircksz. Santvoort (1610/1611-1680) in 1635, the Amsterdam burgomaster and Company director, Dirck Jacobsz Bas (1569-1637), is sumptuously portrayed in the centre of his family's portrait, seated beside his

¹⁸ For a brief biography of Lastman and van Nieulandt, see Ger Luijten and Ariane van Suchtelen, eds., *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1993), p. 309-310 and 312-313 respectively. On Lastman's and van Nieulandt's group portrait, see M. Carasso-Kok and J. Levy-van Halm, *Schutters in Holland: Kracht en zenuwen van de stad* (Zwolle: Uitgeverij Waanders, 1988), p. 48-49.

second wife, in one remote corner of a room of gargantuan proportion.¹⁹ (Figure 4.3) It is an extraordinary depiction of the family's wealth, the patrician director's sophistication, and the symbolic status bequeathed to the beneficiaries of his patrimony. Each figure is very nearly an idealised character, though significantly Bas's status is galvanised by compromising each of the other three adult male figures in the picture, whether by expression, age, or injury—as his son-in-law and Company director (and Counter-Remonstrant proponent?) Abraham de Visscher (1605-1667) standing at the far left is pictured. All the while, the unbreeched boy wearing the nodding horse-hair plume stands in the foreground like a Homeric warrior.

Jacob Lyon's (1587-1648/59) *The Company of Captain Jacob Pietersz. Hooghkamer and Lieutenant Pieter Jacobsz. van Rijn* (1628) is a fashionable precedent of Frans Hals's (1582/83-1666) portrait of another West India Company director as a Company captain, *The Company of Captain Reynier Reael and Lieutenant Cornelis Michielsz. Blaeuw* (1637) [The Meagre Company].²⁰ (Figures 4.4, 4.5) The former is notable for being set in a definite context, the guardroom, and even more significant for its evident censure of overt political symbolism. Is it only coincidence, or justifiable solely as evidence of "the very earliest 'symbolic phase' portrait in which nobody points at the captain," that the guardsman in the upper row adopts a long outmoded gesture, pointing toward the painting above the head of the Captain, to conveniently mask the coat of arms on the far wall?²¹ The hat of the Lieutenant is conveniently positioned to finish the job. In both Lyon's and Hals's painting the emphasis on free space singles-out the principal figure. Yet the fact that

¹⁹ For a brief biography of Santvoort, see Neil MacLaren and Christopher Brown, *The Dutch School, 1600-1900*, 2 vols. (London: National Gallery Publications Limited, 1991), I: 411.

²⁰ On Lyon's painting, see Alois Riegl, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, intro. Wolfgang Kemp, tr. Evelyn M. Kain and David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999), p. 37-39.

²¹ Riegl, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, p. 37.

the two Captains maintain a predominance in the picture is as attributable to their tailors as it is to their central position.

It was the case that “in the Chamber of Amsterdam, a director was required to have invested at least six thousand guilders in the company [and] . . . only those who had invested the above sums, the so-called head-participants, were eligible to become directors;” nonetheless, the portraits imply that the appointed directors had ambitions beyond merely being financial heavies labelled with a religious inclination meant to underpin all their other actions.²² Maurice Cranston wrote that the eighteenth-century French *philosophes* were all “disciples of the English philosopher Francis Bacon.”²³ If this is so, one would be inclined to say that the directors were among his first disciples. They had the necessary résumé, just by advocating progress and forging a dependence on the instruments and proofs of science. At the same time, they were evidently keen socialites and acute observers of social decorum. In seventeenth-century Amsterdam society, men of such inclination would have had no difficulty finding forums to parade themselves and their ideas.

To recognise the oppressive hierarchy within the West India Company’s structure, the imbalance of each Chamber’s scale and their obligations, the roles of authority, political posturing, and even the divisions within each Chamber, necessitates a broad reconsideration of the prevailing view of development in New Amsterdam. The ideological issues raised by the directors’ portraits and the motives that they imply challenge the purveyors of feeble colonial picturesqueness. The seventeenth-century power-brokers composing the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company were anything but the indecisive figures portrayed over decades of historical perennialism.

²² Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580-1680*, p. 93.

²³ See Maurice Cranston’s “Introduction” to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract* (London: Penguin Books, 1968), p. 15.

II

What was the effect of the contemporary political situation in the Netherlands on the “Special Instructions?” There are two aspects to consider in relation to this question. First, the cinquecento relation between the architect [engineer] and ruler heightened co-operation between the two. At the start of the seventeenth century this collaboration was in full bloom. Second, the New World offered the chance to realise an unfettered ideal. For different reasons, this was an appealing prospect to every party involved. The fall of the Remonstrant leader Johan Van Oldenbarnevelt (1547-1619) in 1619, however, meant that for the Remonstrant-inclined Chamber, vested only two years later (1st July 1621), what might have been a profitable collaboration in the Italian model became a master-class in diplomacy. To realise the ‘ideological trophy’ meant engaging in a delicately-balanced political game. To what extent is this project a conciliatory gesture to the States General, under the leadership of the militant Calvinist Prince Maurits of Nassau (1567-1625), and not solely an ideal based on the dissolution of theocratic parts?²⁴ In separate accounts, the Dutch cartographer, printer and publisher Hendrik Hondius (1573-1650), the Flemish Reformed preacher and geographer Petrus Plancius (1552-1622), and the Dutch scientist, military engineer, and mathematician Simon Stevin (1548-1620) have each been attributed an intermediary role in formulating the Company’s policy on military construction. Including the shadowy-figure of Cryn Fredericxsz [Quirijn van Lobbrecht], what was the role of a third and fourth party in the design process?²⁵

²⁴ Maurits died on 23rd April 1625, one day after the “Special Instructions” was published. He was succeeded by his half-brother Prince Frederik Hendrik (1584-1647).

²⁵ On the subject of Quirijn van Lobbrecht, see the recent article by Frans Westra, “Lost and Found: Crijn Fredericx—A New York Founder,” in *de Halve Maen*, vol. 71, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 7-16. For all the expectations raised by its title, Westra’s article, apart from pinpointing the identity of Cryn Fredericxsz, neither adds new evidence, nor raises any significant points regarding Lobbrecht’s role in or relation to the directors’ scheme. While Westra is content to document Lobbrecht’s life, his auxiliary material is useful as the fodder of discursive issues that the present chapter raises.

From the outset it is going to prove necessary to rebutt the chorus of agreement surrounding the proposal's historiographic precedents. There is one example that from the Dutch historian Frederik Caspar Wieder (1874-1943) to Professor Emeritus John W. Reps, by way of Fred Roy Frank, continues to be wrongfully paraded as the precedent of this theoretical city. Jacob van Deventer's (real name Jacob Roelofsz. c. 1505-1575) plan of Philippeville was first printed by Georg Braun and Frans Hogenberg in the *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* in 1581. (Figure 4.6) Among all the contemporary pentagonal fortification plans, on what grounds was Philippeville singled-out? Are Wieder and his accomplices intimating that some unnamed Company director or directors either incidentally happened-upon, sought-out, or were referred to Braun and Hogenberg's atlas? Such speculation is nothing more than Simon Schama-like historicism which these Sherlock Holmeses have flogged as empirical deduction. Philippeville, located in the Province of Namur, is a fortress city founded by Charles V in 1554.

Apart from the obvious pentagonal ground plan with five bastions, a moat, and a couple of other incidental points that Philippeville shares with the directors' city and hundreds of other examples across Europe, Philippeville is no more or less the city's prototype than all of the other unmentioned examples. How are eleven radial streets from a centrepoint equated with six streets following three separate points of reference? How is one to reconcile the circular outline of Philippeville's one secondary street faced with the directors' entirely rectilinear city plan? Furthermore, not a single typological function occupies even a remotely similar position. Of course they could not because there are not any equatable positions. It is true, the centre of Philippeville was occupied by a quadrangle, yet it was rotated 90° from the directors' plan, and the centrepoint was the repository of the pillory. More significantly though, Charles V, and his son Philip II, were fervent Catholic

supporters.²⁶ It is far too short-sighted to exclude the political power of religion from the debate on architecture. Aside from all the planimetric evidence, it is even more improbable that the Company directors would fashion an ideal city in the model of an extroverted Catholic prototype.

This hypothesis is, however, a degree more founded than the miscalculated model of the “Special Instructions” drawn by Elva Kathleen Lyon in her essay titled “The Transfer of Technology from the Dutch Republic to New Netherlands [*sic.*]: Forts, Factories and Cities as a Beginning.” (Figure 4.7) On top of the exceedingly schematic nature of the diagram and the many other more trivial inconsistencies demonstrating the author’s lack of fluency in military construction, I cannot agree with Lyon’s fundamental interpretation that the fortification was planned to be four-sided. This is an opinion of I. N. Phelps Stokes’s that pre-dates the publication of the “Special Instructions” in Arnold Johan Ferdinand [A. J. F.] van Laer’s *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626* (1924).²⁷ At this late date, one can only assume that Lyon’s postulation is predicated on an unclaimed dispute with the document’s text. In the section of the “Special Instructions” titled “Concerning the Division of the Lands,” it very clearly states:

“Between lands No. 1 and No. 2 there shall run a common thoroughfare, No. 14, 25 feet wide, exclusive of the ditches, each of which shall be 9 feet wide. This thoroughfare shall be ranging with the fifth bastion of the fort, so as to be protected thereby.”²⁸

²⁶ Charles V (1500-1558) was Holy Roman emperor from 1519 to 1556, King of Spain and Naples, and ruler of Milan, the Netherlands, and the “isles and terra firma” of the New World. His son, Philip II (1527-1598), was King of Spain from 1556 to 1598.

²⁷ See I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), I: 134 (1915) and VI: 10-13 (1928). Overturning his earlier countenance, in the final volume Stokes all but explicitly states his acceptance of F. C. Wieder’s 1925 reconstruction.

²⁸ Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626*, p. 143-144. See also footnote 11, p. 270, where van Laer notes: “*het vyffde punt vant bolwerck*—literally, ‘the fifth point of the bulwark,’ which in this case must evidently be understood to mean ‘the fifth bastion of the fort.’” Author’s note: I cannot agree with either the evidence or speculation surrounding the “Hartgers View” that van Laer cites in the remainder of the footnote. See Chapter 3—“On Being In/Between: Expanding the Cultural *Episteme* in New Netherland,” p. 104-109, and Chapter 5—“Take Four: The

III

We must start from the knowledge that Nature (*la belle nature*) in its idealised form was itself the seat of reason. To the Chamber's glitterati, New Netherland presented an incomparable opportunity to construct a crystalline intellectual ideal on a *tabula rasa*. Sheer scale alone indicates the ambition of this project. At the same time, one knows that "a closed society, and distance in space and time, are the fundamental conditions of the utopian dream."²⁹ On top of which, from such a perspective, the Dutch Republic for all its glory was already a tawdry ideal. Endless extolling of a Nature *sui generis* by sixteenth and early seventeenth-century explorers and historians introduced an irrepressible mythological quality to the New World landscape that framed the directors' actions and that created the circumstances for conceiving the city as a utopian enterprise. In this city, Nature is a symbol of the physical and ontological passage from the Old to New World. The directors introduced an implied conflict to the plan by manipulating Nature's influence. They reshaped it and ordered it to serve. In this way, they unseated a tradition, stemming from the Greeks, which required a "genuine naturalism" to produce physically, intellectually, and morally superior human beings. As Robert Klein observes: "variations upon the elementary forms out of which ideal-city plans are made serve to transform the draftsman into a magus."³⁰ With evidence to assign individual authorship thin on the ground, the Amsterdam Chamber's directors, and particularly the signatories of the "Special Instructions"—S. Goddyn [Samuel Godijn] and Kiliaen Rentselaer [Kiliaen van Rensselaer]—become ennobled. Combine this mark of their temperament with the directors' affinity for fortifications, no more clearly pronounced than in Werner Jacobsz van den Valckert's (c. 1580/85-c. 1627) portrait

Pitfalls of a Classical Education," p. 154-155.

²⁹ Klein, *Form and Meaning*, p. 90.

³⁰ Klein, *Form and Meaning*, p. 89.

of the *Company of Captain Albert Coenrat Burgh and Lieutenant Pieter Evertsz.* (1625), and their custom for tossing-in a bit of historical style, and one has all the hallmarks to set the standard of seventeenth-century civilised taste. (Figure 4.8) Is Valckert's painting the unnamed source for Wieder's earlier supposition? The only other conclusion is Alois Riegl's. He contends that Coenrat Burgh is "showing the viewer a fortification that the company has just been charged with defending (the war with Spain was raging on again in full force) or the evidence of one of its military exploits."³¹ At the same time, inflating the visual role of reason implied the city's contemporaneity. This earned the idealists their philosophical stripes and enhanced social position. Is this one example of the Reformation's influence on architecture?

If there was any lingering doubt, the city's allegorical imperative and utopian ambition is confirmed in the "Special Instructions." Turning our attention to Wieder's reconstruction—Concept B—the entire project is the ideal 'castle' in the literary Eden. (Figure 4.9) Though, the 'castle' is caught in the historiographic process of transformation from a picturesque element to a stern citadel. If the Company directors were such acute observers of fortification design as they have been credited, then they must have come across any number of late sixteenth-century treatises by "professional military men," that authoritatively shunned the tendency to abstract geometrical solutions on the basis of the landscape's varying topography. These treatises "urged their readers to discount the advice of architects or *dottori*, 'for books don't fight.'"³² As it transpired and the "Special Instructions" attest, the Company directors did not expect to either. As Klein writes: "a utopian who regulates the life of the citizens of his republic is in a position to regulate its setting as well."³³ The "Provisional Regulations" accomplished the first-half of this

³¹ Riegl, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, p. 233.

³² See Simon Pepper, "Body, Diagram, and Geometry in the Renaissance Fortress," in George Dodds and Robert Tavernor, eds., *Body and Building: Essays on the Changing Relation of Body and Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002), p. 119, pp. 114-125.

³³ Klein, *Form and Meaning*, p. 90.

equation. In the “Special Instructions,” the directors cunningly took-up the second half.

The scheme’s overall composition is an extraordinary patterning of the landscape. The conception of this immense place clearly owes its influence to contemporary garden fantasies viewed from ideal positions, foremost of which one should look to the examples of the highly-reputed sixteenth-century artist Hans Vredeman de Vries (1526-1609). (Figure 4.10) As clearly demonstrated throughout *Hortorum viridariorumque elegantes* (etc.) (1583) and *Perspective, id est . . . ars inspicientis . . . oculorum aciei, in pariete, tabula aut tela depicta* (etc.) (1605), his was certainly not the parochial eye of the moral gaze of the Dutch landscape painters. (Figures 4.11, 4.12) The difference between the two lies almost exclusively in the former’s embrace and the latter’s admonishment of reason. In de Vries, fantasy overlays reason in a nascent form of Baroque self-absorption. For anyone approaching this utopia by land, the extensive low-lying pastures consume the tableaux foreground, the topography of which is variegated by the staccato patterns of roads and ditches. The ‘castle’ just beyond is the obvious focal point, whose pentagonal form is juxtaposed by the quadrangular pattern of surrounding houses. Sited on either side of the ‘castle’ are the city’s vineyards and formal gardens. The river acts as the scenographic backdrop for the entire composition. From the more typical approach of the river, this Utopia has only been heightened by the imprint of the European directors. On the edge of endless blue water, is perched the domineering, majestic ‘castle,’ grasped on either side by the sumptuous colour and splendour of the city’s vineyards and formal gardens. Utilitarianism is consigned out of view. How else then could this theoretical proposition be seen for anything other than its idealism?

These were huge marks in the landscape which the *Heren XIX* and States

General would support on the basis of scale alone. The city functioned to galvanise the Republic's imperial claims by significantly altering and populating the land. By contrast to the local utilitarianism of most European examples, the directors' fortification contributed to the Dutch Republic's global omnipresence and signified the centre of the sovereign's colonial territory in North America. It may just be that the folly of scale became one ruse easily played by the Amsterdam Chamber. Not to mention, the pentagon form eschewed authority. Such a device was likely sufficient to disguise what was a far more involved cultural model, one largely based on deforming, and ultimately bankrupting, the contemporary ideal city's typical visual hierarchy. It is clear that the directors' proposal stepped-out of the Vitruvian-inspired military tit-for-tat between the city and machine that dominated architecture up until the seventeenth century. Not another Vitruvian derivation, offensive device, agrarian English settlement, or theocratic treatise, the "Special Instructions" created an intramural machine commanding an enquiry into the nature of its science, what Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) called the 'Galilean mathematicization of nature.' Not only did the directors make it arithmetic, but the city's aestheticism converted the site into a theatre—quite a cultural representation. The staging of architecture, that indicates the significant occupancy of space, is a forerunner of the Enlightenment initiative to realise utopia, to paraphrase Anthony Vidler, by constructing the 'good place' rather than the imagination of 'no place.'³⁴

Amidst such lofty ambitions, it should not be forgotten that fortification was *au courant*. Not only in the sense that drove every treatise-writer since Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) to devote a chapter, chapters, or entire manuscript to fortification, but also as a visual image coveted by the aristocracy, politicians, artists, and anyone looking to ingratiate themselves to the intelligentsia.³⁵ There are

³⁴ See Anthony Vidler, "Diagrams of Utopia," in *Daidalos* 74 (October 2000), pp. 6-13.

³⁵ See Leon Battista Alberti, *De re aedificatoria* (c. 1452), translated by Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach, and Robert Tavernor as *On the Art of Building in Ten Books* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT

countless examples. In *Renaissance Fortification: Art or Engineering?* (1977), Sir John Hale promoted Bernardino Poccetti's (1548-1612) sixteenth-century painting of a military architect's workshop awash with fortification models. (Figure 4.13) Agostino Ramelli, in the frontispiece to his book *Le Diverse et Artificiose Machine* (etc.) (1588), is pictured beside a model of a fortified city with callipers prominently displayed in his right hand. (Figure 4.14) Even nineteenth-century illustrators got in on the game. The depiction of William Penn, from Samuel Griswold Goodrich's *The First Book of History, Combined with Geography* (etc.) (1852), pictures the statesman poised with callipers, and seated alongside a gridiron plan that the print's title infers is Philadelphia. (Figure 4.15) Fortification's social side is almost as significant as all of its philosophical contributions to the Modern Age. Nearly all of the authors of Renaissance architectural treatises clamoured to illustrate their knowledge and inventiveness on the subject of fortification. While it is true that this can be almost exclusively attributed to the fifteenth-century rediscovery of Vitruvius and his emphasis on "measures of defence" in *De architectura*, fortification's influence and its far-reaching effects were not reserved to architects. If one was not transfixed by Alberti, Filarete (Antonio Averlino) (c. 1410-c. 1480), Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1439-1501), or Vincenzo Scamozzi (1548-1616), to name but a few, there was a whole host of military literature by contemporary mathematicians, cartographers, historians, and artillery officers focused especially on military architecture.³⁶ Located in the centre of the European publishing and printmaking industry, the Amsterdam director was also likely to be caught-up in Jacques Besson (c. 1530-1573), Agostino Ramelli (1531-1608), or Vittorio Zonca (c. 1568-1603), perusing paintings ranging from siege operations to portraits and still lifes by artists including Jacques Callot (1592-1635) and Jan van der Heyden (1637-1712), and

Press, 1997).

³⁶ On the development of military architecture in literature in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, see Martha Pollak, "Military Architecture and Cartography in the Design of the Early Modern City," in David Buisseret, ed., *Envisioning the City: Six Studies in Urban Cartography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998).

absorbed in the inaugural fanfare of the Schouwburg (1638) on the Keizersgracht. With all the hang-ups of the Enlightenment *philosophes* and all the desires of the dilettante—note the modish costume of Pieter Evertsz. Hulft (1578-1639) and Simon van der Does (1584-1652), and the fashionable van Dyckian French Court style of Gijsbert van Hemert's (1590-?) family portrait—are we still to believe the directors are the advocates and authors of an ideal city paraded as ultimately unoriginal, and “just one more of the same type”?³⁷ (Figures 4.16-4.18) In fortification's terms, strict typecasting ended at geometrical form.

IV

“So we see that fortresses are useful or not depending on circumstances; and if they are beneficial in one direction, they are harmful in another. It can be put like this: the prince who is more afraid of his own people than of foreign interference should build fortresses; but the prince who fears foreign interference more than his own people should forget about them. . . . So, all things considered, I commend those who erect fortresses and those who do not; and I censure anyone who, putting his trust in fortresses, does not mind if he is hated by the people.”³⁸

Lofty ambitions and fashion consciousness are not the work's sum total. In my view, the directors' operation was also deeply political within the structure of the larger Company. Reading between the “Petition of Walloons and French Concerning Virginia” (1621), the “Provisional Regulations for the Colonists adopted by the Assembly of the Nineteen of the West India Company” (March, 1624), the “Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor Cryn Fredericxsz and for the Director and Council regarding the building of the fort and the houses” (April, 1625), and Wieder's illustrated reconstruction of the “Special Instructions,” provides key insights into the three political groups—the Walloons, *Heren XIX*, and West India Company's Amsterdam Chamber—vying for influence in the colony's

³⁷ Frank, *The Development of New York City*, p. 17.

³⁸ Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, tr. George Bull (London: Penguin Books, 1995), p. 69.

development.³⁹ Among all of the subscription to ideal models in this ‘theoretical city,’ the directors’ mark is clearly motivated to regain the lost maxims of the “Provisional Regulations,” thereby exercising an ideological power over the colonists. Regaining by way of the city plan what the *Heren XIX* had ideologically relinquished is deeply indicative of the Company’s covert power struggle. The reciprocal ‘play’ between architecture and text, which has formed the basis of architectural discourse since the late eighteenth century, acted duplicitously in this city. Such parlance imbues the proposition with an irrefutable tension.

Oliver A. Rink astutely identifies the “Provisional Regulations” as “one of the most neglected documents in American colonial history.”⁴⁰ I am also of the opinion that his motive for saying so, which emphasises the dichotomy of Company power and colonists’ incentives, is way too cut and dry. Rink transforms a Byzantine, early seventeenth-century corporate structure into IBM. The power-play was never so black and white. Just look at the Amsterdam entrepreneur Willem Usselinx. The organisation and ideals of the Company and its colonisation policy had been his crucible, and yet his two principal ideas were that a Dutch agricultural colony would provide the ‘raw materials’ and exclusive export market for the ‘mother-country,’ and that the colonists could realise “the idea of transplanting the ‘true Christian Religion’ to the New World and combating the errors of the Popish Antichrist.”⁴¹ The Remonstrant-inclined, Amsterdam Chamber’s aims were obviously far and away above the rule-based support for the ‘mother-country’

³⁹ “Petition of Walloons and French Concerning Virginia,” tr. J. W. de Forest, in J. W. de Forest, *The de Forests of Avesnes* (New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, 1900), pp. 190-195; “Provisional Regulations for the Colonists adopted by the Assembly of the Nineteen of the West India Company” (March 28, 1624), in Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626*, p. 2-19.

⁴⁰ Oliver A. Rink, *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), p. 76.

⁴¹ C. R. Boxer, *The Dutch in Brazil, 1624-1654* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 4. On Usselinx, see also J. Franklin Jameson, “Willem Usselinx: Founder of the Dutch and Swedish West India Companies,” in *Papers of the American Historical Association*, vol. 2, no. 3, (1887), pp. 155-382.

pervading the twenty commercial conditions outlined in the Regulations. It is not so much the power that the Company would regain in their city, but an enhanced idealism that was not subservient to colonial utilitarianism.

The directors' model was neither going to be a facsimile of a theocratic Walloon enclave in Hainault, nor a panoptical ideal city of tyrannical Spanish despots. Drawn up by a committee of the Amsterdam Chamber comprising Albert Coenraets, Samuel Godyn and Johannes de Laet, the "Provisional Regulations" was a stern document by comparison to the Walloons' clear-cut petition. Yet for all of its judicial power, by failing to specify the physical constitution of the colony, the door was left ajar for a second committee to dictate the colony's civic aspect. This 'opening' was crucial to dilute the overriding spectre of the *Heren XIX*. In short, the "Provisional Regulations" protected against a commercial black-market and the "Special Instructions" constructed one. The only sense of mystique in the Regulations is in Article 10 when the Company writes:

"All minerals, newly discovered or still to be discovered mines of gold, silver, copper, or any other metals, as well as of precious stones, such as diamonds, rubies, and the like, together with the pearl fishery, shall be allowed to be worked by the Company's men only."⁴²

Such visions of Candide in Toledo, however, come crashing down when the following three conditions minutely detail the Company's commercial management of any such miraculous event. By contrast to the obsessiveness of conventional ideal and utopian associations with the image of the sun, the internal spatial machine of the directors' city, with all its back alleys and enclosed streets, is the frontier of temptation. For all of its social technique, the "Special Instructions" are noticeably light on construction methods. The two other missing models—Concept D and Concept E—are not any more tectonically specific, they only serve to indicate the limit of Wieder's mettle.

⁴² Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626*, p. 10.

He did not publish reconstructions of either of these larger scale diagrams. Does the document's lack of detail indicate the Company's division of labour? Crudely put, the directors were the brains and Fredericxsz the braun. It is not an atypical partition of power. Attributing the city plan to Fredericxsz is about as convincing as attributing the pyramids to the stone masons.

V

“Descartes wished that towns would express ‘the will of a few men endowed with reason’; he would not have objected if they expressed man’s imagination as well.”⁴³

There was clearly more to enhancing the architectural reputation of the Reformation than replacing and re-positioning the city's structures like figures on a game board. Unlike Albrecht Dürer, in *Etliche Underricht zu Befestigung der Stett, Schloss und flecken* (1527), who relegated the church to a corner of his quadrangular fortress, or both Alberti and Filarete who left “pride of place to the palace, to austere and separate schools for boys and girls, to the prisons and the house of ‘Vice and Virtue,’” the church was at the obligatory centre of the directors’ proposal.⁴⁴ (Figure 4.19) In fact, the typological distribution was remarkably straightforward. Architectural vocabulary was manoeuvred from the all-pervasive codified system of classicism, by the city's facility to appreciate three-dimensions. I will demonstrate that key building types could be located in prescribed planimetric positions, and at the same time not be rooted within conventional modes of interpretation. In this way, the city can be interpreted as the product of various semiotic paradoxes that resulted from the directors’ political brinkmanship with the States General.

In Wieder's reconstruction—Concept A—the quadrangle marked the

⁴³ Klein, *Form and Meaning*, p. 89.

⁴⁴ Rosenau, *The Ideal City: Its Architectural Evolution in Europe*, p. 46.

boundary of the inhabited city. (Figure 4.20) This edge was circumscribed by a ditch twenty-four feet wide and four feet deep. Along the inside of this line were the gardens and houses of the farmers. These would have been the 'freemen,' positioned in fealty to the Company's 'castle.' Each of these parcels was two-hundred feet square, nearly four times the size of the entire fort first constructed by Hendrick Christiaensen on Castle Island. With the provision for only one gated entrance, overseen by a watchman, the directors followed that utopian prerogative of closing the society. However, the hierarchical form of state is not omnipresent and there is clearly a battle being waged over the seventeenth-century destruction of the cosmos and the geometrization of space. Does the predominance of Euclidian geometry indicate the directors' intent of secularising consciousness, or of retaining 'the world as a finite, close and hierarchically ordered whole?'⁴⁵

Let us now look more closely at Concept C. (Figure 4.21) By the absence of anything marking the plan's centre, the whole question of monumentality is broached. While there is no question that space maintains a hierarchical role, the colonists are not pushed into submissiveness by civic design. We know that "towns with a central plan have a simple means of outwardly displaying their system of government: the seat of principal authority is placed in the middle. That is why liberal utopias leave the center empty."⁴⁶ While the pentagon performs the conventional role of presence by spatial absence; at the same time, the whole question of symbolic intent is raised by the Company's restriction to the pentagon's perimeter. In this way, the plan subtly alludes to Baroque town plans which modulated the Renaissance predilection for determinism.

As I have shown, the directors obviously shunned grand typological

⁴⁵ See "The Intellectual Context for Military Architecture," in Pollak, *Military Architecture, Cartography & the Representation of the Early Modern European City*, p. xviii-xxiv, pp. xi-xxxvi.

⁴⁶ Klein, *Form and Meaning*, p. 95.

manipulations in two-dimensions in order to concentrate on aesthetic premises and the techniques of perspective. Before the Baroque ideal city, the majority of plans maintained the perspective intact. Developed to be perceived right from the city's approach, the Cartesian individual was expected to survive within the scientific framework of the central perspective. This wholehearted abandonment to demonstrative science would have stripped the Walloons of any collective identity. By contrast, the overall indeterminacy pervading the directors' model is a psychological minefield. Again, proof is in the pudding. As the directors write:

“But whereas the height of the first story of the houses is to be 15 feet, which is too low for the church, no floor shall be put in, but the second story of 9 feet shall be added, giving a combined height of 24 feet, which is enough, and above this there shall be a loft.”⁴⁷

Is there then any necessity for conformity between three-dimensional representation and its two dimensional equivalent?

Geometry was not only used for representation, however, but also for construction. In his book, *De Stichting van New York in Juli 1625* (1925), Frederik Caspar Wieder attributes the details of structure to Simon Stevin, an advisor to Prince Maurits. This attribution is not based on any evidence, but is a discursive argument intent on situating Stevin, who is on record as having been commissioned by the *Heren XVII* of the Dutch East India Company (VOC) to “give town planning advice . . . for the layout of a general rendezvous in the East,” within the orbit of the West India Company.⁴⁸ Yet to suggest his involvement and then only cite a few archetypal details that you could find in any book on fortification is a missed

⁴⁷ Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626*, p. 160-163.

⁴⁸ C. J. Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and Their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion During the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Amsterdam: BV Uitgeverij De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1998), p. 139. Whether or not this “rendezvous” was Batavia is a long-disputed question. See Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money*, p. 288, n. 28, for an overview of recent contributions to this debate.

opportunity. A collection of Stevin's posthumously published papers illustrates his elaborate proposals for an ideal city.⁴⁹ (Figure 4.22) These plans and the city's residences are highly indicative of geometry's role in forging a new aesthetic, and one closely tied to the principles of military combat and army camp construction in Jacob de Gheyn II's *Wapenhandelighen: van roers musquetten ende spiessen* (1607).⁵⁰ One that excludes humanism's taste for naturalism. Where E. J. Dijksterhuis writes: "their main value is probably that they contribute to our mental picture of the writer's personality,"⁵¹ more recent studies of Dutch planning, particularly Bea Brommer's and Dirk de Vries's *Historische plattegronden van Nederlandse steden. Deel 4: Batavia* (1992), Kees Zandvliet's *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and Their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion During the 16th and 17th Centuries* (1998), and Ron van Oers's *Dutch Town Planning Overseas during VOC and WIC Rule (1600-1800)* (2000), have logically projected Stevin's influence in colonial settlements of the East India Company, but not a word on the West India Company, chartered less than a year after his death, or New Amsterdam.⁵² Frans Westra came the closest in his article, "Lost and Found: Crijn Fredericx—A New York Founder," although in the process he becomes another victim of Fredericxsz's talismanic hold on New York's colonial historians. He registers the calculated assumption that Fredericxsz trained at Stevin's *Duytsche Mathematique* at the University of Leiden.⁵³ Yet Westra concludes:

⁴⁹ See Simon Stevin, *Materiae politicae* (etc.) (Leiden: A. Rosenboom, 1649).

⁵⁰ On how Dutch experts, including Stevin, integrated Roman ideas, which it has been argued can be traced to practices in Dutch colonisation, see Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money*, p. 159-161, and C. M. J. M. van den Heuvel, "De huysbou de crychconst en de wysentijt. Stevins teksten over architectuur, stede-en vestingbouw in het licht van zijn wetenschappelijk oeuvre," in *Spiegheling en daet. Simon Stevin van Brugghe (1548-1620)* (Brugge: De Bieckorf, 1995-1996), pp. 44-69.

⁵¹ See E. J. Dijksterhuis, *Simon Stevin: Science in the Netherlands around 1600* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970), p. 113.

⁵² Among others, see Bea Brommer and Dirk de Vries, *Historische plattegronden van Nederlandse steden. Deel 4: Batavia* (Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto, 1992), p. 7; C. J. Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and Their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion During the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Amsterdam: BV Uitgeverij De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1998), various pages; and Ron van Oers, *Dutch Town Planning Overseas during VOC and WIC Rule, 1600-1800* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2000), p. 78-88.

⁵³ On the subject of the *Duytsche Mathematique*, see Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money*, p. 75-78.

“As Stevin, the obvious person for the formulation of instructions for fortifications, died in 1620, it is assumed that the instructions with which Crijn Fredericx was provided for the construction of the fort at Manhattan had come from the hand of Professor [Frans] Van Schooten.”⁵⁴

To nobody’s surprise he adds in the footnote: “Unfortunately, no proof of this could be found in the correspondence of the university.”⁵⁵

In Stevin’s proposition, houses were erected in blocks, permitting them to bear the aspect of one “palace,” rather than a row of private dwellings. The linear block fronting roads 4 & 5 follows this model. Spanning two lots, the very centre of this block accommodated the residence of the Commissary. From his own enclave, the directors write: “the Commissary must be able to go into all the lofts on the right-hand side, as well as in all the lofts on the left-hand side, along the entire street, doors to be made from one into the other.”⁵⁶ Effectively, this block was the Company palace. As you can see from Stevin’s illustrations, houses were to be built strictly according to the principles of symmetry. (Figures 4.23, 4.24) Lots no. 31 apply this rationale to the hedonistic sailors placed at the city’s perimeter. Each lot, 20 feet in width and extending in depth 40 feet were subdivided into ship’s quarters, 10 feet square, to accommodate 80 persons, two per “compartment.”

We were not ever going to get out of this without mentioning Plato. In the *Laws* there is the remark: “If men are to have a city wall at all, the private houses should be constructed right from the foundations so that the whole city forms in effect a single wall. . . A whole city looking like a single house will be quite a pretty

⁵⁴ Westra, “Lost and Found: Crijn Fredericx—A New York Founder,” p. 9.

⁵⁵ Westra, “Lost and Found: Crijn Fredericx—A New York Founder,” p. 9.

⁵⁶ Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626*, p. 164.

sight, . . .”⁵⁷ When we look at Wieder’s reconstructed plan, we see that either he has given in to indecision, or even for all its symbolic mass these directors had no intention of fighting. Plato’s wonderfully absurd idea has been taken to even more dizzying heights by extending Lots no. 31 right to the rampart. I have to acknowledge that they had some question about this, but even so it illustrates that the directors were more well versed in and concerned with Plato’s ideas, who argued that in this position “the houses should be easy to defend because they present to the street a regular and unbroken front,” than in reproducing the conventions of seventeenth-century military construction that argued exactly the opposite.⁵⁸

Leonardo da Vinci’s fifteenth-century “Plans for Towns,” concentrates on the town’s individual buildings, where an emphasis is given to technical achievements, including drawings for “movable and adjustable, in fact, prefabricated houses.” These illustrate the unique role of mechanisation in the city. In a section titled “On Moving Houses,” da Vinci writes:

“Let the houses be moved and arranged in order; and this will be done with facility because such houses are at first made in pieces on the open places, and can then be fitted together with their timbers in the site where they are to be permanent.”⁵⁹

While “hydraulic mania” had been *de rigueur* in utopian schemes since Plato’s Atlantis, such mechanistic moves in fortified cities are extremely rare, and yet this is another chapter from the directors’ town-planning play-book. From the initial tripartite block comprising the school, church and hospital, they continue: “And by the time the population shall increase, in order to have more room for the church, the

⁵⁷ Plato, *The Laws*, tr. Trevor J. Saunders (London: Penguin Books, 1970), p. 260.

⁵⁸ Plato, *The Laws*, p. 260. In the “Special Instructions,” the directors write: “It is a matter for consideration, however, whether the 40 feet should be shortened at once, so as to keep a passageway along the rampart, or whether the lots should be allowed to extend to the rampart.” See van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626*, p. 167.

⁵⁹ Jean Paul Richter, ed., *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), II: 22.

school and the hospital can be added to it, thus enlarging the church to a width of 100 feet on the market by a depth of 50 feet.”⁶⁰ Unmistakably, the city is conceived as an impermanent organism. A 1684 edition of Vitruvius’s *Les dix livres d’architecture*, edited by Claude Perrault (1613-1688), includes an exceptional engraving that signifies the indissoluble relationship between the city and the machine. (Figure 4.25) This image demonstrates that the machine is an edifice in the nature of the city sharing a mutually inclusive iconography. To a certain extent, the directors’ city includes just such a ‘blurring’ between the premises of military construction. Again, the psychology undermining humanism is not far around the corner. This time Freud’s analysis pejoratively illustrates the “inhuman detachment of Leonardo” which, he said: “set the artist apart from the majority of town-planners . . . primarily concerned with the human rather than the technical element in planning.”

VI

The directors’ city is without clear precedent. It has its general models, but in its entirety—iconographically, tectonically, typologically, etc.—it is peerless. Such a construction does not fit neatly within any one architectural history, and certainly not within the prevailing colonial sentiment. The directors’ scheme deviated appreciably from the conventional image of the fortified, ideal, and utopian city. Contemporary scholarship in architectural history increasingly emphasises the overlap of these prominent city types. Broadly speaking, colonial historians continue to write in splendid isolation. As a unique combination of all three urban forms, the “Special Instructions” holds a crucial place in the otherwise dry history of Dutch colonial encampments. Cherry-picking innovative ideas from Plato, da Vinci, and Stevin, among others, has dramatic colonial implications. These manoeuvres cast a

⁶⁰ Van Laer, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626*, p. 160-163.

new light on the directors' original intent in New Amsterdam and elevate the directors' city to a seat alongside William Penn's Philadelphia and James Oglethorpe's Savannah, without all the classical hang-ups. Such a heuristic instrument is unmatched in seventeenth-century Dutch colonialism. Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen's (1604-1679) model colony, Mauritsstad, seems positively conventional by comparison. By scrutinising the architecture of the city's unbuilt parts, my intention has been to illustrate the discordance in the development of the colonial city, and to initiate a reassessment of conventional interpretations of the directors' individual and collective motives.

“A city composed of paroxysmal places in monumental reliefs. The spectator can read in it a universe that is constantly exploding. In it are inscribed the architectural figures of the *coincidatio oppositorum* formerly drawn in miniatures and mystical textures.”
Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, tr. Steven Rendall, 1984 (1988), p. 91

“This supreme science also brings unlimited benefits to the public good of cities, both in measuring the length of time for trading and in solving various problems of the universe. Is it not the mainstay and right arm of the army in maintaining civil government, the power, property, substance, and glorious fortunes of every sublime empire and powerful kingdom? And by what means would any strong emperor or glorious champion assail, combat and conquer enemy cities, as well as defend his own, if not by the mechanical art? For this is indeed one of the six parts of that kind of mathematics dealing with palpable things, since in perfecting the military discipline one must assume a knowledge of geometry and arithmetic, together with those other two kinds of mathematics which the Greeks called ‘Optics’ and ‘Mechanics’, inasmuch as three principal conditions are necessary for every great and active leader.”
Agostino Ramelli, *The Various and Ingenious Machines of Captain Agostino Ramelli of Ponte Tresa*, tr. Martha Teach Gnudi, (1588) 1987, from the Preface

At the “International Conference on Shipping, Factories and Colonization,” held in Brussels from 24 to 26 November 1994, Elva Kathleen Lyon presented a

paper subsequently published under the title, “The Transfer of Technology from the Dutch Republic to New Netherlands [*sic.*]: Forts, Factories and Cities as a Beginning.”¹ To my knowledge, Elva Lyon is the only scholar to have attempted the Promethean task of elucidating the influence of technology in New Netherland, and specifically in New Amsterdam. While her stance is invaluable for bringing this subject to the minds of cultural historians, the fact that the work is highly abbreviated, limited in the scale of technology it considers, fails to avail itself of a single primary source from the mountain of sixteenth and seventeenth-century scientific, architectural and intellectual treatises, and generally lacks adventure, meant its relegation to the outreaches of New York’s colonial scholarship was all but preordained.

It is my intention to recall Elva Lyon’s principal thesis, as outlined in the title of her paper, extend its catchment area, and redress historiography’s imbalance by systematically presenting the abundant evidence of literary and visual scientific opportunism unique to Dutch colonialism in North America. The resulting formal structures go a long way to distinguishing Dutch colonial developments from English ones. As Joyce Chaplin writes:

“Praise of *techne* and worries over idolatry were not opposing cultural forces, ranging secularism versus piety, but were connected tendencies that formed the basis of doubt for the English over their status as technical creatures.”²

Broadly speaking, the Dutch did not suffer such scepticism. Technology was not only pragmatically infallible (it was essential to their existence), but from René

¹ See Elva Kathleen Lyon, “The Transfer of Technology from the Dutch Republic to New Netherlands [*sic.*]: Forts, Factories and Cities as a Beginning,” in J. Everaert and J. Parmentier, eds., *International Conference on Shipping, Factories and Colonization* (Brussels, 24-26 November 1994) (Brussels, 1996), pp. 333-342.

² Joyce E. Chaplin, *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500-1676* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), p. 40.

Descartes (1596-1650) to Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) the Scientific Revolution played an important part in seventeenth-century intellectual discourse in the Netherlands, of which utopian dialogue was a significant aspect. Similarly, it invades colonial discourse.

To construct the ideological entity of Manhattan Island, the present chapter is constructed around a connection between three unlikely sources—Sebastiano Serlio's *Architettura, Libro de prospettiva* (1545), Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), and Sir Francis Bacon's *Gesta Grayorum* (1594). Alongside these three radical views of the city, Dutch West India Company records, individual accounts, and other pertinent scientific and architectural treatises will be examined to demonstrate how the general concepts of colonisation, and particular representations of city and building, were subject to an approach privileging the new, early modern science. I think it is fair to claim that to date the documentation of such an influence, and it is scant, has been restricted to the most obvious figure-ground plans of North American colonies, *i.e.* variations on the gridiron plan.³ This is owing, in large part, to the philological view of John William Reps. In the scholarship of North American colonial planning all roads lead to Reps. As a result, since the publication of *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States* (1965), scholarship on urban history in colonial America has placed an exaggerated emphasis on the city plan—no doubt, in part, for its flattering associations with Greek and Roman culture. Moreover, American urban historians have been partial to the plan as the space where order and equality is represented. Yet, as Louis Marin points out: “It is nothing more than a surface where there exist spaces filled and empty, black and white. . . The entire surface is granted a sort of regulated ubiquity.”⁴ All is

³ See Camillo Sitte's critique of American grids in Camillo Sitte, *The Art of Building Cities: City Building According to Its Artistic Fundamentals*, tr. Charles T. Stewart (New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1945).

⁴ Louis Marin, *Utopics: Spatial Play*, tr. Robert A. Vollrath (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press Inc., 1984), p. 208.

compartmentalised. For obvious reasons, New Amsterdam has not factored at even this level of discussion. Ultimately, the present work's illustration of the effects of the mechanical arts will be judged by its ability to break the stranglehold of historicism's habitual mode of perception.

More than an interrogation limited to colonial New York, this work intends to serve as an indictment of the way that colonialism in North America is continuously viewed from a classically-defined, socio-cultural perspective. It is as if every historian of colonial North America, if not European, is a closet Europhile. It creates an unseemly submissive condition. Remember, the seventeenth-century European colonisation of North America was undertaken at the start of an era renowned for the upheaval generated by Cartesianism.⁵ Yet, the contemporary scholar has retreated to a simpler methodology that has proven an effective strategy in containing colonial knowledge. Such a form of scholarship, while proclaiming to look only at the facts, actually ignores the evidence.

Colonial accounts speak in a tongue that is forked between utopian and dystopian descriptions, or what Howard Mumford Jones termed as the image and "anti-image" of the New World.⁶ This schism has created a cultural history built on a system that frequently gives preference to the dystopian perspective. It originates from the rhetoric which stresses the nature of the land. Generally speaking, until the "moist" and "fertile" land is penetrated there is a consensus among observers across Europe that the New World is paradise. Even though, in the earliest accounts it is just as eagerly viewed as a building store. Officer Robert Juet (?-1611) writes:

"We rode still, and went on Land to walke on the West side of the River,

⁵ See Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁶ See Howard Mumford Jones, *O Strange New World, American Culture: The Formative Years* (New York: The Viking Press, 1964).

and found good ground for Corne and other Garden herbs, with great store of goodly Oakes, and Wal-nut trees, and Chest-nut trees, Ewe trees, and trees of sweet wood in great abundance, and great store of Slate for houses, and other good stones.”⁷

And Johannes de Laet (1583-1649) records: “On the land they found an abundance of blue plums and the finest oaks for height and thickness that one could ever see; together with poplars, *Lonen*, and various other kinds of wood useful in ship-building.”⁸ In New Netherland, subsequent commentaries descend into pronouncements on colonial dysfunction. It is this facet of colonial dialogue that has bewitched colonial historiography. Yet, utopian rhetoric is not suddenly abandoned. What happens to the dominant historiographical point of view when we alter our intellectual perspective? Prioritising an utopic reading of colonial accounts calls into question the authority entrusted to a conventional bottom-up approach. Architecture is only one of many disciplines whose offensive could shift New Netherland’s colonial scholarship away from its repetitive condition. Exchanging our conventional cultural and social approach to New Amsterdam for a discipline-dominated one will substantially alter the projected image of the colony’s intellectual tradition.

I

It was not much before the middle of the nineteenth century that New York City began to self-consciously disport itself in an utopian fashion. Once John Bachmann (*fl.* 1849-1885) and Ezekiel Porter Belden (1823-1911), among others, promoted an approach to the city which had lain dormant for more than two centuries, it was no time before Gotham exchanged the image of goat-paths for Batman. (Figures 5.1, 5.2) What the marvel of “Manhattanism” did for the ego of the

⁷ J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), p. 23-24.

⁸ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 38.

twentieth-century city, however, it equally undid for the legacy of the seventeenth-century one. Consequently, New Amsterdam was pigeon-holed into one of two modes—as either an incomplete empirical jigsaw puzzle, or nostalgic backdrop to the emerging metropolis. Not only is New Amsterdam New York City’s black sheep, but the intellectual and economic depth of the Netherlands in the seventeenth-century, coupled with the much-hyped West India Company colony in New Holland, has left the colony similarly sidelined in historiography on the Dutch Republic’s Golden Age.

To dislodge the colony from its position as the city’s poor relation, a form of *Delirious New York* (1978), Rem Koolhaas’s late-seventies polemic on the city’s predominantly twentieth-century utopian obsession, can be projected on an arguably as vibrant forty-year tract in the seventeenth century. Such an interrogative, “retroactive” approach to the city is not altogether unprecedented. The most familiar must be *Il Campo Marzio dell’Antica Roma* (1761-62) by the eighteenth-century Italian architect, Giovanni Battista Piranesi (c. 1720-1778).⁹ (Figure 5.3) As Manfredo Tafuri writes of Piranesi’s project:

“Since Roman antiquity is not only a recollection imbued with nostalgic ideologies and revolutionary expectations, but also a myth to be contested, all forms of classical derivation are treated as mere fragments, as deformed symbols, as hallucinating organisms of an ‘order’ in a state of decay.”¹⁰

The key to Piranesi’s undertaking rests on the assertion that Roman antiquity was a “myth to be contested.” The treatise’s second plate, *Scenographia*, clears away Rome’s historical detritus to create a *terra nuova*. (Figure 5.4) Then, by placing a

⁹ In *Comparative Architecture* (1836-43), the nineteenth-century British architect Joseph Gandy attempted to establish a typology of architecture “soaring beyond the schools of Vitruvius and Palladio.” See Brian Lukacher, “Joseph Gandy and the Mythography of Architecture,” in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 53, no. 3 (September 1994), p. 280, pp. 280-299.

¹⁰ Manfredo Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, tr. Barbara Luigia La Penta (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1988), p. 14.

few key remnants of Antiquity in a suprastructural role on an open and level plain, Piranesi ontologically redefines the city's history. It is a technique borrowed from Book IV of Leon Battista Alberti's treatise *De re aedificatoria* (1485), where, as Mario Gandelsonas writes: "The city and its different urban moments are articulated into structured pairs of oppositions."¹¹ The final sheet in Piranesi's treatise, *Ichnographia*, transforms Rome into an iconic machine banishing the influences of naturalism, *i.e.* form and order, by creating the epitome of artifice. (Figure 5.3)

Piranesi's process was a direct challenge to Abbé Marc-Antoine Laugier's (1713-1769) urban thesis, *Essai sur l'Architecture* (1753) and its Vitruvian sympathies, which, to paraphrase Tafuri, 'reduced the city to a natural phenomenon.' The same binary opposition, artifice versus naturalism, informs the present work. Piranesi's project is not an "archaeological mask," who could fail to see that it is an "experimental design" in which the city is unknown? For our purposes, the significance of *Il Campo Marzio dell'Antica Roma* is less in the "epic representation of the battle waged by architecture against itself," than in its decision to 'churn historicism out of the machine's back-side.'¹² Coincidentally, Edward Gibbon did not publish *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* until between 1776 to 1788.

The reader of the present chapter is likely to ask—what relevance, if any, does this example have to the study of colonialism in New York? It is obvious that my technique and endpoint are miles away from Piranesi's; however, the broader ambition that is shared between the present study and Piranesi's masterwork is to situate the city's historical evidence within another context as a means to demonstrate its historiographic versatility. In New York, this amounts to extracting the colonial city from the clutches of Dutch marginalia; in the wider context, to

¹¹ Mario Gandelsonas, *X-Urbanism: Architecture and the American City* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999), p. 13.

¹² Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, p. 15.

invoking a wholesale reassessment of colonialism's contribution to urban history. As one will see, an alternative version of that history stems from the 'nearly synonymous' connection between architecture and scenography that is raised in the text of the Roman architect Vitruvius (first century B.C.E.) and the theatrical drawings of Sebastiano Serlio (1475-1554).¹³ This stage facilitates a link to the spatial conditions detailed in Sir Thomas More's (1478-1535) *Utopia*, and is tied to the effects characterising the "four principal works and monuments" in Sir Francis Bacon's literary *Wunderkammern* that was staged as a Christmas revel by the men studying law at Gray's Inn, London in December 1594.¹⁴ Essentially, Serlio pinpoints the colonial subject, More addresses the utopian aspects of settling, and Bacon supplies a methodology for viewing the colonial construction. This is a lineage which dovetails into the province of architects and that suggests another way of interpreting the Dutch colonial city. The reader follows the work's progression from the broadest to narrowest condition, while concurrently viewing the principal subject, New Amsterdam, at the centre of this discourse. What is such an outlandish assertion built on? The objective of the present work is to broach a model that calls into question the empirical deceit accompanying the 'cult of the colonial artefact' that is central to influential historical surveys. Colonial manuscripts have been read in a manner that unnecessarily and inappropriately places the colonial city in the exact same agricultural to urban legacy as the European city.

II

Many seventeenth-century Netherlandish artists mastered a largely unacclaimed genre of painting spatially located between the rustic ardour of Claes

¹³ On the connection between architecture and scenography, see, in particular, Hubert Damisch, *The Origin of Perspective*, tr. by John Goodman (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995), pp. 199-234.

¹⁴ Francis Bacon, *Gesta Grayorum* [1594], in James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, eds., *The Works of Francis Bacon*, 14 vols. (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1857-1874), VIII: 334-335.

Jansz. Visscher's *Plaisante Plaetsen* (c. 1611-1612) and the urban fervour of Georg Braun's and Frans Hogenberg's *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1572-1617). The soporific gaze of Anthonie Jansz. van der Croos's *Profiel van Leiden* (1651) and Willem van Drielenburgh's *Gefantaseerd gezicht op de stad Utrecht* (1660-1670), intimates the miasma of a place that is located between the town and countryside. (Figures 5.5, 5.6) It has been common practice to position the North American colonial city in the same forlorn realm. Paradoxically, the placelessness of dystopian scholarship gives the colony a utopic dimension.

By calling the utopic oeuvre from the sixteenth to eighteenth century into service, we not only amend our frame of reference, but usefully extract the idealism running throughout colonial tracts. In one of the most extreme examples, the celebrated Dutch colonist Adriaen van der Donck (c. 1618-c. 1655), copying the rhetorical style immortalised by Sir Thomas More in the dialogue between Raphael Hythlodæus and Peter Gilles, concludes his *Beschrijvinge van Nieuw Nederlandt* (1651) with "A Dialogue Between a Patriot and a New Netherlander upon the Advantages which the Country Presents to Settlers, &c."¹⁵ There are even more specific examples beckoning. Pliny-like descriptions of New Netherland's Eden-like quality and the land's magical properties have been retold countless times. Yet, these exponents all overlook the correspondence between early modern science and the supernatural, the propriety of such rhetoric, and the seamless way that these descriptions merged with accounts of the city. Within the text of van der Donck's *Beschrijvinge*, in a comparative style typically reserved for utopic tracts and seated alongside descriptions of a "terrestrial *Canaan*"—e.g. "we may freely say, that the summers are always better in the New Netherlands than in Holland;"¹⁶ "wolves are

¹⁵ See "A Dialogue Between a Patriot and a New Netherlander upon the Advantages which the Country Presents to Settlers, &c.," in Adriaen van der Donck, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, ed. Thomas F. O'Donnell, tr. Jeremiah Johnson (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968), p. 120-133.

¹⁶ Van der Donck, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, p. 62.

numerous in the country, but these are not so large and ravenous as the Netherlands wolves are;¹⁷ “but in general, grafting is not as necessary here as in the Netherlands, for most of the fruit is good without it, which there would be harsh and sour, or would not bear,”¹⁸—van der Donck writes:

“The pursuit of agriculture is not heavy and expensive there, as it is in the Netherlands. First, because the fencing and enclosing of the land does not cost much; for instead of the Netherlands dykes and ditches, they set up post and rail, or palisado fences, and when new clearings are made, they commonly have fencing timber enough on the land to remove, which costs nothing but the labour . . .”¹⁹

Much more than a “seventeenth century ‘anatomy,’” as Thomas F. O’Donnell described the *Beschrijvinge*, in van der Donck’s dialogue New Netherland is unmistakably the new exemplar.²⁰

Sixteenth-century maps and views of North America certainly did nothing to diminish the idea of either a northwest passage to Asia or of a land like Eldorado—even though, as Joyce E. Chaplin writes: “The very attempts to navigate the north and discover a northwest passage represented a willingness to forsake contemporary understanding of the globe.”²¹ At the same time analyses of the human place within the world relied on cosmography, a classically based theory that divided the world among sublunary zones. While fifteenth to seventeenth-century explorers and cartographers were willing the northwest passage into existence, they were simultaneously cementing a spatial and cultural method for interpreting the globe that depended on difference. Evert Gijsbertsz’s *Chart of America* (c. 1595), like the

¹⁷ Van der Donck, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, p. 46.

¹⁸ Van der Donck, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, p. 24.

¹⁹ Van der Donck, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, p. 29-30.

²⁰ See Thomas F. O’Donnell’s “Editor’s Introduction” to Van der Donck, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, p. x-xi.

²¹ Chaplin, *Subject Matter*, p. 45.

Vesconte de Maggiolo Map (c. 1527), divided the globe into four distinct zones.²² (Figures 5.7, 5.8) These two maps not only forsook imparting any knowledge that would discourage hopes for a northwest passage, but both, the later coinciding with the publication of Sir Walter Raleigh's *The Discovery of Guiana* (1595), include the east coast of North America, and with it the territory claimed as New Netherland by the States General in 1614, among the period's wealthiest allegorical cities and states.

Sixteenth-century maps were inevitably translated into seventeenth-century representations of the city in order to satisfy the materialistic hunger brought on by the rapidly expanding and increasingly efficient printmaking industry. The nineteenth-century rise of photography raised vexing questions about the relation between the 'real' and its representation. This had abrupt and lasting effects for (i) understanding the ontological limbo that accompanies the utopic image, and (ii) the legitimacy of the product of the camera obscura paradigm.²³ As Diana Agrest writes: "A photograph is always perceived as existing in the past; its very presence bespeaks absence. It is the document of a fugitive moment, a faraway place, or a lost being or object."²⁴ The first engraving reputedly depicting New Amsterdam, *t' Fort nieuw Amsterdam op de Manhattans* (c. 1626-1628), is a product of this representational crisis. (Figure 5.9) This explains its capacity to alarm. Seen from the traditionalist's perspective, it is not hard to comprehend that the potential fallout from the image's conflicting narratives—ranging from a utopic figural composition to

²² For a brief description of the *Vesconte de Maggiolo Map*, see Robert T. Augustyn and Paul E. Cohen, *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1997), p. 16-17. For a description of the *Chart of America*, see C. J. Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and Their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion During the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Amsterdam: BV Uitgeverij De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1998), p. 66-68; and Kees Zandvliet, ed., *Maurits Prins van Oranje* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2000), p. 358-359.

²³ Jonathan Crary writes: "In the texts of Marx, Bergson, Freud, and others the very apparatus that a century earlier was the site of truth becomes a model for procedures and forces that conceal, invert, and mystify truth." See Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992), p. 29.

²⁴ Diana Agrest, *Architecture from Without: Theoretical Framings for a Critical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1993), p. 158.

token Dutch and Italian iconography—poses a justifiable threat to historicism’s perennial stronghold.²⁵ On top of which, the landscape is inverted. More than one commentator has pointed out that the land mass in the background is New Jersey, not Long Island as one would expect. Is this an indication that a camera obscura was used to construct the view? On account of the image’s signifiers, as well as lingering questions over the print’s production process, the engraving can only be interpreted in one of two ways—as either an invention, or an indication of the colonists’ mechanical prowess. In which case, the city’s figure is either utopic or ideal, both of which extricate it from the pragmatist’s evolutionary logic. What has happened to accounts of the spectacle that a ten-foot square mobile room would have created? What was the exact geographic position of the copyist and his apparatus? Not a single contemporary remark has ever been discovered on the presence of such a “complex social amalgam” in the colony.²⁶ Were such ingenious mechanical devices commonplace? If so, the voluminous literature that has relied on a single, untitled illustration from Athanasius Kircher’s *Ars magna Lucis et Umbrae* (etc.) (1646), and suggested that the first portable devices were not in use much before 1650, is entirely off the mark.²⁷ (Figure 5.10) If an invention, how is the image diachronic?

For all of its mockery of Leibnizian optimism, Washington Irving’s *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty* (1809) shares more than one similarity with Voltaire’s *Candide* (1759). Each makes an extreme satirical commentary on systems and both employ the ontology of history as a rhetorical device. The crucial difference is that the indoctrination of *Candide* and Pangloss necessitated their circumnavigation of the globe, whereas for

²⁵ See the detailed discussion of *t’ Fort nieuw Amsterdam op de Manhattans* in Chapter 3—“On Being In/Between: Expanding the Cultural *Episteme* in New Netherland,” p. 104-109.

²⁶ Crary writes: “The camera obscura, then, cannot be reduced either to a technological or a discursive object: it was a complex social amalgam in which its existence as a textual figure was never separable from its machinic uses.” See Crary, *Techniques of the Observer*, p. 31.

²⁷ See Chapter 2: “The Camera Obscura and Its Subject,” in Crary, *Techniques of the Observer*, pp. 25-66. Also, Helmut Gernsheim, *The History of Photography: From the Earliest Use of the Camera Obscura in the Eleventh Century up to 1914* (London: Oxford University Press, 1955), pp. 1-19.

essentially the same education Diedrich Knickerbocker needed only to be a *post factum* observer of the “Dutch Dynasty” in colonial New York. When Irving writes: “The sage council, . . . not being able to determine upon any plan for the building of their city—the cows, in a laudable fit of patriotism, took it under their particular charge, and as they went to and from pasture, established paths through the bushes, on each side of which the good folks built their houses . . .,” he constructs a mythological foundation that manoeuvres colonial New York into the history of cities dating to the ancient Etruscans.²⁸ On this general custom, Joseph Rykwert writes:

“Before the walls were erected, an ox was hitched to a golden plow and led around in a great ellipse that circumscribed the area of the new settlement. This ‘sacred furrow’ defined the space within which people would live and marked the exact location of the city walls by separating the sacred area of habitation from the profane universe of the outside.”²⁹

Giorgio Vasari’s (1511-1574) fresco, *The Foundation of Florence* (c. 1565), identifies the founding of Florence both with the furrow, signifying the act of possession, and the protective—and faithfully Vitruvian—towers. In *The Making of Urban America*, Reps intellectualises Irving’s rhetoric. He writes:

“The town began to grow with no over-all plan for its development. New streets were laid out from time to time as they were needed, usually following the lanes that had become established naturally as men and animals followed the most convenient paths between houses, farms, and the fort. This method of growth resulted in streets of irregular alignment and width.”³⁰

In the process, Reps transforms Irving’s myth making into a testimony of colonial

²⁸ Washington Irving, *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty*, in Washington Irving, *History, Tales and Sketches*, ed. James W. Tuttleton (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1983), p. 476.

²⁹ Joseph Rykwert, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1976).

³⁰ John W. Reps, *The Making of Urban America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 148.

formlessness, which carries with it the derisory mark of aberrance and disorder.

For the remainder of Irving's *History*, readers are besieged by an inexhaustible catalogue of atrocities and disasters, reminiscent of scenes from Pieter Breughel the Elder's pictures. One is assaulted by a debased, at least since Simon Schama's *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (1987), form of the adjectives used to describe the Dutch Republic's Golden Age. However, Irving's text is not alone for such descriptions of New Amsterdam. Devout scholars of the *Vertoogh van Nieu-Neder-Land* [Remonstrance of New Netherland, and the Occurrences There] (1649) encounter essentially the same rhetoric. In the *Vertoogh*, the "poor humble" authors describe in detail the oligarchical colonists' avarice, sloth, spendthrift, "guile," promiscuity, "self interest," and "artful and insidious" temperament. Time and again, visitors, colonists, and Company officials—in diaries, travel reports, and official records—detail colonial excess. Each party—colonists and Company representatives—accuses the other of intemperance. One observer, David Pietersz. de Vries (1593-1655) recalls:

"The 8th of August [1636], the gunner of the fort gave a parting feast, and had a tent erected on one bastion of the fort, where a table and benches were set and many people bidden. When the banquet was at its highest, the trumpeter began to blow, as to which some words were passed; when the keeper of the store, Heyndrick Hudden, and the keeper of the merchandise, Corelaer, railed at the trumpeter, who gave each of them a santer quarter, whereupon they ran home, and brought out a sword, and which to have revenge upon the trumpeter. They went to the house of the commander and used much foolish language, one calling out, 'I am the same man who took the life of Count Floris.'"³¹

Colonial commentators have judged episodes like this one as betrayals of civility, exemplifications of the colonist losing his reason (the empire-builder's and historiographer's typical device for castigating colonial settlements). However, the

³¹ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 198-199.

fact that these remarks are persistently targeted at the “Fatherland’s” hang-ups, religious orthodoxy, and lack of natural wealth—*e.g.* forests, wildlife, and precious stones—make them as easily understood from the opposite camp, one of Cockaigne-like prodigality. Colonial records abound with descriptions that depict a paradise of eating and drinking (what better place to “feast” than elevated several storeys in the “dry, sweet, and healthy” air), where God has commanded the people to avoid work of any kind—Michaëlius writes of the “distress because many people were not very industrious, . . .”³²—and they inhabit a landscape full of eroticism and appealing exotica. As in Cockaigne, a greatly expanded bird population features. The Reverend Johannes Megapolensis, Jr. writes:

“In the forests here there are also many partridges, heath-hens and pigeons that fly together in thousands, and sometimes ten, twenty, thirty and even forty and fifty are killed at one shot. We have here, too, a great number of all kinds of fowl, swans, geese, ducks, widgeons, teal, brant, which sport upon the river in thousands in the spring of the year, . . .”³³

The only difference is that in New Netherland the animals do not cook and serve themselves. Dialogues endlessly describe how one was “well entertained,” “dined,” and “feasted.” In one, insistently erotic, passage from De Vries:

“I accordingly went with the commander of our little fort, . . . and invited the minister and the mayor and other leading men, with their wives, who were very fond of eating cherries, as there were from forty to fifty cherry-trees standing about the redoubt, full of cherries. We feasted the minister and the governor and their wives, . . .”³⁴

The cultural geography of maritime spaces was protean, the ship and the sea acting as mediums of transmogrification. The authors of the *Vertoogh* persistently acknowledge the effects of this process. They write: “‘The Board of Managers,’ say

³² Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 132.

³³ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 169.

³⁴ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 204.

they, 'are, indeed, masters in Fatherland, but we are masters in this land' . . . Director Kieft himself said, and allowed others to repeat it, that in this country he was Sovereign and the same as the Prince in Netherland. . . This present Director . . . also quotes right readily this maxim, 'The Prince is above the law.'"³⁵ De Vries writes of being escorted by Kieft "to the large hall, which he had been lately adding to his house. Coming to it, there stood all his soldiers ready to cross the river to Pavonia to commit the murder."³⁶ And that "he [Kieft] had, with his co-murderers, determined to commit murder, deeming it a Roman deed, . . ."³⁷ To De Vries one last time:

"I began to make preparations to return with the large ship to Holland, when this governor [Wouter van Twiller] commenced his pranks of the head, and began to act foolishly as if he were drunk. . . He then ordered the guns at the angles of the fort to be so trained as to shoot at the yacht, when I ran to where he stood at the angle with the secretary and one or two of his council, and asked them whether the land was full of fools."³⁸

Was the colonial society mocking the Company's culture? The shortcoming to this line of enquiry, however, is that it remains tantamount to sacrilege to presuppose anything ironic, parodic, or utopic, in what has been labelled as such an earnest, albeit unsuccessful enterprise. We are getting ahead of ourselves. Nonetheless, this brings us to the artifice.

III

A: Colonial Space

Addressing the *Trattato sopra le scene*, in Book II of Sebastiano Serlio's

³⁵ E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, 11 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, Printers, 1856-1861), I: 298.

³⁶ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 227.

³⁷ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 227.

³⁸ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 189.

Architecture, Libro de prospettiva (1545), and specifically the three scenes of the classical theatre—satyric, tragic, and comic—that Vitruvius first described in *De Architectura libri decem*, Hubert Damisch writes:

“But if Vitruvius presents the satyric scene as the antithesis, the absolute negation of the two scenes connoted as architectural, with caves and mountains being opposed to structures built by the hand of man like nature to culture, this is no longer the case with Serlio. In addition to the fountains and streams, snails and other ‘strange little beasts,’ he introduced small huts *alla rustica* . . . in other words, a primitive, even archetypal mode of architecture, one in clear opposition to more cultivated varieties, be they noble or common, tragic, or comic.”³⁹ (Figures 5.11-5.13)

How is it conceivable to look at these three images, as Alberto Pérez-Gómez suggests, as nothing more than “different stages appropriate for the three genres of classical theater”?⁴⁰ How does it serve Damisch to suggest that the Vitruvian paradigm was “completed by Serlio”?⁴¹ Regardless of the two authors’—Vitruvius and Serlio—contrasting approach, both cases leave the viewer debating how to architecturally, which is to say socially and culturally, bridge the gap between the first and the second and third scenes—*i.e.* between the satyric, and the tragic and comic.

Serlio addressed the Vitruvian account of origins foretold in the scenes; however, he did not succumb to Vitruvius’s structural indeterminacy. Instead of exemplifying conventional dialectic ‘oppositions,’ *i.e.* between nature and culture, Serlio fostered an explicit architectonic connection between the three images. In the process, he made a ‘space’ for other scenes by creating an architectonic ‘opening’ between the satyric, and the tragic and comic. Is this the colonial space? Is it evidence

³⁹ Damisch, *The Origin of Perspective*, p. 283.

⁴⁰ See Alberto Pérez-Gómez and Louise Pelletier, *Architectural Representation and the Perspective Hinge* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997), p. 22-23.

⁴¹ Damisch, *The Origin of Perspective*, p. 283.

of another Italian connection to the New World? Christopher Columbus's, Amerigo Vespucci's, and Giovanni da Verrazano's discoveries were all well documented and widely circulated in sixteenth-century Italy in broadsheets, travel reports and cosmographies.⁴² Serlio bridged the ontological chasm imposed by Vitruvius, introduced a structural chronology to architectural history, and encouraged an incalculable number of architectonic and iconographic states outside of an European hegemony. For our purposes, the significance of these three engravings is the faceless paradigm that Serlio intimated with the implied 'opening.' At the same time, the intellectual conception of architecture as a theatre or stage of the world is preserved. In reality, the entire chapter answers to a possible scenario for the 'fourth scene.'

Revisiting these three widely familiar scenes has the added effect of demonstrating the degree to which scholarship has glossed-over architecture's written history between the sixteenth and eighteenth century. This history has been one-way traffic, based almost exclusively on evidence in architectural practice to legitimise and substantiate theories prevalent in architectural writings. Arguing for a wider application of these treatises, Pamela O. Long writes:

"The significance of architectural writings is . . . that they constituted the first textual tradition which, as a result of that interaction, disseminated in writing the [Vitruvian] ideal of the unity of theory and practice. The explicit and repeated articulation of that ideal in widely disseminated treatises and commentaries had important consequences for the intellectual history of the period."⁴³

Serlio's architectural scenario is radical for two reasons: (i) for the loophole that it creates in the wake of the Renaissance city, and (ii) for the lineage that it implies, by

⁴² For a general overview of late fifteenth and sixteenth-century literature on the subject of the New World, see Hans Wolff, "Early Literature about America: 'Zeytungen' (Broadsheets, Travel Reports, and Cosmographies)," in Hans Wolff, ed., *America: Early Maps of the New World* (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1992), pp. 27-40.

⁴³ See Pamela O. Long, "The Contribution of Architectural Writers to a 'Scientific' Outlook in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," in *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2, (Fall 1985), p. 298, pp. 265-298.

contrast to Vitruvius, of the city to that point.

I am forever disparaging of Lewis Mumford's critique in *The City in History* (1961) that, generally speaking, promotes a reading of city history as one sweeping episode "from medieval universality to baroque uniformity."⁴⁴ My concern is not so much to argue against this sort of model, which arguably has its usefulness, but rather to insist that there are some important discontinuities that such 'monolithic constructions' have obscured.⁴⁵ Though aberrations were clearly not Mumford's cup of tea, his description of this "intermediate stage" (a phase that spans everything between the medieval and baroque and which "still unfortunately is called 'the' Renaissance") does not entirely miss the fact that the "visual disarray that had been tolerated in the ancient city gave way to a formal costume."⁴⁶ We could do with a radical synthesis of historical developments in this period, of the order of Manfredo Tafuri's infamous commentary on modernity in *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (1976), to challenge the discourse of the twentieth-century's most widely published architectural historians—including Leonardo Benevolo, Sir Banister Fletcher, Sir Peter Hall, Spiro Kostof, Lewis Mumford, and David Watkin—all of whom belittle the colonial project. Moreover, the connection between architecture and theatre, while clearly not an uncommon theme, remains an underdeveloped plot in the European, and especially the colonial city, and particularly in the early modern representations of each. My present use for these is modest, however, by comparison to the stark realisation that the entire visual history of the western city is one enormous *theatrum mundi* stemming from this polemical debate. With this in mind, Serlio's redrawing of Vitruvius's theatrical decors has clear

⁴⁴ Lewis Mumford, *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (London: Penguin Books, 1966), p. 398.

⁴⁵ More recently and not without notice, in his *Cities in Civilization: Culture, Innovation, and Urban Order*, Sir Peter Hall virtually ignored the period between 1620-1760. See Peter Hall, *Cities in Civilization: Culture, Innovation, and Urban Order* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1998).

⁴⁶ Mumford, *The City in History*, p. 401.

implications for one of the enduring philosophical questions plaguing society since wanderlust overcame sixteenth-century Europeans, especially for the portent it depicts between the virtues and pitfalls of nature and culture.

Arthur Ernest Bell writes: “Following Bacon, the men of science seemed to believe that ‘the real and legitimate good of the sciences is the endowment of human life with new inventions and order.’”⁴⁷ By the early seventeenth century, Descartes viewed Nature as a sphere of universal law that could be explained by reference to underlying mechanisms, and argued that the ‘universe should be regarded as a machine.’ Cartesianism encouraged a disrespect for antiquity. By this point, the humanist’s absorption of classical texts had been plied to death. In the visionary illustration *Artificium nunquam uisum* (etc.), from *Instrumentorum et Machinarum* (etc.) (1569?), the “Inventor of Machines, Teacher of Mathematics, Distiller of Oils, and Huguenot Pastor” Jacques Besson re-emphasised the widely-recounted Renaissance formula on the origins of building, and the derivation of the classical language of architecture from the cave.⁴⁸ (Figure 5.14) Showing “some ancient relics—an obelisk, a capital, and a column—being pulled out into the open . . . the tools and instruments do not shine any less brilliantly in the sunlight of a new era than the ancient works themselves.”⁴⁹ More significantly, Besson places the mechanical apparatus in a supremely allegorical role. Exalted by the sunlight, the machine becomes a ‘hinge’ enabling the cultural space between Serlio’s satyric and tragic scenes to be bridged. In the same instance, the device betrays the artifice of the ennobled language. As Horst Bredekamp comments: “The art of antiquity and modern technology each seem to be vaunting their own unique grandeur. As if in

⁴⁷ Arthur Ernest Bell, *Christian Huygens and the Development of Science in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1947), p. 192.

⁴⁸ See Alexander Gustav Keller, “The Missing Years of Jacques Besson: Inventor of Machines, Teacher of Mathematics, Distiller of Oils, and Huguenot Pastor,” in *Technology and Culture*, vol. 14 (1973), pp. 28-39.

⁴⁹ Horst Bredekamp, *The Lure of Antiquity and the Cult of the Machine: The Kunstkammer and the Evolution of Nature, Art and Technology*, tr. Allison Brown (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1995), p. 19-20.

some triumphal procession, the various relics of ancient art are brought into the light of a new machine age . . . ”⁵⁰ Overlaying these literary inventions was a fervent scientific methodology that defined the age. In *Radical Enlightenment* (2001), Jonathan Israel states:

“It was unquestionably the rise of powerful new philosophical systems, rooted in the scientific advances of the early seventeenth century and especially the mechanistic views of Galileo, which chiefly generated that vast *Kulturkampf* between traditional, theologically sanctioned ideas about Man, God, and the universe and secular, mechanistic conceptions which stood independently of any theological sanction.”⁵¹

To date, little emphasis has been placed on the scientific and mechanical aspects of utopia, and yet these fantasies were dependent on the rise of science to engender their perspective. In New Amsterdam, the colonial space is witness to the banishment of: (i) iconographic sovereignty—“He shall see that meanwhile the other carpenters are distributed to cut timber to erect a barn for the cattle and dwellings for the farmers in the service of the Company, it being for the present sufficient if they are tight and dry, *without ornament*, in order that no time may be lost;”⁵² (ii) cultural specificity, and (iii) theocentrism. The machine is the critical component of seventeenth-century colonial space. It is modernity personified in an unblemished landscape. Its appearance, as Leo Marx observes, results in an “interrupted idyll.”⁵³ The machine was colonialism’s sign of autonomy.

B: Model [Concept] Space

⁵⁰ Bredekamp, *The Lure of Antiquity and the Cult of the Machine*, p. 20.

⁵¹ Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*, p. 14.

⁵² I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), VI: 8. Author’s note: The italics are mine to indicate emphasis.

⁵³ See Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964). Crucially, Marx observed that the idea of the ‘machine in the garden,’ as symbolised by the conflict between pastoralism and urbanisation, recurs throughout the history of American culture. Where Marx’s study is restricted to ante-bellum America, my intention is to demonstrate the influence of the machine in the Dutch colonisation of New Netherland.

Twenty-nine years before Serlio formally implicated the classical theatre in architectural history, and in the immediate wake of an upsurge in discourse on the New World, the European imagination was further ignited by Sir Thomas More. Eleven years after More's publication of *Utopia*, and with a geographical make up similar to More's fabled island, Giacomo di Gastaldi (c. 1500-c. 1565) immortalised Giovanni da Verrazano's (1485-1528) account of the New York region. (Figure 5.15)

Utopia, as Françoise Choay writes, "proposes a model organization of space which has the potential for realization and the capacity for transforming the natural world by instituting unimagined kinds of spaces."⁵⁴ Perhaps More's *Utopia*, and sixteenth and early seventeenth-century utopian discourse in general, can offer an insight to colonial space. The key utopic devices, which include the theatre and machine, are linked both objectively and subjectively to city history. Scholarship has overwhelmingly favoured the subjective form. Yet as Choay notes: "It is paradoxical that Utopia, which is no place, is nevertheless first of all a space."⁵⁵ In summary of Utopia's physical portrait, she continues:

"It is an island, separated from the continent by an isthmus fifteen thousand paces wide; it is 'crescent-shaped like a new moon,' with a perimeter of 500 miles, while 'between the horns of the crescent, which are about eleven miles apart, the sea enters and spreads into a broad bay.' The bay forms a sort of ocean lake, perfectly calm; access to it is hindered by a great rock, reefs, and shallows, while on the opposite side, the coastline is noteworthy for its rocky shoals. These natural features are presented in a direct causal relation to a set of built features which give the portrait of Utopia its cultural dimension: the isthmus is the result of a technological operation devised by the founding hero Utopus to separate the island from the mainland; a fortress crowns the rock that bars the entrance to the bay . . . This conjunction of nature and culture has produced an original landscape in some ways evocative of Plato's Atlantis . . ."

The capital city, personalized by the name of Amaurotum, is also given

⁵⁴ Françoise Choay, *The Rule and the Model: On the Theory of Architecture and Urbanism*, ed. Denise Bratton (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997), p. 137.

⁵⁵ Choay, *The Rule and the Model*, p. 138.

individual character by a set of topographical features that affect its buildings. It ‘lies near the *omphalos* of the land,’ flanking a hill near the ocean, traversed and bordered by a great river, the Anydrus, and another, smaller one that flows into the first. The slope of the terrain and the distribution of the rivers give rise to unique arrangements: the defensive system which converts the smaller interior river into a reservoir of potable water in case of siege; the cisterns that assure the provision of rainwater to places where it would be difficult to employ canalization; the absence of a moat (which the Anydrus replaces) on one side of the enclosure; the deviation of the city wall from the perfect square which is surely the model of the utopian city; and finally, the bridge that connects the two banks of the Anydrus.”⁵⁶

Let us briefly consider More’s Utopia as an abridgement to New Amsterdam. It too is an island. Unlike Utopia, Manhattan’s isthmus is a natural condition. As I have already demonstrated, this did not preclude Isaack de Rasière, the chief commercial agent of the West India Company and secretary of New Netherland, from promoting a second, artificially constructed one.⁵⁷ To the Company director Samuel Blommaert, De Rasière writes:

“The small fort, New Amsterdam, commenced to be built, is situated on a point opposite to Noten Island; [the channel between] is a gun-shot wide, and is full six or seven fathoms deep in the middle. This point might, with little trouble, be made a small island, by cutting a canal through Blommaert’s valley, so as to afford a haven winter and summer, for sloopes and ships; and the whole of this little island ought, from its nature, to be made a superb fort, to be approached by land only on one side (since it is a triangle), thus protecting them both.”

Such a technological manoeuvre, following the precedent set by Utopus, is equally evocative of the operation performed on nature by Atlas in Plato’s Atlantis. Most commonly depicted as a lowly Dutch dike-builder, is De Rasière the heir apparent of Atlas? It was not an uncommon position among seventeenth-century fortification theorists, who are to be differentiated from their Renaissance counterparts. The

⁵⁶ Choay, *The Rule and the Model*, p. 139-140.

⁵⁷ See the brief discussion on Isaack de Rasière in Chapter 3—“On Being In/Between: Expanding the Cultural *Episteme* in New Netherland,” p. 108-109.

crossover between the utopic and physical world by the seventeenth-century theorists assumed an increasingly utilitarian aspect. Moreover, their *raison d'être*, similar to utopian authors, was boosted by an increasingly social and political critique of society. Promethean human power created More's Utopia. The same "vision of a secular sainthood," and reference to humankind's rising power over nature, distinguishes New Amsterdam from its two most immediate colonial neighbours, Philadelphia and New Haven, as well as the Puritans' "City on a Hill" in Boston. In all three English examples, the figure of God predominates—in the privileged view on which the plan of the first two depends, and on the hilltop site of the latter that is an obvious metaphor for Jerusalem.⁵⁸

De Rasière's proposition has much in common with a broader reading of Utopia. He continues:

The river marks out, naturally, three angles; the most northern faces and commands, within the range of a cannon shot, the great Mauritse River and the land; the southernmost commands, on the water level, the channel between Noten Island and the fort, together with the Hellegat; the third point, opposite to Blommaert's valley, commands the lowland; the middle part, which ought to be left as a market-place, is a hillock, higher than the surrounding land, and should always serve as a battery, which might command the three points, if the streets should be arranged accordingly."⁵⁹

The position that Utopia occupies, "near the *omphalos* of the land" (the *omphalos* being an ancient word for the spiritual and physical centre of a state), mirrors New Amsterdam's place in New Netherland. The entire territory's state of betweenness resembles a metaphoric island. Manhattan Island's original natural features are consistently downplayed. It has been New York City's real misfortune

⁵⁸ For a Vitruvian-based interpretation of the settlement of New Haven, see Anthony N. B. Garvan, *Architecture and Town Planning in Colonial Connecticut* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951), p. 46-49.

⁵⁹ "Letter of Isaack de Rasières to Samuel Blommaert, 1628 (?)," in Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 104-105.

that among extant visual accounts there is not a reliable record of the Island's original topography.⁶⁰ That notwithstanding, descriptions flooded contemporary accounts. Notably, these do not refer, in any terms, to the Netherlands. In one extreme example, Megapolensis writes: "The country is very mountainous, partly soil, partly rocks, and with elevations so exceedingly high that they appear to almost touch the clouds."⁶¹ The mimetic approach to Dutch colonisation in New Amsterdam presupposes that there is no contingency between Manhattan Island's physical geography and its colonial buildings.

De Rasière's passage emphasises an orthographic depiction of the land, tying the city to concepts of mensuration. His remarks are in the spirit of the directors' 'ideal' conception for the colony. Both of which, inclined to geometry and science, project a metaphysical order, cleaving "to the higher Platonic world of Being rather than that of transient becoming."⁶² De Rasière imitates Archimedes, whose popular rediscovery in the early seventeenth-century vaulted him into a privileged, almost other-worldly, status. Like More's, De Rasière's description is brutally physical. Why is colonialism summed-up in terms of plans when the rhetoric is so visibly sectional? From the outset, in the "Instructions for Willem Verhulst, Director of New Netherland" (January, 1625), space is, principally, described neither planimetrically, nor perspectively, but from the scale of the landscape—"It is also to be noted that all hilly lands upon the which the sun, at noon, being in the south, shines

⁶⁰ There have been efforts to address the Island's original topography, none of which are wholly satisfactory. It is for that reason, as much as any other, that they have failed to ignite scholars' interest. Fred Roy Frank makes one of the most thorough examinations, made-up of projections from the *Manatus Map* (c. 1665-1670), the *Ratzen Plan* (1766-1767), and the *Ratzer Map* (1766-1767), in his unpublished Master's Thesis, *The Development of New York City 1600-1900* (1955), p. 6-9. Years before, Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, in *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928), cited the *Ratzen Plan* as "the earliest really reliable plan which shows the general contour lines." Yet, this plan is 150 years after the Dutch arrived, and like the *Manatus Map*, of an extremely small scale. Even earlier, in 1909, Townsend MacCoun published *The Island of Manhattan, at the time of its discovery*. I am indebted to Charles T. Gehring for drawing the subject of Manhattan Island's topography to my attention.

⁶¹ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 168.

⁶² Mark Dorrian, "On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland," in *The Journal of Architecture*, vol. 6, no. 1 (Spring 2001), p. 41, pp. 27-51.

perpendicularly are the best; . . .”—and the individual building—“And it is to be noted that where there is no tide the dwellings shall be erected as far as possible down-stream, . . .”⁶³ The city is constructed as an individual place, determined in even the particular features of its buildings—“Thus were the walls of the church speedily begun to be laid up with quarry-stone, and to be covered by the English carpenters with overlapping shingles cleft from oak, which, by exposure to the wind and rain, turn blue, and look as if they were slate”⁶⁴—by the ‘contingencies of physical geography.’

C: Objective Space

On 7th June 1629 a revised version of the “Freedoms and Exemptions for the Patroons and Masters or Private Persons who would plant a colony and cattle in New Netherland” was made public.⁶⁵ In Article III it was specified that Manhattan Island was to remain a free territory under Company control and management. This document has been examined from all sorts of perspectives—including economic, political, and social ones. As with most legal documents, a fully-formed architectural concept is part and parcel. Manhattan Island’s natural spatial condition was of long-standing, but on this date it was officially legislated over for the first time.

Viewing the *terra nuova* of the New World as the proscenium for one of Serlio’s ‘other’ scenes, and then confining this schema to a specific place, having a specific make up, in this case Manhattan Island, appeals to two of Europe’s foremost, and until recently understated, sixteenth and seventeenth-century

⁶³ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, VI: 8.

⁶⁴ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 213.

⁶⁵ The first plan was approved by the Amsterdam chamber of the Dutch West India Company on 10th March 1628. On the two versions of the Patroonship plan, see Oliver A. Rink, *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), p. 94-116.

intellectual traditions—the genre of literature known at the “Theatre of Machines,” and the formalised representation of the outside world termed the *Wunderkammern*, or “museum as a theater of the universe.”⁶⁶ The *Cabinet Geometrique de Mr le Clerc* conjoins the principal components of these two fields. (Figure 5.16) Manhattan Island is constantly couched in the terms that constitute these two intellectual paradigms. As a cabinet, colonists and Company officials talked of “collecting” and “acquiring,” of “experimenting,” “discovering,” and “examining.” As a ‘theatre of machines,’ one cannot escape the insistent Aristotelian rhetoric of *techne*, including measuring, digging, ship-building, milling, and so on. The characteristics of both categories intimate intellect.

The “radical” Calabrian Dominican Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639), in *Civitas Solis* (1602), was probably the first person to make a prosaic connection between the *Wunderkammern* and the city.⁶⁷ In a less ghoulish manner, in Jan Brueghel the Younger’s *Venus and Cupid in a Collector’s Cabinet* (c. 1630-1640), the juxtaposition of the distant vista of Antwerp, viewed through the arcade on the painting’s right-hand side, with the collector’s cabinet establishes a direct causal relation between the two ‘objects.’⁶⁸ (Figure 5.17) In fact, the collector’s cabinet is a city all its own. A few years before Campanella, in *Gesta Grayorum* (1594), Sir Francis Bacon gives clear recourse to identify the city, and what is collected in the

⁶⁶ Jacques Besson published the first ‘theatre of machines,’ *Instrumentorum et Machinarum* (etc.) (Orleans?, 1569?). A whole spate of works followed closely thereafter, most notably—Agostino Ramelli, *Le Diverse et Artificiose Machine* (etc.) (Paris, 1588); Ambroise Bachot, *Le gouuernail . . . Lequel conduira le curieux de geometrie en perspectiue dedans l’architecture des fortifications, machines de guerre* (etc.) (Melun, 1598); and Vittorio Zonca, *Novo Teatro di Machine et Edificii* (etc.) (Padua, 1607).

⁶⁷ Anthony Grafton admirably sums-up Campanella’s project. He writes: “Campanella . . . imagined the walls of a Utopian City of the Sun on which citizens would see specimens of every imaginable plant and animal, with their properties explained. The visual ‘signatures’ that linked them to one another, and to the internal organs of the humans who consumed them would be neatly docketed and classified. Thus the city itself would become a guide to all forms of legitimate knowledge of nature, one which educated its inhabitants in subject after subject as they passed through its concentric rings of walls.” See Anthony Grafton, “Believe It or Not,” in *The New York Review of Books* (November 5, 1998), pp. 14-18.

⁶⁸ Brueghel follows the precedent of juxtaposing the two subjects—the city and collector’s cabinet—established by his father and Peter Paul Rubens in *The Sense of Sight* (1617/1618).

colonist's *theatrum mundi*, with the sixteenth-century, Reformation-fuelled, collector's cabinet. In the voice of 'The Second Counsellor, advising the Study of Philosophy' to the "Prince of Purpoole," he writes:

"And to this purpose I will commend to your Highness four principal works and monuments of yourself: . . . The fourth such a still-house, so furnished with mills, instruments, furnaces, and vessels, as may be a palace fit for a philosopher's stone."⁶⁹

In *New Atlantis*, published thirty-three years later, Bacon significantly enlarged and elaborated on three of the four monuments—a garden, a collection of rare beasts and birds, and the 'still-house'—incorporating them into a "House of Solomon." Could this be a thinly-disguised reference to colonial space? One would have to wait, however, over a hundred years later before Giambattista Nolli (c. 1692-1756) published his plan of Rome, *Nuova Pianta di Roma* (1748), before the city was formally indicted in this process. That is not, however, reason to dismiss the claims to city-making laid down by late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century philosophers, engineers, and artists, among others.

Is it possible, even plausible, to view the colonial space of New Amsterdam as a transitive space between the ideal material world of the museum and the real material world outside it? By contrast to the armaments of military fortification, and the science of siege-devices and defensive machines, and even of churches that typically dominate colonial landscapes and their rhetoric—de Vries notes: "Kieft . . . told me that he had now had a fine inn built and of stone, . . . I replied that . . . it was a scandal to us when the English passed there, and saw only a mean barn in which we preached"⁷⁰—the colonists' civil machines take-up an appreciable percentage of dialogue in New Amsterdam. These components—including mills and brewing

⁶⁹ Bacon, *Gesta Grayorum*, VIII: 335.

⁷⁰ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 212.

devices—are worth closer scrutiny. The mills are hardly ordinary utilitarian devices. They operate symbolically. In the *Vertoogh*, it is written: “the Church, . . . intercepts and turns aside the Southeast wind from the gristmill which stands in that vicinity; and this is also one of the causes why a scarcity of bread prevails frequently in summer for want of grinding;”⁷¹ and in the *Journal of New Netherland*: “In the beginning their Honors had sent certain number of settlers thither, and at great expense had three sawmills erected, which never realised any profit of consequence, on account of their great heaviness, . . .”⁷² Then there are those that signify ingenuity. As Michaëlius writes: “Much timber is cut here to carry to the Fatherland, but the vessels are too few to take much of it.”⁷³ As was common practice in the ‘theatre of machines,’ colonial apparatus atypically conjoined typological functions. In the *Historisch Verhael* (etc.) (1626) Nicolaes van Wassenaer comments: “François Molemaecker is busy building a horse-mill, over which shall be constructed a spacious room sufficient to accommodate a large congregation, . . .”⁷⁴ When Van der Donck writes: “The nut-wood grows as tall as the oak, but not so heavy. . . it grows straight and is tough and hard. We now use it for cogs and rounds in our mills and for threshing-flails,” he indicates the deliberateness paid to the machine’s detail.⁷⁵ Similarly, De Vries is never short of an exemplary adjective, of “*fine* water-mills,”⁷⁶ and “where two *good* mills could be erected . . .”⁷⁷

The cabinet places things in wholly unnatural proximity that has an architectural formalism all its own. The rhetoric that accompanies this genre is dynamic, not static. The language that seventeenth-century visitors used to recount

⁷¹ O’Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 299.

⁷² Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 271.

⁷³ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 131.

⁷⁴ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 83-84.

⁷⁵ Van der Donck, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, p. 19.

⁷⁶ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 206.

⁷⁷ Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664*, p. 209. Author’s note: The italics are mine to indicate emphasis.

their experiences of *Wunderkammern*—including “arranging,” “confronting,” juxtaposing, dialogue, “moving,” adjacency, etc.—is steeped in architectural overtones. The same dynamic, three-dimensional rhetoric informs our colonial correspondents. Neither for the cabinet, nor for the colonial city is the two-dimensional plan the issue. Erasmus said that “the city is a huge monastery.” Serlio metaphorically described it as a building. As an ‘iconographic cabinet,’ incorporating tectonic, scenographic, and mathematic vocabulary based on oppositions, or ‘differences’—the very same elements that Bacon used to make-up his “House of Solomon”—the colonial city projected onto the real landscape of Manhattan Island its own ‘shadowy ideological antagonisms.’

IV

Between the publication of Vincenzo Scamozzi’s treatise *L’idea della architettura universale* (1615) and Abbé Marc-Antoine Laugier’s urban thesis, *Essai sur l’Architecture* (1753), one would be excused for thinking that architecture took a vacation for nearly a century and a half. Without a seminal text to dissuade them, architectural and urban historians have, broadly speaking, been content delimiting the Baroque influence until it meets the Neo-classical trajectory of the Enlightenment. In essentially the same period, spanning from René Descartes (1596-1650) to Giambattista Vico (1668-1744), we are acutely aware that philosophers dispensed with traditions at nearly the same rate as they felled forests in order to accommodate their literary outpouring. Where is the correspondence between these two groups? And then there is the enigma of the New World that had been steadily gaining pace since Christopher Columbus’s discovery in 1492. The encyclopaedia of the New World was produced in Germany by the de Bry family in fourteen volumes, *Historia Americae sive Novi Orbis*, between 1590 to 1634. The fictional best seller on the subject was, without doubt, Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia*. With almost equal vigour to

the philosophers clearing of space, and in tandem with technology's impetus, from the end of the sixteenth century European governments circled the globe to occupy "unclaimed" space. It was in this period, after the cult of Scamozzi had abated and five years before Descartes moved to the Netherlands and really 'heated-up,' that Manhattan Island was colonised. If architecture and urban theory in Europe was seen to be on a holiday, imagine how colonialism's entry has fared?

It was almost three hundred years to the day from the end of Dutch authority over Manhattan Island to the publication of Reps's *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States*. In the four intervening decades, architectural and urban colonial historiography has remained static. Simply put, the primary objective of the present work has been to demonstrate aspects of the rhetorical tradition in colonial discourse pertaining to the Dutch colonialism in New Netherland, and particularly at New Amsterdam, that have a bearing on the colony's architectural and urban interpretation.

“Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier. . . Cultural consecration does indeed confer on the objects, persons and situations it touches, a sort of ontological promotion akin to a transubstantiation.”

Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, tr. Richard Nice, 1984, p. 6

“The dominant form of space, that of the centres of wealth and power, endeavours to mould the spaces it dominates (i.e. peripheral spaces), and it seeks, often by violent means, to reduce the obstacles and resistance it encounters there. Differences, for their part, are forced into the symbolic forms of an art that is itself abstract. A symbolism derived from that mis-taking of sensory, sensual and sexual which is intrinsic to the things/signs of abstract space finds objective expression in derivative ways: monuments have a phallic aspect, towers exude arrogance, and the bureaucratic and political authoritarianism immanent to a repressive space is everywhere.”

Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, tr. Donald Nicholson-Smith, 1991, p. 49

There is no doubt, I have always had it in for Peter Stuyvesant (1611-1672), the Director-General of New Netherland from 1647 to 1664.¹ Anything else would be unthinkable. All of the rhetorical methods and models upholding Stuyvesant are constructed with one aim—to bolster his reputation which, let us not forget, at the

¹ For a recent, general genealogy of Peter Stuyvesant, and the one this manuscript has made use of, see Charles T. Gehring, “Petrus Stuyvesant, directeur-generaal van Nieuw-Nederland: een spannend begin 1647-1652,” in *Jaarboek Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie*, 50 (1996), p. 83-87.

very same time elevates Stuyvesant's stature as New York City's founding father (dovetailing neatly with contemporary American sentimentalism) and steamrollers the city's history into an ever-neater order.

Here is how the tale is typically told. A one-legged military hero, hailed by the Dutch West India Company "as a symbol of 'Roman' sacrifice," is despatched to the economic and ideological thorn in the side of one of the "Golden Republic's" two prized commercial companies.² Portrayed like Henry VII after Richard III, Peter Stuyvesant set out effecting a campaign of "zero tolerance" to resurrect a territory physically overrun by Native Americans and spatially infiltrated by the English. How does the tale end? According to the lore paraded by the historian Cornelis Ch. Goslinga, "not until a minister read Luke 14: 31-32 to him."³ At which time, rather than suffering the fate of being run out of town like his predecessor, Stuyvesant surrendered the colony a martyred hero, "withdrew from public affairs and retired to his farm."⁴ If there is any doubt of the stature this homily accords Stuyvesant, Luke 14: 31-32 reads:

"Or what *king*, going out to wage war against another *king*, will not sit down first and consider whether he is able with ten thousand to oppose the one who comes against him with twenty thousand? If he cannot, then, while the other is still far away, he sends a delegation and asks for the terms of peace."⁵

It makes quite the parable. And as if words alone were not enough to cement this classically-inspired legacy, late-nineteenth and twentieth-century illustrators have flocked to the historian's cause. As collaborators to this praxis, these artists have

² Cited in Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 42.

³ Cornelis Ch. Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast 1580-1680* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1971), p. 20.

⁴ See the entry for Peter Stuyvesant in Kenneth T. Jackson, ed., *The Encyclopedia of New York City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 1133-1134.

⁵ Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy, eds., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 105NT. Note: Italics are mine to indicate emphasis.

eagerly supplied a ready-made image to events, thereby fabricating a key facet of the historian's arsenal. Nineteenth-century depictions of bravado in response to Colonel Richard Nicolls's summons to surrender the colony are prime examples of the propensity to cast Stuyvesant in a Napoleonic mould. (Figures 6.1, 6.2) It is no coincidence then that in *The Encyclopedia of New York City* (1995) there is not an entry, hardly even a mention, for Stuyvesant's much-maligned predecessor Willem Kieft (1602-1647),⁶ the Director-General of New Netherland from 1637 to 1647.⁷ In America, we all know the power and determination of the hero-making industry. In New York, it is evidently in full swing.

What this fairy tale does not reveal are the key ideas that one will be coaxed to accept. First, one must be aware of the twenty-seven year publication blackout. It is largely accepted that the first view of New Amsterdam, *t' Fort nieuw Amsterdam op de Manhatans*, depicting the colony c. 1626-1628, was not published until 1651, four years after Stuyvesant had taken over the helm. (Figure 6.3) It would hardly be provocative to suggest that this view is but one step removed from Jean-Jacques Rousseau's (1712-1778) pined-after "pure state of nature." For that matter, it has clearly benefitted from Theodore de Bry's (1528-1598) popular late sixteenth-century image of America in the third volume, *Americæ Tertia Pars* (etc.) (1592) of the de Bry family's fourteen-volume masterwork, *Historia Americæ sive Novi Orbis* (1590-1634). (Figure 6.4) The second, inset view, *Nieuw Amsterdam op t Eylant Manhattans* (c. 1655-1656) depicts the colony between 1651 to 1655. (Figure 6.5) Published only four years later, it illustrates an utterly transformed and burgeoning

⁶ Kieft's birthdate has been the subject of some speculation. In his unpublished essay, "Neglected Networks. New Netherlanders and Their Old Fatherland: The Kieft Case," Willem Frijhoff puts forward a strong case for assigning his birthdate as 24th August 1602, and not in either 1595 or 1597 as is generally stated.

⁷ By all accounts Willem Kieft did not arrive in New Netherland until early in 1638. This must explain why the majority of scholars assign this date to the commencement of his tenure. In actuality, the resolution of the States General to commission Willem Kieft and when he was "thereupon sworn" was dated 2nd September, 1637. See Edmund Bailey [E. B.] O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, 11 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1856-1861), I: 104.

colony. It is a tasteful view, particularly for all its youthful naiveté. This rapid-fire transformation of the colony's principal settlement, the responsibility for which has been ascribed to Stuyvesant, would unquestionably have made a strong impression in the floundering Company's stock pamphlet. How pervasive were modes of economic production on the representation and publication of images of the Dutch East and West India Company colonies? By contrast, Kieft did not create a marketable city. That is a crucial shortcoming for the Director-General of any commercial company. However, his directorship was tellingly poised between two Stadholders—Maurits of Nassau and William II—with a penchant for dogmatic planimetric exercises. Instead, under the stadholderate of Frederik Hendrik (1584-1647, Stadholder of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Overijssel, and Gelderland from 1625 to 1647), as Jonathan Israel writes, "the lines of political and ideological strife in Dutch society had, to an extent, become blurred."⁸

This blackout also means that the debate over the colony's disastrous state would have been all but unknown except to those in the immediate orbit of the Company. So why has it been necessary for history to create a 'fall guy'? Has the consensus been to bow to the hero-making industry to such an extent that it is impossible to acknowledge separate states of urban production? Is this bias attributable to the unassailable legacy of Washington Irving's *A History of New York* (1809)? There is no question that Bobbett & Edmonds's grotesque portrayal of Kieft in *A History of New York* (1850) represents popular opinion. (Figure 6.6) It also happens to be the only prevalent image of him. Has history been influenced and fuelled by tales, like the colonist Maryn Adriaensen's, who, over hysteria borne from Kieft's Indian attacks, is reputed to have "attacked the director-general with a knife, apparently intending to assassinate him"⁹? More likely, the prevailing sentiment can

⁸ Jonathan I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 595.

⁹ Oliver A. Rink, "Private Interest and Godly Gain: The West India Company and the Dutch

be put down to the general historian's understandable lack of either urban or architectural know-how, and the fact that these two disciplines have remained on the margins of the colonial debate.

It is no coincidence that commensurate with Stuyvesant's political ascent, coinciding neatly with the appointment of William II to Stadholder, development in New Netherland swung to follow the day's dogma. At this time the quadrangle of power—what I have described elsewhere as the relationship between the States General, the *Heren XIX*, the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company, and the colonists—was fundamentally reorganised. In other words, in the person of Peter Stuyvesant and on the direct commission and appointment of the States General of the United Netherlands, the orthodox Calvinists' ascendancy was finally crowned.¹⁰ Prior to this point, as Van Cleef Bachman astutely comments:

“The directors had been able to convince the States General not only of their good faith in searching for a solution [to colonisation in New Netherland] but also of the necessity of avoiding a binding, permanent settlement until a certain amount of experimentation had been made.”¹¹

Bachman's is the clearest statement to date upholding the liberal kinship between the West India Company directors and the colony's Director-Generals in advance of Peter Stuyvesant and the States General orthodoxy in New Netherland. In fact, Stuyvesant's reputation is a modern construction almost entirely whitewashing the colonists' protestations in the *Vertoogh van Nieu-Neder-Land* [Remonstrance of New Netherland, and the Occurrences There] (1649), and the West India Company's

Reformed Church in New Netherland, 1624-1664,” in *New York History*, vol. 75, no. 3 (July 1994), p. 259, pp. 245-264.

¹⁰ For Arnold Johan Ferdinand [A. J. F.] van Laer's English translation of Petrus Stuyvesant's Commission as Director, dated 28th July, 1646, see Alma R. VanHoevenberg, “The Stuyvesant's in the Netherlands and New Netherland,” in the *New-York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin*, vol. 10, no. 1 (April 1926), pp. 3-12.

¹¹ Van Cleef Bachman, *Peltries or Plantations: The Economic Policies of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland 1623-1639* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969), p. 151.

charges of maladministration following the colony's capitulation to the English. Coincidentally, the same allegations, under different circumstances, were brought against Stuyvesant's three predecessors—Pieter Minuit, Wouter van Twiller and Willem Kieft.

Second, there is a common literary trope sustaining two centuries of colonial historiography that cannot easily be separated from seventeenth-century political posturing. Why have these two become mutually dependent? As the tale in New Amsterdam is conventionally told, Stuyvesant found the city the same as Kieft, who found it the same as Wouter van Twiller, who found it the same as the Director-General before him, and so on.¹² The implication is clear. In each case, if it is not the Director-General laying the groundwork for his own triumph, it is the historian. For obvious reasons the buck stops with Stuyvesant. That has not prevented his tenure being portrayed, unlike all the others, as nothing less than an exemplar. On landing at New Amsterdam, Kieft dutifully recorded how he found "Fort Amsterdam totally and wholly in a ruinous condition . . . five farms vacant and fallen into decay . . . every vessel was unserviceable . . . The whole of the house in the fort is yet in need of considerable repair, as well as the five stone houses, the wooden church, the lodge and the smith's . . ."¹³ This tone is sustained by popular accounts of how equally immoral the population was—"The diversity of New Amsterdam's inhabitants when Kieft arrived was matched only by their turbulence. . . Fully one-quarter of the town's buildings were 'grog-shops or houses where nothing is to be got but tobacco

¹² In the "Report on the Surrender of New Netherland," Stuyvesant writes: "Secondly, by the exceedingly detrimental, land-destroying and people-expelling wars with the cruel barbarians, which endured two years before my arrival there, whereby many subjects who possessed means were necessitated to depart, others to retreat under the crumbling fortress of New Amsterdam, which, on my arrival, I found resembling more a mole-hill than a fortress, without gates, the walls and bastions trodden under foot by men and cattle." See J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), p. 459.

¹³ E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, 15 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, Printers, 1856-1867), I: 96. Cited in Bachman, *Peltries or Plantations*, p. 154.

and beer.”¹⁴ Oliver A. Rink writes: “The directors of the Amsterdam Chamber no doubt looked upon him [Kieft] as a saviour for the faltering colony.”¹⁵ The same sentiment followed Stuyvesant’s commission to New Netherland ten years later. Historiography’s momentum will only be upended by altering one’s frame of reference. The entire chapter answers to this mandate. The general consensus is that at the start of Kieft’s tenure hardly any of the institutions common and generally considered irreplaceable in European cities had been established in New Amsterdam. Acceding to his detractors, it would be true to say that Kieft did not dramatically change this pattern. To his few silent proponents, the challenge is to plot, from existing material, the unique urban thesis that emerged under his stewardship.

I

If ever there was a historic figure upon whom praise has been heaped by the indefensible bucketful, it is Peter Stuyvesant. A follower *par excellence*, “one of the Company’s better and proven servants,” Stuyvesant has been constructed to represent the victory of everything that is good over bad, and portrayed as the guardian of traditional values, law and order, democracy, etc.—the list goes interminably on.¹⁶ It is for this reason that he is so easily warming to his ever-expanding role as New York City’s founding father. He is classifiable in all the terms contemporary society wants to quantify especially when his predecessors can be tattooed with the stigma of moral depravity.

By stark contrast, Willem Kieft has had scarcely a word written in his favour, and for all intents and purposes, one is led to believe that it would have been better-

¹⁴ Cited in Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, p. 33.

¹⁵ Oliver A. Rink, *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), p. 132.

¹⁶ Goslinga, *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast 1580-1680*, p. 280.

off if he had drowned even before he did. In fact, to find a single word in his favour, and then not without a caveat, one will have to retreat as far back as Mary Louise Booth's *History of the City of New York* (1859). Even then, her concise account: "In some respects Kieft brought order out of chaos, and improved the appearance of the town," is way off the mark.¹⁷ To most, the fact that his ship the *Princess Amelia* went down just after he had been deposed is only too fitting a retribution for what is commonly described as "the havoc . . . he wreak[ed] on New Netherland over . . . eight or nine years."¹⁸ These contemporary accounts of his tenure fall right into line with those of the nineteenth century. Benson J. Lossing writes:

"Van Twiller was succeeded by William Keift [*sic.*], an energetic, rapacious, and unscrupulous man, who brought serious trouble upon the colony. He endeavoured to concentrate all power in his own hands, and began a tyrannous rule."¹⁹

Make no mistake, the cause for these judgements is not attributable to a recovered bounty of seventeenth-century evidence. It is true to say that David Pietersz. de Vries (1593-1655), Adriaen van der Donck (c. 1618-c. 1655), and Everhardus Bogardus (c. 1607-1647) are all on record speaking-out against Kieft. However, their accounts, all fuelled by personal grudges, are about as reliable an insight into Kieft's character as Irving's.²⁰ This raises the issue that an authoritative and comprehensive background study of Kieft has yet to be published. In an era when outright aggression is ever-increasingly equated with tyranny, despotism and madness, Kieft's urban accomplishments are sullied by his methods. He has been pilloried by adjectives on a scale equal to John Milton's detractors. That withstanding, it is my

¹⁷ Mary L. Booth, *History of the City of New York from Its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York: W. R. C. Clark & Meeker, 1859), p. 86.

¹⁸ Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, p. 30.

¹⁹ Benson J. Lossing, *History of New York City, Embracing an Outline Sketch of Events from 1609 to 1830, and a Full Account of Its Development from 1830 to 1884* (New York: The Perine Engraving and Publishing Co., 1884), p. 8.

²⁰ On the subject of Bogardus's sermons against Kieft, see Willem Frijhoff, *Wegen van Evert Willemsz.: Een Hollands weeskind op zoek naar zichzelf, 1607-1647* (Nijmegen: SUN Memoria, 1995).

view that Stuyvesant is the city's most infamous parrot, Kieft its most unsung savant.

This campaign of eulogising and vilification is based on the comprehensibility of the city's development during Stuyvesant's tenure and the direct, albeit primitive associations drawn with Dutch models of the "Golden Age" and of European urban development during this period in general. This qualification preys heavily on the interpreter's taste, and particularly attaching it to practices in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic. Tying explanations of urban and architectural discourse to a culture's moral values is a society's form of Russian roulette. This is the prevailing form of historical perennialism practised on New Amsterdam. Following the Indian Wars under the stewardship of Kieft, it is not hard to see how the city's flagrant architectural aggressiveness under Stuyvesant is portrayed passively. Urbanism's techniques arrived in New Amsterdam well before Stuyvesant, only they have never been recognisable to literary historians following the textbooks of architectural history. It is plain to see that Kieft engaged the military, legal and economic necessities of scale. Sacrificing several hundred soldiers, as happened while clearing the Algonkian tribes in order to further Dutch expansionism between 1639 to 1645, was a means to achieve a spatial result.²¹ Moralism was not expected to stand in the way of progress. In general, actions during Kieft's tenure having spatial consequences indicate a territorial strategy on a par with the concepts of Grotius's theory of property, which is to say inclined to Arminianism. The modes of territorial organisation that underline Kieft's development of the landscape and settlement in the vicinity of Manhattan Island may be claimed to be an elaboration on the larger-scale effect of Grotius's theory of property that is detailed in Chapter 3—"On Being

²¹ As Oliver A. Rink notes, this manoeuvre was also decisive in curbing the unwanted ascendancy of the Patroons influence in the colony. On the subject he writes: "His [Kieft's] appointment must have signaled a defeat for the patroon's cause within the chamber because his actions in New Netherland suggest that he arrived in the colony with a mandate to curb van Rensselaer's influence." See Rink, *Holland on the Hudson*, p. 132.

So what constitutes ‘virtuous’ and ‘vicious’ acts? In history’s eyes, Kieft’s actions are vicious, dystopian, and socially unacceptable, while Stuyvesant’s undertaking of the Company’s largest civil engineering project, a fortified wall running along the city’s northern and western borders, is virtuous. It is clear that the prevailing maxim among the “Chosen People” ran along the lines that Simon Schama describes:

“To be filthy was to expose the population to the illicit entry of disease and the vagrant vermin that were said to be its carriers. . . Conversely, to be clean was to be patriotic, vigilant in the defense of one’s homeland, hometown and home against invading polluters and polluted invaders.”²²

The palisade and controlled gateways afforded a barrier to just such “unpleasant” persons. This was never more lavishly embellished than in the illuminated manuscript, *A Description of the Towne of Mannados or New Amsterdam* [The Duke’s Plan] (1664), portraying the city as a pattern of lush gardens and ordered houses. (Figure 6.7) It is the pre-eminent display of orthodox Calvinism’s assumption of New Netherland’s urban practices and testifies to the extent that Stuyvesant’s “aesthetic housekeeping” endeavoured to create images of New Amsterdam in the likeness of Pieter de Hooch’s (1629-1684) views of Delft. Like the Dutch Republic, Stuyvesant hid an iron fist behind the rubric of culture. Nonetheless, the city’s constriction made it an Englishman’s stepping-stone. What was so advantageous to that?

The prevailing tendency to overlook colonialism’s critical spatial inventiveness is not limited to New Amsterdam’s literary historians, but extends

²² Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (London: Fontana Press, 1991), p. 378.

across the much larger field of urban history in general. As much as urban and architectural historians might aspire, city-making and urban models resist incorporation in a pattern-book. Why for so long have the architectural and urban aspects of seventeenth-century colonialism been so grossly underestimated? One widely-respected scholar writes:

“The cities of colonial America were the most important examples of sixteenth-century town planning. The lack of imagination that they showed, when compared with the refinement and inventiveness of European artistic culture, illustrates the way in which ability and opportunity no longer coincided. In Europe the greatest minds of the time found themselves unable to realise their plans, while third-rate technicians who emigrated to America were given the chance to plan and complete entire cities. And yet they both had the same goal: to bring order to the urban environment in accordance with the new principles of symmetry and geometric regularity.”²³

In New Netherland, it is patently easy to realise that this generalisation was not ever the case—neither espoused by Kieft, for whom civic idealism was certainly not bound up in Leonardo Benevolo’s conception of scientific order and rationalism, nor for the States General via Peter Stuyvesant, who expected power, prestige and control to be transferable by the tenets of orthodox Calvinism applied to urbanism.

II

As Wim Klooster writes: “No man is so identified with the image of New Netherland as is Pieter Stuyvesant.”²⁴ Portraits of him are at pains to illustrate such a sovereign status. One nineteenth-century example, A. G. Lund’s lithograph of *Peter Stuyvesant and his Counsel preparing the charter for the City of New York in 1652* (1879), is unmistakably modelled after seventeenth-century images of the

²³ Leonardo Benevolo, *The History of the City*, tr. Geoffrey Culverwell (London: Scolar Press, 1980), p. 639.

²⁴ Wim Klooster, *The Dutch in the Americas 1600-1800* (Providence, RI: The John Carter Brown Library, 1997), p. 56.

schutterstukken and *regentenstukken*, for example Govert Flinck's *Vier doelheren der Kloveniersdoelen* (1642) and Bartholomeus van der Helst's *De overlieden van den Kloveniersdoelen te Amsterdam in 1655* (1655).²⁵ (Figures 6.8-6.10) In the same essay, Klooster makes hasty mention to an issue which is far more insightful. He writes:

“For the Dutch in North America, Stuyvesant's position and reputation may be compared with the prominence of Johan Maurits in Brazil. Both men were great personalities, strong leader types, tenacious by nature, and excellent representatives of their country.”²⁶

However, Klooster's assessment of Stuyvesant's character has fallen into just the trap that Stuyvesant set and which New York has vigorously promoted. Yet the comparison he initiated is a fruitful one. In 1647, Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen's (1604-1679) portrait was published in Caspar van Baerle's (1584-1648) *Rerum per octennium in Brasilia et alibi nuper gestarum* (etc.) (1647).²⁷ (Figure 6.11) Subsequent portraits galvanised the representation of Maurits and heightened the stature accorded to a colonial leader. (Figures 6.12, 6.13) A couple of years later, Stuyvesant's own portrait bears a striking similarity to these.²⁸ (Figure 6.14) In fact,

²⁵ According to a note attached to the lithograph—*Peter Stuyvesant and his Counsel preparing the charter for the City of New York in 1652*—in the Emmet Collection, Miriam and Ira D. Wallach Division of Art, Prints and Photographs, The New York Public Library, the image is “from a picture by T. D. Bray in 1663,” and is reputed to show: John De Peyster, Dan Van Buskirk, Philip Van Rensselleer, Peter Stuyvesant, William Sturtevant, and Michael Dykeman.

²⁶ Klooster, *The Dutch in the Americas 1600-1800*, p. 56.

²⁷ See Caspar van Baerle, *Casparis Barlaei, rerum per octennium in Brasilia et alibi nuper gestarum* (etc.) (Amsterdam, 1647). C. R. Boxer writes of this work: “This Latin work was published under the auspices of John Maurice, Count of Nassau-Siegen, whose governorship of Netherlands-Brazil (1637-44) it recounts in a not unreasonably eulogistic style.” See Boxer, *The Dutch Seaborne Empire, 1600-1800*, p. 163.

²⁸ There is a small academic industry centred on the question surrounding the attribution to Stuyvesant's portrait. At the time of writing this manuscript, construction at the New-York Historical Society prevented first-hand viewing of the painting. As far as scholarship on the portrait is concerned, the most contemporary accounts continue to be divided on its attribution. According to the caption attached to the portrait in Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, p. 42, the painting was executed in New Amsterdam by Hendrick Couturier, c. 1660. Under the entry for Peter Stuyvesant in Jackson, *The Encyclopedia of New York*, p. 1133, the caption reads—“artist unknown.” Finally, in this author's recent correspondence with the Stichting Iconografisch Bureau in The Hague, it was noted that “all the Peter Stuyvesant portraits we know seem to have been based on the one painting by Abraham van Dijck” [held in the collection of The New-York Historical Society]. Earlier studies of this portrait by Charles X. Harris, “Henri Couturier: An Artist of New Netherland,” in *New-York*

it would hardly be earth-shattering to suggest that Stuyvesant's portrait was modelled on Maurits's, and it is less than surprising to find that by erecting a bust to grace his burial site at St. Mark's Church in-the-Bowery, New York's campaign to canonise Stuyvesant followed right in Maurits's footsteps.²⁹ With these two images, one is obviously meant to associate the two men's deeds.

Stuyvesant likely courted, even campaigned, for such a comparison. Leaving aside the fact that it must be the only time North America looked South for enlightenment, like countless other earlier historians, Klooster makes the comparison at the expense of Willem Kieft. He comments: "While Dutch interests in the area had suffered from neglect under Governor Kieft, Stuyvesant took a more energetic approach."³⁰ Recent suggestions of cultural industry in New Netherland, including the fact that Stuyvesant's portrait was painted in the colony, and proposals that New Amsterdam was populated by more than paysans and pilferers, do not change the fact that Stuyvesant was not the enlightenment figure of Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen. Neither his civic nor political record, and certainly not his lifestyle or social status, suggest there is any room beyond the uncanny similarities of their

Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin, vol. 11, no. 2 (July 1927), p. 45-52; and "Jacobus Gerritsen Strycker (c. 1619-1687): An Artist of New Netherland," in *New-York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin*, vol. 10, no. 3 (October 1926), p. 83-91, firmly attributes the work to Strycker. In "Recovering the Lost Ark: The Dutch Graphic Tradition in the Hudson Valley," in *A Beautiful and Fruitful Place: Selected Rensselaerswijck Seminar Papers*, ed. Nancy Anne McClure Zeller (Albany: New Netherland Publishing, 1991), Ruth Piwonka argues for an attribution to Henri Couturier, as does Wayne Craven in *Colonial American Portraiture: The Economic, Religious, Social, Cultural, Philosophical, Scientific, and Aesthetic Foundations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 94-97.

²⁹ In Hans R. Hoetink, "Johan Maurits van Nassau Founder of the Mauritshuis," there is a photograph of a marble bust of Johan Maurits by Bartholomeus Eggers. The caption reads: "This sculpture was done in 1664 for the garden opposite the Mauritshuis. In 1669 Johan Maurits had the bust moved to the burial-vault he had constructed for himself in Siegen, West Germany." See Hoetink, "Johan Maurits van Nassau Founder of the Mauritshuis," in *Dutch Painting of the Golden Age from the Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis*, ed. Hans R. Hoetink (The Hague: Johan Maurits van Nassau Foundation, 1982), p. 20. In "The Stuyvesants in the Netherlands and New Netherland," Alma R. VanHoevenberg writes: "Gov. Stuyvesant was buried beneath the chapel, erected by him on his bouwerie (farm). . . In 1915 the Kingdom of the Netherlands presented to the City of New York, an heroic bust, in bronze, of Petrus Stuyvesant by the Dutch sculptor Toon Dupuis. This was appropriately placed near his tomb and in the custody of St. Marks Consistory." See VanHoevenberg, "The Stuyvesants in the Netherlands and New Netherland," p. 10.

³⁰ Klooster, *The Dutch in the Americas 1600-1800*, p. 56-57.

individual representations to sustain such a comparison.³¹

Appointed governor of New Holland by the Dutch West India Company in 1636, not as in Stuyvesant's case by the States General, Johan Maurits's colonial service was defined by cultural opportunism.³² His endeavours can be interpreted as an early form of the intellectual model espoused in the Enlightenment's *magnum opus*—the *Encyclopédie* (1751-1765) of Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert. The stated purpose of the *Encyclopédie* was “to collect the knowledge dispersed on the surface of the earth, and to unfold its general system.”³³ Maurits's most significant achievement, certainly in the line of urbanism and architecture, was to exercise this methodology a century earlier in New Holland. An unusual suite of painters, naturalists, and cartographers accompanied Maurits to the colonial outpost—as C. R. Boxer writes: “more a scientific than a warlike expedition.”³⁴ Maurits was the authentic bourgeois. His acceptance of the capacity of reason to banish ignorance and advance society makes him a plausible role model for the eighteenth-century Parisian *haute bourgeoisie*. A list of Maurits's colonial accomplishments reads like a list of Enlightenment ambitions. Enumerating his feats, Klooster writes:

“Johan Maurits had an astronomical observatory built in New Holland, founded a Botanical and Zoological Garden, and even had a new capital built on the island of Antonio Vaz near Recife. Within a few years, Mauritsstad blossomed into a city of six thousand inhabitants, filled with buildings two or three stories high. No trouble or expense was spared either for two estates that sprang up on the same island, Boa Vista and

³¹ For a general description of Johan Maurits in Brazil, see C. R. Boxer, *The Dutch in Brazil, 1624-1654* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957).

³² It is worthwhile to note that Stuyvesant was in the service of the West India Company at Pernambuco between 1635-1639. In 1639 the company moved him to Curaçao. What I am intimating is that as an impressionable youth from the remote town of Peperga in Friesland, not only did Stuyvesant's self-obsession originate at this time, but that it was attributable to the first-hand influence of Maurits' statesmanship and *élan* in Brazil.

³³ For the Encyclopedists statement of purpose, see Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, vol. 5 (Paris, 1755).

³⁴ Boxer, *The Dutch in Brazil, 1624-1654*.

Four engravings of Frans Post’s (1612-1680) from Caspar van Baerle’s *Rerum per octennium in Brasilia et alibi nuper gestarum* (etc.)—*Mauritiopolis, Mauritio, Reciffa, et Circumiacentia Castra, Boa Vista, and Friburgum*—attest to colonialism’s subjection to intellectualisation. (Figures 6.15-6.18) Particularly meaningful to this study, Post’s views make the case for substantiating an ideological relationship between Maurits and Kieft centred around spatial regimes—including comparable strategies for extending and delineating local territories and unparalleled approaches to the ontological role of colonial construction—and for promoting the more general argument that the West India Company aided and abetted unique approaches to colonialism. In addition to an ideological kinship, is there evidence of a personal connection between these two colonial leaders?

A decade later in New Amsterdam, the ever-efficient bureaucrat Stuyvesant hastily complied with States General directives by expelling Kieft’s civic idealism with the Company sailors. As with his portrait, Stuyvesant depended on the institution of a state of mimicry to steal light from Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen, his visionary contemporary.

III

While an uncommon question, though not an inappropriate one considering the responsibilities entrusted to a seventeenth-century colonial leader, what is the civic legacy of Willem Kieft and Peter Stuyvesant? This is to be my means test for these two. In *The Rule and the Model* (1997), the French urban historian Françoise Choay convincingly traced urbanism’s discursive origins to the fifteenth century with

³⁵ Klooster, *The Dutch in the Americas 1600-1800*, p. 28.

the publication of Leon Battista Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* (c. 1452). As she writes:

“Only from the second half of the nineteenth century on did the foundational discourse on space proclaim its scientific status and designate its domain with the term *urbanism* . . . However, that was not really the beginning. . . In this case, as in many others, a discursive mode and a practice which are said to have been born in the nineteenth century, and assigned to an epistemic configuration that supposedly began to develop at the point of passage from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, only make manifest ruptures with tradition which were already evident and organize domains already defined in the fifteenth century.”³⁶

Let us look at the urban crucible that history has attributed to these two seventeenth-century figures. It is my supposition that it was not until intellectualism was replaced by authoritarianism, *i.e.* when Kieft was replaced by Stuyvesant, and when the role of the Director-General took the form of a mouthpiece, that New Amsterdam's ideal, or as I have already intimated, its ideological project, was watered down into a model of orthodox Calvinist urbanism.

Kieft is the architect of a city diametrically opposed to Stuyvesant's development. Though it is also true to say, Stuyvesant's city was not the mild-mannered Dutch entrepôt that it has been reputed to be. Kieft was not a copyist. The organisation of the colonial territory that he initiated or facilitated indicates a move toward a politics of openness by which space, not stone walls, was the delimiting force. His colonial record is marked by the influence of intellectuals spanning from Archimedes to Machiavelli. Frederick Zwielerlein was the first to observe:

“While it was a matter of life and death for the colony of New Netherland to resist the encroachments of New England governments,

³⁶ Françoise Choay, *The Rule and the Model: On the Theory of Architecture and Urbanism* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997), p. 3.

Kieft seems to have welcomed the occasion to treat with some families from Lynn and Ipswich for their settlement under Dutch jurisdiction in 1641. The Director General no doubt thought that settlements of Englishmen, bound by an oath of allegiance to the West India Company, would prove a good barrier to further encroachments of New England governments.”³⁷

More recently, Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace asserted that the intensive acceleration of distributing private land grants after 1643, when “he distributed nearly two dozen patents to prospective settlers whose farmsteads, mostly on Long Island,” reflected Kieft’s intention to “create a buffer around Manhattan and serve as tripwires in the event of further attacks.”³⁸ They go on to write: “The following summer, to the same end, he would begin to settle manumitted slaves north of New Amsterdam.”³⁹ Somehow these authors never saw the larger picture that these manoeuvres so plainly bespeak.

Kieft did not follow the process of fortification which was rampant in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Europe. What he orchestrated was no less idealistic than the directors’ proposed city—“Special Instructions for the Engineer and Surveyor Cryn Fredericxsz and for the Director and Council regarding the building of the fort and the houses” (April, 1625)—only its objectiveness did not rely on either the constriction or epistemology of the European ideal city—most notably modelled by Filarete in *Trattato d’Architettura* (c. 1457-1464), Albrecht Dürer in *Etliche Unterricht zu Befestigung der Stett, Schloss und flecken* (1527), and Simon Stevin in *Materiae politicae* (1649)—but on the expansiveness portrayed in literary utopias.⁴⁰ Was this owing, in part, to the colonists’ influence? The

³⁷ Frederick J. Zwierlein, “New Netherland Intolerance,” in *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 4, pt. 2 (April 1918), p. 196, pp. 186-216.

³⁸ Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, p. 40.

³⁹ Burrows and Wallace, *Gotham*, p. 40.

⁴⁰ See Christopher Pierce, “The Directors City: A Heuristic Instrument,” presented at the *British Association for American Studies Annual Conference*, University of Wales Swansea, Great Britain, 6-9 April, 2000. For a fine introductory study of the ideal city, see Helen Rosenau, *The Ideal City: Its Architectural Evolution in Europe* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1983).

Walloons' cities, unlike Netherlandish ones, can be split between those developing within the confines of a wall—Avesnes, Chimay, Chièvres, Valenciennes, Ath, Binche, Soignies, Landrecies, Lessines—and those acting as throughways—Baudour, Silly, Raismes, Berlaimont, Gommegnies. In the latter, passages and the community's architectural interspersions in the landscape combine to operate as signifiers of a distinct territory. In the broadest possible sense, I am calling attention to the polysemy of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), and again referring to Choay who writes of its "capacity for transforming the natural world by instituting unimagined kinds of spaces," as well as Sir Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1627).⁴¹ (Figure 6.19) It was not until the late eighteenth century that these nascent ideas of decentralised power would even begin to be realised in Europe, although inclinations towards them were particularly pervasive in the compositions of Dutch and Flemish landscape paintings throughout the seventeenth century. In his formal construction of the Dutch landscape, Jacob van Ruisdael (1628/29-1682) asserted a claim to a defined quarter of visual space. By advancing a complex relationship between the variant topography and individual symbols of civilised society Ruisdael created unique spatial territories. These qualities are particularly salient in *View of Naarden* (1647) and *An Extensive Landscape with a Ruined Castle and a Village Church*. (Figures 6.20, 6.21) The same cognitive principles are hardly alien to architectural history. Keeping with Françoise Choay's Renaissance bent, Pietro del Massaio's (*fl.* 1458-1472) *Veduta di Roma* (1472) and *Florentia* (1472), both from Ptolemy's *Geographia*, record a territorial understanding of the city not unlike Ruisdael's of the countryside.⁴² (Figures 6.22, 6.23) It is my assertion that three conditions—the "marvelous" island, the panorama, and the gravitas of the mark on the *tabula rasa*—are the fundamental principles underlying Kieft's civic agenda.

⁴¹ Choay, *The Rule and the Model*, p. 137.

⁴² On Ptolemy's fifteenth-century city images, see Naomi Miller, "Mapping the City: Ptolemy's *Geography* in the Renaissance," in David Buisseret, ed., *Envisioning the City: Six Studies in Urban Cartography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 34-74.

IV

One is often so easily caught in the traps of what denotes a civilised society. Let us look at the facts. Kieft is consistently portrayed following an immoral model, as a fallen and corrupted intellect who subjected the colonists to every vice and not a single virtue. It is no surprise to find at the very centre of *The Fort in Kieft's Day* (c. 1888) at least three victims hanging from the gallows, one of which Charles Robert Leslie (1794-1859) depicts close-up and under the gaze of Kieft who is, yet again, portrayed bestially. (Figures 6.24, 6.25) It bears a sharp contrast to the neat portrayals of Nicolaes Visscher's *Nieuw Amsterdam op t Eylant Manhattans* and Johannes Vingboons's *Nieuw Amsterdam ofte nue Nieuw Iorx opt 'T Eylant Man* (c. 1670). These two nineteenth-century representations are a social commentary aimed squarely at Kieft. They belittle Kieft's position by associating him with Englishmen, whom we know from Thomas More are like "incompetent schoolmasters, who prefer caning their pupils to teaching them."⁴³ As More continues, and obviously in the light which we are to see Stuyvesant: "Instead of inflicting these horrible punishments, it would be far more to the point to provide everyone with some means of livelihood, so that nobody's under the frightful necessity of becoming first a thief and then a corpse."⁴⁴ On closely scrutinizing Kieft's family background, Willem Frijhoff generally promotes Kieft's social position, but at the same time establishes Kieft's intellectual ceiling as equal to his family's standing—"a medium prosperous merchant family of old Amsterdam extraction . . . more interested in trade than in intellectual life but certainly not uncultivated."⁴⁵ Yet the ambitious, ideologically-motivated spatial regime that Kieft instituted in New Netherland

⁴³ Thomas More, *Utopia*, tr. Paul Turner (London: Penguin Books, 1965), p. 44.

⁴⁴ More, *Utopia*, p. 44.

⁴⁵ Comments from an unpublished draft essay, "Neglected Networks. New Netherlanders and Their Old Fatherland: The Kieft Case," that Willem Frijhoff first presented at the conference entitled "New Netherland at the Millennium: The State of New World Dutch Studies" (19-21 October 2001).

indicates a predilection for Grotius on par with commerce. What can be made of Kieft's connections to the intelligentsia? It might be surprising for the reader to discover that it was Washington Irving (1783-1859) who first intimated Kieft's philosophical tendency, though he clearly regarded such a form of political control as a crime, when he writes:

“He was exceedingly fond of trying philosophical and political experiments; and having stuffed his head full of scraps and remnants of ancient republics, and oligarchies, and aristocracies, and monarchies, and the laws of Solon and Lycurgus and Charondas, and the imaginary commonwealth of Plato, and the Pandects of Justinian, and a thousand other fragments of venerable antiquity, he was forever bent upon introducing some one or other of them into use . . .”⁴⁶

Almost all of the city's scholars have followed his antithetical conclusion: “so that between one contradictory measure and another, he entangled the government of the little province of Nieuw Nederlandts in more knots during his administration, than half a dozen successors could have untied.”⁴⁷

For the most part, twentieth-century scholarship has portrayed Stuyvesant almost as upright as the palisade he constructed around the city. The early nineteenth-century pseudo-history of Washington Irving conferred this title to him. Yet where certain mid nineteenth-century illustrators appear to have been more determined to entertain the conflicting tones of Irving's satire and irony, twentieth-century literary historians were not. A fallible Stuyvesant may have occupied the focal point of certain nineteenth-century illustrations, but not a single artist was willing to compromise the context's apocryphal resurrection. Each group have made exaggerated social comments, placed the colony squarely in a Dutch *modus operandi*, and portrayed the nature of the island entirely in keeping with the prevailing

⁴⁶ Washington Irving, “A History of New York: From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty,” in *History, Tales and Sketches* (New York: The Library of America, 1983), p. 515.

⁴⁷ Irving, “A History of New York,” p. 515.

historical context under Stuyvesant. A final blow was landed with the publication in 1915 of the first volume of I. N. Phelps Stokes's empirical masterpiece, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928). Ever since, Stuyvesant has been untouchable and both literary and illustrative genre scenes have been increasingly disposed to authoritative models. However an altogether separate, wry, and 'unauthorised' pictorial legacy of Stuyvesant remains from the mid nineteenth century.

Where Irving's description of the "young vrouw" just arrived from Holland sought to uphold Stuyvesant's moral constitution, Asher B. Durand's (1796-1886) depiction of the same scene in *Dance on the Battery in the Presence of Peter Stuyvesant* (1838), hardly casts him as "grievously scandalised," but projects him in a far more low light.⁴⁸ Stuyvesant is a fellow compatriot, and with his stolen look at the petticoats of "alarming shortness," equally subject to the lascivious desires of his fellow men. (Figure 6.26) The painting might well be interpreted as a conventional political ploy on Durand's part to bolster Stuyvesant's persona by association and with it his broad-based appeal. We all know that Americans do not like their leaders, even seventeenth-century ones, being too autocratic. At the same time, you cannot mistake the setting's idealism. The loathsome depictions of an adulterated landscape supporting a morally bankrupt and physically-ruined settlement have been overturned to depict paradisaical visions of New Netherland contiguous to the contemporary Dutch and Flemish reenchantment with Eden spearheaded by Roelandt Savery (1576-1639) and Jan Brueghel I (1568-1625), e.g. *The Garden of Eden* (c. 1611/1612) and *Het aardse paradijs met de zondeval van Adam en Eva* (c. 1615).⁴⁹ (Figures 6.27, 6.28)

⁴⁸ See Irving, "A History of New York," p. 674-675. This painting is catalogued in Jan Seidler Ramirez, ed., *Painting the Town: Cityscapes of New York* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 71-73.

⁴⁹ For a brief discussion on the "theme of the crowded, exotic, animal-dominated landscape," see Ivan Gaskell, *The Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection: Seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish Painting* (London: Philip Wilson Publishers Ltd., 1990), p. 474-477.

The next moment, in John Whetten Ehninger's painting, *Peter Stuyvesant and the Cobbler* (1850), our subject is cast as an intensely principled man according to the conventional mode with which we are all by now familiar. (Figure 6.29) He cuts a superior, domineering and machoistic figure, though you would be hard pressed not to acknowledge the dissenting voices and the blatant separation between the Company and colonist. The same sentiment informs another of Durand's literary genre scenes, *The Wrath of Peter Stuyvesant* (1835). (Figure 6.30) You will have to look closely at Ehninger's painting, but that is one affluent, unmistakably Dutch city street portrayed just on the other side of the clear-cut wall. It is apparent the colonists have their geographical, but not their ethical liberty. Civility is unmistakably meant to conform to a common European epistemology. If a little less affluent and fashioned a little more on the Dam in Zaandam than the Warmoesstraat in Amsterdam, the *Triumphal Entry of Gov. Stuyvesant* (c. 1846-1854), self-consciously reaffirms the architectural well-being of Ehninger's painting, while reverting to Durand's popular appeal to overcome portraying Stuyvesant's physical figure as unlikely a one ever presumed to befit a military hero. (Figures 6.31, 6.32) The pageantry bears more than a passing resemblance to that depicted in John Barlow's engraving *Triumphal Arch, Erected at Maidstone in Honor of the King by Flint Stacey, Esq'. (etc.)* (c. 1799). (Figure 6.33) Stuyvesant is again no George Washington in Susan Rivington Stuyvesant's *The Trumpeter*, showing trumpeter Anthony van Corlaer announcing to Governor Stuyvesant the surrender of Fort Casimir in 1654. (Figure 6.34)

Nineteenth-century visual historians attached to Irving were understandably suspicious of, and consequently much less clear about, the city's visual image and its leader's persona than contemporary historians purport to be. Today, when historical novels are all the rage, and historiography increasingly follows Simon Schama's

model, historical genre painting is still publicly dismissed, while privately coveted. Whether skilful or not, these pseudo-Dutch fantasies are the architectural models to which the city's history is most often compared, and the stereotype that the majority of historians in the last century have seemed determined to empirically prove. Yet the fact remains that the two key subjects in these illustrations have been cognitively inverted. Today, Stuyvesant's figure is never so compromised and the context never so boldly portrayed.

Broadly speaking, by now we have all been sold, largely on account of the mass appeal of Pieter de Hooch's views, and to a lesser extent Jan Vermeer's (1632-1675), the conviction that cleanliness and order are the virtues of Dutch taste. We have had it ingrained that "the spick-and-span towns shone from hours of tireless sweeping, scrubbing, scraping, burnishing, mopping, rubbing and washing."⁵⁰ Simon Schama's conclusion that these "exercises in relentless ablution" were "moral rather than material[, a]nd they were deeply associated in the collective mentality with the polarities of pride and shame, solidarity and alienness," are the same ones advanced by Stuyvesant's enthusiasts.⁵¹ It is no coincidence that depictions of the colonial city tally with accounts that "the more demanding Calvinists in particular did attempt to establish godly norms of social behavior that were laid down as fitting for the new Chosen People."⁵²

The early twentieth-century depiction of *Stuyvesant's Town House, 1658*, and *Stuyvesant's Country House, 1658*, from Samuel Hollyer's *Old New York Views* (1905), are the very model of his portrayed virtue and could only be based on the moralism projected in de Hooch's pictures.⁵³ (Figures 6.35, 6.36) It is a noticeable

⁵⁰ Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, p. 375.

⁵¹ Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, p. 378.

⁵² Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, p. 381.

⁵³ See Samuel Hollyer, *Old New York Views* (New York: Privately Printed, 1905), in the Local History Division of The New York Public Library.

step-up from depictions after van Ostade, Brouwer, or Teniers. Nonetheless, twentieth-century portrayals based on seventeenth-century paintings are not projections of fact. Gloria Deák is one of many that continue to make such an untenable intellectual leap. She writes:

“Colonial Manhattan took on a distinctly Dutch look, defined by rows of dwellings with crow-stepped gables and a steeply pitched, tiled roof. Though scant record of the early interiors exists, they undoubtedly followed the character of homes in Holland depicted by leading Dutch artists Jan Vermeer and Pieter de Hooch.”⁵⁴

Hollyer’s image of Stuyvesant’s “Town House” does not even bear a remote likeness to the Director-General’s “Great House” as it is depicted on either *Afbeelding van de Stadt Amsterdam in Nieuw Neederlandt* (c. 1665-1670) or the “Restitutio View” (c. 1674).⁵⁵ One is lead to believe that de Hooch’s private spaces, as exemplified in *Woman and Maidservant in a Courtyard* (c. 1661-1663) and *A Seated Couple with a Standing Woman in a Garden* (c. 1663-1665), and that Peter C. Sutton describes as “literally and geometrically extensions of the domestic environment,” are as likely to be snapshots in Stuyvesant’s garden as the courtyards in the Dutch Republic that they are modelled on.⁵⁶ (Figures 6.37, 6.38)

Yet for all this beauty and social acceptability, as recently as 1642 New Amsterdam had been branded a “sexual carnival” that could only be considered a “properly settled colony” and “stable community” once its perversion, *i.e.* the

⁵⁴ Gloria Deák, *Picturing New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 277.

⁵⁵ There is no question that the artist of this view attempted a depiction of the “Governours House” indicated on the fanciful Duke’s Plan—*A Description of the Towne of Mannados or New Amsterdam . . . 1664* (1664), see Figure 6.7. At this time, the Castello Plan—*Afbeelding van de Stadt Amsterdam in Nieuw Neederlandt* (c. 1665-1670)—which is broadly in accordance with the position and depiction of Stuyvesant’s “Great House” in the Restitutio View—*Nieuw-Amsterdam onlangs Nieuw jorck genaemt, en hu hernomen by de Nederlanders op den 24 Aug 1673* (New-Amsterdam lately called New York, and now retaken by the Netherlanders on the 24 Aug 1673) [The Restitutio View] from the map issued by Carolus Allard titled, *Totius Neobelgii Nova et Accuratissima Tabula* (c. 1674)—had not yet been discovered at the villa in Florence after which it is named.

⁵⁶ Peter C. Sutton, *Pieter de Hooch, 1629-1684* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 32.

society's mental health, was brought into line. At this point, the colony was neither the Calvinist Eden envisioned by the States General, nor history's nirvana, *i.e.* "Holland on the Hudson." Persistent accounts of debauchery are the clearest indication that the conventional sixteenth and seventeenth-century European model of isolating the citadel from the city, which was in large part developed to separate the militia and townspeople to offset just such corrupting activity, was never a spatial example promoted during Kieft's tenure in New Amsterdam. In Paulus Utenwael's (Wtewael) (?-1611) engraving of Kampen, one obvious example of this practice, the IJssel River assumes a superstructural function, similar to the role of the Hudson and East River under Stuyvesant. (Figure 6.39) By contrast, Kieft's network system positioned the two rivers in an infrastructural capacity, connecting Manhattan Island to the colony's entire administrative area. By subscribing to architectural models based on social control, historians continue to wrongly judge Kieft's directorship on ethical standards. That does not, however, explain why the colonists' diaries are consistently interpreted through Calvinism's extremist lens. Moral ill-repute has been branded as the calling card of the uncivilised, and historians indignantly continue to place blame for a concept of failure based solely on an ethical system squarely at the feet of the Director-General's personification. This makes all the more obvious the entrenched architectural typologies used to define civilised societies. The implication is clear—when the European model is broken only primitivism prospers.

V

The construction and development programme realised under Kieft's administration did not rigidly follow either a pre-existing model or predetermined rules. Kieft was immersed in land management. Like Maurits in Pernambuco, never more convincingly illustrated than in Frans Post's drawing of Mauritiopolis, Kieft

can be seen to be similarly preoccupied with the potential of visual space to imply ownership while not being strategically quantifiable. (Figure 6.15) Rather than follow the predetermined rules and English predilection for cartography, by which the colony depended on military might to avoid being left a sitting duck, these two colonial leaders literally unfurled the spatial preoccupations of Baroque painting over expansive three-dimensional landscapes. Right across Kieft's tenure there is reference to grants, the first 'ground-briefs,' improvement and development projects, and land acquisitions spread across all of Manhattan Island extending to Harlem, also on Nut [now Governors] Island, Staten Island, Varckens [now Blackwells] Island, Long Island, all throughout what is now Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens, as well as Jersey City on the western side of the Hudson.⁵⁷ These moves redressed the colony's balance of power from the Patroons—private entrepreneurs, most famously Kiliaen van Rensselaer, who colonised New Netherland after the ratification of the plan entitled "Freedoms and Exemptions for the Patroons and Masters or Private Persons who would plant a colony and cattle in New Netherland" (1628)—into the Company's, and essentially Kieft's favour.⁵⁸ "That Mr. Kieft's power in this country was greater and more extensive, as regards his commission, than was that of his Highness of Orange in the Netherlands," befitted the status that the Company accorded to his roost on Manhattan Island by reserving it solely for itself.⁵⁹ Likewise, colonialism rarely afforded a conventional distribution of occupations. To the individual so inclined it offered the potential for an untold accumulation of job titles. Besides the role of planner, developer and architect, Kieft's "princely power"

⁵⁷ For a thorough, general chronology of the colony during Kieft's stewardship, see Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), IV: 86-110.

⁵⁸ From the first approval of the "Freedoms and Exemptions for the Patroons and Masters or Private Persons who would plant a colony and cattle in New Netherland," in 1628, and as was permissible by the plan, would-be patroons staked-out vast tracts of land in New Netherland for development in what increasingly came to be seen as a threat to the Company's monopoly on trade. In and among miles of scholarship on the patroonship plan, as good as any a place to start would be "Chapter 4: The Patroonships," in Oliver A. Rink, *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986), p. 94-116.

⁵⁹ O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 206.

included the functions of the military strategist juggling neighbouring English, French, and Swedish settlements. By comparison to the topographic and township conventions administered in other North American colonies, the scale of Kieft's plan of action and the list of social and architectural relationships he promulgated is unprecedented.

Of Kieft's many notable individual building projects, the construction of a two-story stone building, functioning as a tavern, on the East River at Pearl Street and Coenties Alley, was unquestionably the colony's ontological *pièce de résistance*. The structure did not foreclose the city by facing inward, but directed its gaze outward, in an astute gesture of inclusivity. At the same time, positioned on a prominence, it acted as a beacon exerting control by extending the city's interests to the technical boundary of mechanical observation. One may recall that Archimedes claimed to wield a concave mirror from the heights above the city that set ships afire in the bay below. It is easy enough to make a case for the relationship between the city tavern (reappointed in 1653 as the "Stadt Huys") and building examples in sixteenth and seventeenth-century scientific treatises. I have in mind particular models from a range of works, including Jacques Besson's *Theatrum instrumentorum et machinarum* (etc.) (1578), *Novum et certum inventum*; the frontispiece from Athanasius Kircher's, *Ars magna Lucis et Umbræ in decem libros digesta* (etc.) (1646), and the plate titled *Speculi Ustorii*; and an untitled plate in Leonhard Zubler's *Novum instrumentum geometricum* (etc.) (1607). In all three of these works, architecture assumes critical celestial positions and functions as an important scientific device.⁶⁰ (Figures 6.40-6.43) Never mind their colonial implications, the connection between these treatises and sixteenth and seventeenth-century urban

⁶⁰ See Jacques Besson, *Theatrum instrumentorum et machinarum . . . Cum Franc. Beroaldi figurarum declaratione demonstratiua* (Lyon: Apud Barth. Vincentium, 1578); Athanasius Kircher, *A. Kircheri . . . Ars magna Lucis et Umbræ in decem libros digesta* (etc.), 2 vols. (Rome, 1646); and Leonhard Zubler, *Novum Instrumentum Geometricum . . . Germanice? primum descriptum* (etc.) (Basel, 1607).

practices across Europe remains largely uninvestigated. As another object in the island's landscape, the edifice not only depicted the institution's presence, but clearly indicated its role as part of a larger macrocosm. Architecture was clearly meant to facilitate the extension of the colony's rights and dominion. Typically only ramparts, with all their negative typological associations, claimed the same function. When in history has another tavern ever outwardly claimed the iconic role almost always reserved for the church? At nearly the same time, it is also reputed that a stone church was constructed within Fort Amsterdam. As before, its position should not be underestimated. By being placed at the island's geographic periphery, the functions of this institution were tied to a minority of the colony's population. Such a position compromised religion's power on Manhattan Island and in the larger colony, and highlighted its polemical ambiguity under Kieft.

There is no evidence of Kieft's subscription to the conventional wisdom that a civilised state could only emerge from the idealist's model, or that by deviating from its essential tenets the settlement was any less worthy. Two unsatisfactory city plans help to make the point. The first of these, and the one marginally contemporaneous, *Manatus Gelegen op de Noot Rivier* [The Manatus Map] published c. 1665-1670, depicts the colony two years after Kieft's commission, c. 1639. (Figure 6.44) The second, *Plan of New Amsterdam about 1644* (1902), is an illustration by J. H. Innes from his book, *New Amsterdam and Its People*. (Figure 6.45) Even while the latter restricted its view to the lower part of Manhattan Island, they both agree on two things—how little commitment there was to centralisation, and how slight the inclination towards conventional structures and rational ordering systems associated with European city models and the finer aspects of contemporary utopias. Instead of conceptualizing the city as a system of solids, the Manatus Map presents the territory as a network of voids. The landscape becomes a city that is conceived for commercial circulation. These points are not entirely

unrecognised. In *Maps in Manhattan, 1527-1995* (1997), Robert T. Augustyn and Paul E. Cohen conveniently summarised many longer-winded descriptions of *Manatus Gelegen op de Noot Rivier* writing:

“This decentralized approach to settlement characterized the Dutch enterprise from the very beginning. Of the 130 original colonists, it is believed that only eight settled on Manhattan, while the remainder fanned out as far as the Delaware River valley, Connecticut, and Albany. Later colonists arriving in the 1630s also followed this approach.”⁶¹

However, whether Kieft’s epistemology heightened this practice locally, and whether “this picture of unfocused settlement” might have any implication for colonial history and the relationship between commerce and spatial planning, is overlooked.

Why has the practice of decentralisation, so often associated with ‘formlessness,’ always come to indicate a negative phenomenon—an “illegitimate” utopia? From Filarete (c. 1410-c. 1480) to Sir Ebenezer Howard (1850-1928), architectural history is consistently written in favour of integral schemes. Likewise, North American colonial historiography not only suffers from Anglocentrism, but in terms of planning, the grid is unfailingly seen in an apothecic light.⁶² In New Netherland, it is apparent another utopian view emerged to counter the convenient models of Plato and More. By now we all know that utopia is not supposed to encourage private property, individualism, or an unequal apportionment of land, nor is it to have irregularly-positioned dwellings, or concealed spaces. Actions in New Netherland call these social and spatial institutions to question, while at the same time not forsaking an ideological basis firmly rooted in ideal aspirations. In fact, on

⁶¹ Robert T. Augustyn and Paul E. Cohen, *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1997), p. 28.

⁶² On the subject of the grid in modern art, Rosalind E. Kraus writes: “The arts, of course, have paid dearly for this success, because the fortress they constructed on the foundation of the grid has increasingly become a ghetto.” This comment has a certain resonance as it pertains to the historiography of colonial planning in North America. See Rosalind E. Kraus, “Grids,” in Rosalind E. Kraus, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1986), p. 9, pp. 9-22.

Manhattan Island alone, there are a series of relationships between the garrison, individual edifices, formal gardens, and landscape which speak of a broadly decentralised, yet mutually dependent territory. An unwillingness to deviate from the stereotypical conditions and models of urbanism and utopia has inhibited scholarship's comprehension of the city's development between 1637 to 1647.

By 1644 it was openly declared in a letter from the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company to the States General "that the Company is fallen into such inability and discredit that it is out of its power, any longer, without considerable aid from the State, to supply any distant places, or to continue any further the necessary daily payments in this country."⁶³ On the knowledge that this condition was hardly better five years earlier, it is safe to say that Kieft's extensive developments were geared as much for economic as military success. It is clear that Kieft relished the Company's decision to promote large-scale settlement. He promoted an increasingly intricate, expanding, and uniquely hierarchical society and dispersed the settlers "far in the interior of the Country" in response to the directors decree of 1639 that made "the Fur trade with the Indians . . . free and open to every body."⁶⁴ This nexus across what are today the five boroughs of New York City, New Jersey, Long Island, and Westchester functioned in a "tentacular" fashion. Unlike the twentieth-century tendency to characterise the octopus and its tentacles as a synonym for destructive and disorderly urban growth, such a model increasingly associates Kieft, like many early modern urban planners, with aspirations drawn from the natural sciences. These metaphors were understood positively not least because of their clear hierarchical order and functional differentiation.⁶⁵ Furthermore, the "Proposed

⁶³ O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 141.

⁶⁴ O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 150. Cited in Langdon C. Wright, "Local Government and Central Authority in New Netherland," in *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1973), p. 15, pp. 7-29. On the "Proposed Articles for the Colonization and Trade of New Netherland," see O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 110-115.

⁶⁵ I am indebted to Volker Welter for informal conversations that he initiated several years ago on the subject of these "unpleasant" animals and their urban associations. However, I must make it clear that

Freedoms and Exemptions for New Netherland, 1640” makes provision for a dynamic land pattern by authorising colonial migration. The directors write: “In case any one be deceived in selecting ground, or should place by him chosen afterwards not please him, he will, upon previous representation to the Governor and Council then be at liberty to select another situation.”⁶⁶ With a spark of imagination, one should easily be able to contemplate the monumentality, power, and meaning of the individual structures and spaces spread across the “bounteous” landscape. It is naïve for historians to continue regurgitating the States General’s claim that the acquisition of this land was solely a “policy of colonization through agricultural development.”⁶⁷

For the abrupt collapse of Kieft’s “princely power,” Manhattan’s sovereign status, and the projected population explosion, Kieft remonstrated—“You must put the blame on the freemen.”⁶⁸ Clearly Kieft’s spatial expansionism was utterly inanimate, or at least always operating within an unwritten law. These laws never foresaw how the insufferable individual could scupper such a finely-tuned organism. If we are to believe the conventional interpretation of the “Report of the Board of Accounts on New Netherland. 1644,” at about this time there was a seismic shift in Kieft’s philosophy. But all the dystopian associations forced on Kieft are invariably traceable to Irving’s very first caricature. According to the “Report:”

“It would be advisable to carry out and put into practice the plan of the Director [Kieft], already alluded to, that the Colonists should settle, a certain number of families together, on some of the most suitable places,

I am responsible for distorting the subject by associating it with colonial developments almost three centuries earlier.

⁶⁶ O’Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 119.

⁶⁷ Michael Kammen, *Colonial New York: A History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 47.

⁶⁸ O’Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 195. The “Report of the Board of Accounts on New Netherland, 1644,” indicates the scale of realised and forecast growth that accompanied opening the fur trade to everyone in 1639—“in place of seven Bouweries, full thirty were planted and full one hundred more expected in a short time from the plantations which were taken up; insomuch that there was every appearance that provisions might be furnished in two or three years for ten thousand men.” See O’Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 150.

in the form of hamlets, towns and villages, as the English are wont to do, who thereby live more securely; and such was the Company's intention in the granting of the printed Freedoms and amplification thereof."⁶⁹

Certainly Kieft's policy of dispersion had always promoted this goal. If only in the process the individual had not mistaken a unique form of legal positivism for natural law. By picturing English success alongside the sacrifice of Manhattan's princely kingdom—as the “emigrating Colonists and freemen, who are inclined to go thither; and to cause them to settle down first on the Island of Manhattes. Allowing them as much land as they will be able to cultivate, whether in raising tobacco, whereunto that Island, on account of its great fertility, is considered well adapted”—Kieft was indubitably cast as the States General's scapegoat.⁷⁰ He has been summarily catapulted into the role of Thomas More by every subsequent history. The historian's total abandonment of the West India Company's position, in particular Kieft's acquittal of “divers criminal misdeeds” by Peter Stuyvesant, then the West India Company's Director-General in New Netherland, is indicative of the extent to which the city's colonial history has been compromised by a prejudicial misinterpretation of power.⁷¹ It is plain to see that our vision of New Amsterdam has become myopic.

VI

Willem Kieft's literal and metaphoric fall ushered in a period of colonialism in New Netherland following the most dogmatic European and Calvinist urban models, in imitation of the Friesian towns near Stuyvesant's birthplace. Jacob van Deventer's

⁶⁹ O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 151.

⁷⁰ O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 154.

⁷¹ For the “Judgement pronounced by Director Peter Stuyvesant on Jochem Pietersen Kuyter,” dated 25th July 1647, see O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 213-214. For the decision to overturn Stuyvesant's ruling, see “Resolution of the States General to grant Safeguard to Messrs. Cuyter and Melyn,” dated 6th May 1648, see O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 252.

late sixteenth-century drawing of Kuÿnder and Steenwÿck is indicative of the traditional formal relationships between the centre and periphery that Stuyvesant instated in New Amsterdam. (Figure 6.46) If you are suffering fools, just compare the most expansive view of the city at the end of Stuyvesant's reign, *The Nicolls Map* (c. 1664-1668), with *Manatus Gelegen op de Noot Rivier* depicting two years into Kieft's tenure. (Figures 6.47, 6.44) The critical shift that this change signalled, both of power in the Dutch Republic and the role of the Company in the colony's affairs, was not one towards either enlightenment or utopia. Rather, the colony recoiled to a form of primitivism disguised behind the facade of ethical and economic values. On what grounds can Stuyvesant's city continue to be upheld as an exemplar of natural law? At the same time, the States General resorted to the age old tactic of political nationalism, Stuyvesant himself negatively commenting on the fact that "your Honors' colonies in *New-Netherland* are only gradually and slowly peopled by the scrapings of all sorts of nationalities (few excepted), who consequently have the least interest in the welfare and maintenance of the commonwealth."⁷² The standard histories of colonial development continue to be linear narratives touting spatial constriction as the sole representation of seventeenth-century intellectual progress. There are anomalies to this pattern. The unique colonial lessons to be learned from New Amsterdam are not coincidental with its institutionalisation, but with the period when the colonial enterprise reinvented itself according to the ideals of the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company under the directorship of Willem Kieft. As the French geographer Elisée Reclus writes:

"If, on the one hand, it constitutes, in some of its incidents, a formidable fact for the moralist, it is, on the other hand, in its normal development, a sign of healthy and regular evolution. Where the cities increase, humanity is progressing, where they diminish, civilisation itself is in danger"⁷³

⁷² Cited in Wright, "Local Government and Central Authority in New Netherland," p. 14.

⁷³ Elisée Reclus, "The Evolution of Cities," in *Contemporary Review* 6 (1895), p. 246, pp. 246-264.

Is the portrait of the contemporary New Yorker one of a figure fallen to the extent of submitting to Peter Stuyvesant's grossly generalised model of urban development as the colonial watershed?

CHAPTER 7 FLUSHING OUT FECUND FACES: ON URBANISM IN NEW
AMSTERDAM, 1647–1664

“Brothels and colonies were two extreme types of heterotopia, and if you consider, for example, that the ship is a piece of floating space, a placeless place, that lives by its own devices, that is self-enclosed and, at the same time, delivered over to the boundless expanse of the ocean, and that goes from port to port, from watch to watch, from brothel to brothel, all the way to the colonies in search of the most precious treasures that lie waiting in their gardens, you see why for our civilization, from the sixteenth century up to our time, the ship has been at the same time not only the greatest instrument of economic development, of course, but the greatest reservoir of imagination. The sailing vessel is the heterotopia par excellence. In civilizations without ships the dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police that of the corsairs.”

Michel Foucault, “Different Spaces,” in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley, (1984) 1998, p. 184-185

This chapter is first an enquiry into city and architectural typologies in the seventeenth century; second, an interrogation of the traditions and effects of replication; third, an investigation into at least two competing colonial methodologies; and only finally, a comment on New Amsterdam after 1647. By contrast to the preceding chapter’s assessment of the colony’s spatial strategies at the regional scale, this one narrows the focus onto the city. It will not take the most acute observer to see that the seventeen-year period I have framed runs parallel to Peter Stuyvesant’s tenure as New Netherland’s Director-General. The present work does not adhere

either to the popular cultural form promoted by Homi Bhabha or Edward Said of forever reproaching colonialism for its imperialist tendencies. In fact, the present thesis depends on the moral dualism of colonialism's imperialist ambition. The internal and external disquiet displayed in supplanting laissez-faire economics and city-making in the seventeenth-century colonial project had profound implications for the European consciousness and a knock-on effect that altered the visual representation and actual structures of the European city.¹

I

3rd September 1664. Holed-up for the last three days on his East River *bouwerij* with a ream of freshly-pressed paper and a reservoir of India ink, frenetically dismissing his associates' advice, despatching communiqué after communiqué, and deliberating on the city's state, Peter Stuyvesant is in the throes of one final stand for posterity's sake.² (Figure 7.1) From this station, the Director-General is keenly aware of the fact that as long as he can either retain control of the city, or watch it be consumed under foreign aggression, his place in history, like that of his mentors, Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen (1604-1679) in Brazil and Pieter de Carpentier (1588-1659) in Batavia, is ironclad.³ Stuyvesant's sequesterment at this climactic moment has been interpreted to mean many things, but all overlook the fact that his prevarication is the clearest indication that the "Capital" of New Netherland was a shadow of the Maurits-style military order, efficiency, and purity he had

¹ In the conclusion to *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America 1625-1742*, Carl Bridenbaugh writes: "The colonizing movement was itself an expression of early capitalistic activity. It called forth organized rather than individual efforts and resources, created new and wider markets for economic development, and opened up seemingly unlimited territories for imperialistic exploitation. It thus produced a marked effect upon Old World economy, accelerating the breakdown of local units of business, and facilitating the formation of larger and more complex organizations of commerce and finance." See Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America 1625-1742* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), p. 468.

² The location of Stuyvesant's *bouwerij* is indicated on the Nicolls Map by the note—"The Governors that was last his Bowry."

³ Stuyvesant clearly chose his mentors by fortune and fame, as opposed to political allegiance which he did not share with either Maurits or de Carpentier.

portrayed. As such, it was on his next throw of the dice that the fate of his legacy rested. Concurrently, at Nyack (near Fort Hamilton), the patron of New Utrecht, who by all accounts was “a good Cartesian and not a good Christian,” but nonetheless one of Stuyvesant’s presumed accomplices and for whose picture of the city four years earlier Stuyvesant held up an Amsterdam-bound boat, Jaques Cortelyou is equally powerless, probably already conquered.⁴ At this point, neither verbal rhetoric nor visual representations will extricate these two men from the guns of the “four great men-of-war” trained on them.

The reference to René Descartes (1596-1650) at this penultimate moment is pertinent. His inclusion not only introduces a crucial vision of the city in the seventeenth century, but fosters a historiographical debate over the rhetorical facadism typifying Stuyvesant’s regime, and whether or not it is represented in the extant visual representation. As I have already declared, this episode effectively appeals—beyond the room from which Stuyvesant’s final communiqué to Colonel Richard Nicolls was written, even beyond the spatial distantiation from the object under threat—to the register of the colonial city and by larger implication to its role in what Mario Gandelsonas described as the “transatlantic transfer.”⁵ In this process, Gandelsonas writes: “America functioned as a screen where the colonizer attempted not just to recreate the European city, but also to inscribe imaginary architectural scenarios that had been ‘resisted’ by the existing cities on the other side of the Atlantic.”⁶

⁴ Cited in John van Zandt Cortelyou, *The Cortelyou Genealogy: A Record of Jaques Cortelyou and of Many of His Descendants* (Lincoln, NE: Press of Brown Printing Service, 1942), p. 9. According to Stokes, “on August 18-28 [1664], the English squadron cast anchor in Nyack Bay, below the narrows between New Utrecht and Coney Island. This created a virtual blockade of the port and enabled the English to commit depredations on shipping and at Staten Island.” See I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), I: 111.

⁵ Mario Gandelsonas, *X-Urbanism: Architecture and the American City* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999), p. 11.

⁶ Gandelsonas, *X-Urbanism: Architecture and the American City*, p. 11.

If you are a consistent reader of colonial New York histories, you will be surprised to find that in current semiotic thinking the signifier and the signified have gone their separate ways. Time and time again, you will have been subjected to history's painting over Peter Stuyvesant through Ferdinand de Saussure's myopic lenses. I am as eager as the next person to wish a pretty face was just that, but one look at the lavishly detailed and delimiting depiction of *Afbeeldinge van de Stadt Amsterdam in Nieuw Neederlandt*, also known as the "Castello Plan" (c. 1665-70), ought to sound the sirens. (Figure 7.2) *A Description of the Towne of Mannados or New Amsterdam* (1664), hardly acts to allay our superficial suspicions. (Figure 7.3) These two faces of New Amsterdam, one Dutch and one English, are architecturally and urbanistically anything but fanciable in Saussure's terms. Surely since Svetlana Alpers's by now widely familiar interrogation of "The Mapping Impulse in Dutch Art," it should be no surprise to suggest that they are both without doubt illustrative gamesmanship *par excellence*.⁷ But what is the point and purpose to this urban tomfoolery?

As with most pretty pictures, the Castello Plan is no exception to the generalisation that there is often a whole lot more to something than what first meets the eye. The first word of its title—*Afbeeldinge*, meaning portrayal or depiction—declares as much. The popular title bestowed early in the twentieth century, the "Castello Plan," has had a deleterious effect.⁸ Regardless of its name's princely kinship—it is named after the villa in Florence [Villa Castello] where it was

⁷ See Svetlana Alpers, *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 119-168.

⁸ For a complete description of the image's discovery in 1910 by Colonel J. J. Staal, editor of the Dutch Geographical Journal (*Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig genootschap*), and subsequent connected events, see Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 173-179. It is also a chance to see Stokes at his sceptical best by comparison to the typically authoritarian mantle that he assumes later in the same volume in the extensive section devoted to the Castello Plan.

discovered at the beginning of the century—to refer to this as a ‘plan,’ and there is no mistaking that is what it has come to function as, is to shower the image with unwarranted credentials. The image does not even include a scale. A spartan colour palette and the absence of rendering bolsters its authority as a map. This image is the pre-eminent display of orthodox Calvinism’s command of New Amsterdam’s urbanism. It is a Company trophy exalting the right-wing directors and their accomplice Peter Stuyvesant. No doubt with eyes for imitating the decorative perspective plan of Batavia adorning the East India House in Hoorn to the glorification of Governor General de Carpentier (Figure 7.4), or the numerous views of New Holland engraved by the “Canaletto of Brazil,” Frans Post (c. 1612-1680), and published to wide acclaim by Caspar van Baerle in *Rerum per octennium in Brasilia et alibi nuper gestarum* (etc.) (1647), with the submission of Cortelyou’s survey of New Amsterdam on 7th July 1660, Stuyvesant wrote to the directors at Amsterdam:

“After closing our letter the Burgomasters have shown us the plan of this city [New Amsterdam], which we did not think would be ready before the sailing of this ship. In case you should be inclined to have it engraved and publish it, we thought it advisable, to send you also a small sketch of the city, drawn in perspective by Sieur Augustin Heermans three or four years ago, which perhaps you may wish to insert in a corner, *i.e.*, as an inset, in case the directors determined to have the plan engraved.”⁹

They must have agreed with his suggestion, though not with the composition that he proposed. In any case, the Castello Plan is not the “Real McCoy.” It is at best a copy and more than likely an autonomous object.

⁹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 208. See also C. J. Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and Their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion During the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Amsterdam: BV Uitgeverij De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1998), p. 200. In response to Stuyvesant’s remark, Zandvliet writes: “Perhaps Stuyvesant’s idea for a printed plan, enhanced with a view of the town, was inspired by the map of Recife which had been published by Visscher in 1648.”

Whether this “elaborate birds-eye view” was meant to decorate the Chambers’ offices, outfit a foreign monarch’s collection, or act as an instrument of commercial propaganda, early in the twentieth century I. N. Phelps Stokes, the ultimate Rankean, saw fit to correct the plan’s absence of what he declared its “important accessories.”¹⁰ “Drawn in outline only, without relief, and . . . entirely lacking in chiaroscuro, as well as in colour values and the indication of surface texture and materials,” these additions, for Stokes and John Wolcott Adams, were all that was necessary to “render the finished drawing as real and as true a picture as possible of New Amsterdam at the close of the Dutch period.”¹¹ The result of this collaboration, *Redraft of the Castello Plan*, was published in 1916. (Figure 7.5) In the only cumulative carto-bibliography of New York City other than Stokes’s *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928), Robert T. Augustyn and Paul E. Cohen write in *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995* (1997): “Together these two works provide a nearly photographic image of the physical reality of New Amsterdam in the summer of 1660.”¹² The photograph, in general, is promoted as an infallible record of events by these authors. In this position, the two drawings become the proof of every Stuyvesant enthusiast and fuel his myth as New Amsterdam’s *deus ex machina*. Surely by now we are all well acquainted with Walter Benjamin’s, not to mention Susan Sontag’s and Roland Barthes’s, corpus on the fallacy of photography’s realist claims. In the familiar words of Benjamin: “the instant the criterion of authenticity ceases to be applicable to artistic production, the total function of art is reversed. Instead of being based on ritual, it begins to be based on another practice—politics.”¹³ To which Barthes adds: “photography is a kind of

¹⁰ We know that the Florentine prince Cosimo de’ Medici III visited Jan Blaeu in December 1667. From facts first documented by Stokes (see Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 175), Augustyn and Cohen reiterate the image’s provenance to this visit. They write: “From Blaeu, he purchased the so-called *Atlas Vingboons*, which contained numerous hand-drawn maps and plans of town, harbors, and forts. Included in the atlas was this copy of the Cortelyou survey and a copy of the Manatus Map.” See Augustyn and Cohen, *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995*, p. 40.

¹¹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 342.

¹² Augustyn and Cohen, *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995*, p. 38.

¹³ Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, tr. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books,

primitive theater, a kind of *Tableau Vivant* . . .”¹⁴ By promoting the Castello Plan and the Stokes/Adams Redraft as photograph-equivalents, these authors have underestimated photography’s ability to lie and act prejudicially.

III

The Castello Plan is widely reputed to be based on Cortelyou’s third survey commissioned on 7th June 1660 and despatched to Amsterdam on 6th October 1660. The fact remains that not a single one of the four Cortelyou surveys of New Amsterdam (1657, 1658, 1660, and 1661) has ever surfaced. Still, Pulitzer Prize recipients Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace exhort the Castello Plan’s legitimacy, commenting: “when the directors of the West India Company saw this plan of the city, they complained that the place still didn’t seem built up enough.”¹⁵ The Castello Plan, however, was not the image that the directors were referring to at all. Even the doyen of American city history, John W. Reps, in *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States* (1965), became ensnared by the realism of Stokes’s twentieth-century reproduction, describing it as a “superb map of the city.”¹⁶ The way that the image is made bespeaks its intent. The Castello Plan does not masquerade as either the product of any one of the dozen popular types of perspective machine, all which typically revealed their technique if not their source, or the product of a slavish imitator in the atelier of one of the seventeenth century’s cartographic poachers. Each image—the Castello Plan and the Stokes/Adams Redraft—is a “superb map of the city,” but one closer to James Rosenquist or Andy Warhol than to Georg Braun and Frans Hogenberg or Johannes

1969), p. 224.

¹⁴ Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, tr. Richard Howard (New York: Hill & Wang, 1981), p. 32.

¹⁵ Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 64.

¹⁶ John W. Reps, *The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 150.

Blaeu.¹⁷ The two views “mechanical and scientific control over the auratic,” impel the viewer to delight in the image’s surface appearance.¹⁸ As M. Christine Boyer writes on the visual principle of “pure pleasure” involved in the fascination with images: “Pleasure in the spectacle itself restrains the look from probing behind the mysterious veil; instead the viewer remains mesmerized by the realistic impression of ‘how things must have appeared.’”¹⁹

The Castello Plan is compositional, not cartographic. How else can you define the unspecified sea and the social prosperity implied by the plush parterres? It is also a form of political discourse concerned with the acquisition and maintenance of power. By preceding Enlightenment idealism, the image of the city is not mitigated by tempered reflection, but takes a form of unencumbered extremism. In this case was the state, the Company, or Stuyvesant the principal meddler? Who acted as the go-between?²⁰ It is clear, in a broader context, that contemporary scholarship is haunted by the blurring between the scientific authority entrusted to cartography and such unashamedly graphic portrayals. Who can fail to see the historiographic fallibility of soliciting witnesses in images?²¹ The Plan’s cleansing effect is unmistakable, as is the fact that it does not contain a single quantitative component. Uncommonly, the view is from the east. By orientating the image to imply a European prerogative, the author pronounces the cultural superiority and social

¹⁷ For a fascinating, insightful, and expansive cultural analysis of replication and reproduction, see Hillel Schwartz, *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles* (New York: Zone Books, 1996).

¹⁸ M. Christine Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994), p. 295.

¹⁹ Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments*, p. 295.

²⁰ The Castello Plan is not immune to the industry centred on attributing unsigned engravings and paintings. Owing to the image’s inclusion in Johannes Vingboons’s Atlas—*Verzameling van Pas-Kaarten, Dienende tot de Vaart naar Oost en Westindien; meest alle uitvoerig met de Pen getekent* (etc.) (1665)—it is largely assumed that even if Vingboons was not the principal draughtsman the image was likely to have originated from his atelier. We know of Vingboons’s propensity to embellish images in order to satisfy the tastes of the Dutch East and West India Company directors—what concessions did he make for the tastes of foreign monarchs?

²¹ On this general subject, see Peter Burke, *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd., 2001).

bequest of the Dutch. The land mass is purely figural and entirely devoid of topography. Nature is subsumed, even outside the palisade, under the rubric of culture. Such cultivation of nature clearly understands civility as a recourse to emphasise the colony's divine license. It is my view, and one that I have illustrated in depth in Chapter 3—"On Being In/Between: Expanding the Cultural *Episteme* in New Netherland," that the colony relied on spatial strategies not only to legitimise its possession of the land, but to invest it with a divine right.²² While promoting Stuyvesant's remit, that included assigning this divine right to the Prince of Orange's Counter-Remonstrant prototype, the Plan's author also secured Stuyvesant's illegitimate legacy.²³

Crucially, the image is embedded within one of architectural history's recurring preoccupations—the connection between artifice and urban space. The antecedents as far back as Vitruvius's *De Architectura libri decem* (first century B.C.E.). Is this congenial-looking settlement the Sadeian-like landscape of booty, incursions, whipping, striking, stripping, imperilment, and plundering described by the colonists from the time of the *Vertoogh van Nieu-Neder-Land* [Remonstrance of New Netherland, and the Occurrences There] (1649) up until the time of the colony's capitulation to the English, and onto whose rhetorical bandwagon Stuyvesant jumped in his *post factum* "Report on the Surrender of New Netherland" (1665)?²⁴ While no doubt a tool utilised "to obtain—and to present—a more

²² See Christopher Pierce, "Unusual Practices: Unseen Sides of the 'Petition Of Walloons And French Concerning Virginia' in New Netherland," presented at the Society for Netherlandic History Conference, "Power and the City in the Netherlandic World, 1000-2000," at Columbia University, 11-12 June, 2001.

²³ One prominent aspect of Stuyvesant's remit was, as Stokes writes: "to prevent a continuance of irregularities in the building and erecting of houses, such as extending lots far beyond their boundaries, setting up nuisances on highways and streets, and neglecting to build on granted lots." See Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 111. As is well recorded, on 22nd July 1647 Stuyvesant authorised and empowered the city's three surveyors "to condemn and in future to stop all unsightly and irregular Buildings, Fences, Palisades, Posts, Rails, etc." See Edmund Bailey [E. B.] O'Callaghan, ed. and tr., *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland, 1638-1674* (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1868), p. 74-75.

²⁴ All of these descriptions of the colony, and more, can be found in the first two volumes of E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, 11 vols.

comprehensive vision of the city,” the picture’s vantage point, more covertly, on the one hand falsifies the city’s forms and functions, and on the other is a purposeful ploy to depict the city’s most remote scale.²⁵ This is a method of political intervention widely employed by seventeenth-century cartographic publishers in the Netherlands. At this scale, the city’s forms and figures are rationalised. The city plan goes through a process of architectural censorship with colossal political ramifications.²⁶ Moreover, as Louis Marin writes:

“The viewpoint is fixed at a totalizing point of view. One can see all. But the eye placed at this point occupies a place that is an ‘other’ point of view: it is in fact impossible to occupy this space. It is a point of space where no man can see: a no-place not outside space but nowhere, utopic.”²⁷

IV

On 13th May 1619 at the Binnenhof in The Hague, the Remonstrant leader Johan van Oldenbarnevelt was beheaded. Among scores of rolling heads, his was undoubtedly the prized possession of the Counter–Remonstrant Stadholder Maurits, the Prince of Orange (1567-1625). It only took until November of the same year for control of every town council in the States of Holland to be overtaken by Counter-Remonstrants. No less significantly, on 6th November 1650 at The Hague, William II, Prince of Orange, died of smallpox. His demise marked the advent of the First Stadholderless period, stemmed the tide of the ‘good patriots,’ and ushered the States party faction back to power. It would be hard to argue that William II’s death more than accelerated the inevitable. By this point the supremacy of orthodoxy was

(Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, Printers, 1856).

²⁵ Hubert Damisch, *Skyline: The Narcissistic City*, tr. John Goodman (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), p. 11.

²⁶ On the subject of bias in the discipline of cartography, there is no finer writer than J. B. Harley (1932-1991). In particular, see J. B. Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essay in the History of Cartography*, ed. Paul Laxton (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

²⁷ Louis Marin, *Utopics: Spatial Play*, tr. Robert A. Vollrath (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press Inc., 1984), p. 207.

already fatally wounded by the pen of René Descartes. In the widely-disseminated *Discourse on Method* (1637), Descartes made no attempt to disguise the fact that “the plan of reforming a State” (and city) required adjusting the “foundations” by “the plumb-line of reason.”²⁸

In *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806* (1995), Jonathan Israel implies that the moralistic reform movement of the Counter-Remonstrant Prince of Orange was responsible for the capitulation of Dutch cities to political models. The present work owes its initiative to Israel’s wide-ranging analysis of the complex relationship between Maurits’s power and the Dutch city. At this time urbanism became increasingly connected with an individual’s political fortune. There is, however, much more to Maurits’s urban legacy than a change of architectural style. Attempts to inscribe this political model on the expansive urban psyche necessitated a ‘divine commission.’ It did not take any time before Maurits began acting as the self-appointed architect of a Counter-Remonstrant God. Beneath the historiographic determinism and obvious Vitruvian moral high-ground of recalling Classicism, which you will find littering the folios of the society architects Jacob van Campen (1595-1657), Philips Vingboons (1607/08-1678) and Pieter Post (1608-1669), lie far more culpable techniques in the form of spatial and typological reconfiguration, and the institutionalisation of architecture’s metalanguage. For thirty-one years this urban hybrid was the Dutch city’s dominatrix.

The order that Maurits’s *krijgsschool* applied to military manoeuvres did not end at either their publication or execution on the battlefield.²⁹ In the phase of Counter-Remonstrant control, we are repeatedly forced to see the Dutch city through

²⁸ René Descartes, *Discourse on Method and the Meditations* (London: Penguin Books, 1968), p. 37.

²⁹ See Jacob de Gheyn II, *Wapenhandelinghe van roers musquetten ende spiessen* (The Hague, 1607).

the same ordering device that positioned soldiers and military encampments with automaton-like efficiency. (Figures 7.6, 7.7) If the same logic was not forcibly inflicted on the physical city, it was at least representationally decisive. Comparing two paintings of Utrecht—*The Ganzenmarkt and the Town Hall Bridge in Utrecht* (c. 1620), painted by Joost Cornelisz. Droochsloot, and Pieter Jansz. Saenredam's *The Mariaplaats and the Mariakerk* (1662)—the influence of this process of visual correction is explicitly pronounced. (Figures 7.8, 7.9) In stark contrast to Droochsloot's view, Saenredam formalises the painting's vantage point, eliminates the disruptive influence of individuals, animals, transportation, and impermanent edifices, and prioritises the buildings' edges against the painting's background to achieve a uniform building mass. The effect of all these manoeuvres is to create an artifice-like austerity. The logic and perfection of the perspective was perfectly suited to Maurits's image of the city.³⁰

When Michel Foucault points out “that from the eighteenth century on, every discussion of politics as the art of government of men necessarily includes a chapter or a series of chapters on urbanism, on collective facilities, on hygiene and on private architecture,” he purposefully side-steps the practices of these men's predecessors.³¹ It is true the tenets were not typeset before the eighteenth century; however, the idea of the architect/city-builder as social physician, acting for the ruler, is of long standing, dating to at least the fifteenth century. Amidst the seventeenth-century religious and economic vicissitudes of the Dutch Republic, the physical city became the site of an intensive ideological struggle. Yet the scale of the social

³⁰ From a visual perspective, it is plausible to assert that the traditional compositions of Claes Jansz. and Nicolaes Visscher in this period, discussed at length in Chapter 3—“On Being In/Between: Expanding the Cultural *Episteme* in New Netherland,” reflect a particular political inclination on the part of the artists in contravention of Maurits's, *i.e.* Counter-Reformation's, pronounced style. This would go a long way to explain many of the aesthetic anomalies identified in Nicolaes's representation of New Amsterdam, *Nieuw Amsterdam op t Eylant Manhattans*, that appear to defy the colony's authority.

³¹ Michel Foucault, “Space, Knowledge, and Power,” tr. Christian Hubert, in K. Michael Hays, ed., *Architecture Theory since 1968* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2000), p. 430.

unravelling of Remonstrant cities—Rotterdam, Gouda, Alkmaar and Hoorn—and the social engineering of Counter-Remonstrant ones—Haarlem, Leiden and Dordrecht—is not deducible from conventional planimetric registers. It is, however, readily apparent in the work of the Dutch printmaker Claes Jansz. Visscher (1587-1652). Visscher’s well-known *d’Arminiaensche Schans tot Leyden* (1618) documents one of the key architectural mutations ignored by the city’s official surveyors. (Figure 7.10) You will not find the “Arminiaensche Schans”—“the nickname given to the fortification erected in 1617 for the defense of the town hall at the behest of the city council which sympathized with the Remonstrants”—on a single city plan of the same period.³² Nor will you find the dramatic timber-framed structure occupying the focal point of the *Spaensche Inquisitie*. (Figure 7.11) Although most obvious at the scale of form-making, political strategies of space are far from exhausted in these two images. Any consideration of spatial politics must extend into a “micro-geographics” that constitute social and cultural perceptibility.³³ In *t’ Arminiaens Testament* (1618), Visscher alters Simon Frisius’s *Pyramis Pacifica* (1609) into a tower-like construction onto which he projects events concerning Arminians in Dutch cities. (Figure 7.12) In other Visscher images, including *t’ Arminiaens Kapproen* (1620), *D’Arminiaensche uytvaert* (1619), and *t’ Gerecht van s’ Gravenhage* (1619), one finds the effects of such strategies including costume, conduct, and the body’s expiration. (Figures 7.13-7.15) As at Oldenbarnevelt’s beheading, dutifully recorded in Visscher’s engraving *Iustitie aen ian van Oldenbarnevelt Geschied* (1619), and the execution of Arminians in *Iustitie over enige Arminiaensche Verraders* (1623), alterations to the city’s configuration included impermanent edifices constructed to silence the proponents of Remonstrantism. (Figures 7.16, 7.17) If it was not for Visscher’s political meddling, we would be ignorant of the architectural

³² Carry van Lakerveld, ed., *The Dutch Cityscape in the Seventeenth Century and Its Sources* (Bentveld-Aerdenhout: Uitgeverij Landshoff, 1977), p. 92.

³³ I borrow the term ‘micro-geographics’ from Mark Dorrian. See his essay, “On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland,” in *The Journal of Architecture*, vol. 6, no. 1 (Spring 2001), p. 28, pp. 27-51.

reconfiguration that dominated Dutch cities in the period of its religious and political tumult: in other words, of the dependency of Counter-Reformation on the architecture of the city. This picture of seventeenth-century Netherlandish cities as the sites of such intensive, authorially anonymous incursions is strangely at odds with the conventional picture of them as elegant, purely picturesque Baroque backdrops. It seems prudent, therefore, to ask—in the absence of documentation of Visscher's ilk—how much is to be seen, especially by the naïve eye engrossed in the pure pleasure of the Castello Plan's surface?

V

Is it really true to say, with George Bataille, that “there is no architecture that is not the Commendatore's?”³⁴ Especially when the “Commendatore” of this city, who was so anxious to put Cortelyou's plan in the post that he included it as a postscript, was so quick to relinquish any responsibility six years later in his “Answer” to the charges that the West India Company made against him for surrendering to the English without a demonstration of resistance.³⁵ First, Stuyvesant writes: “the fort is situate in an untenable place . . . having, within pistol shot, on the North and Northeasterly sides, higher ground than that on which it stands;” second, “the fort was and is encompassed only by a slight wall, 2@3 feet thick, backed by coarse gravel, not above 8, 9@10 feet high in some places;” and third, “the houses are in many places [*sic.*] higher than the walls, and bastions and render these wholly exposed; most of the houses also have cellars . . . so that whoever is

³⁴ Denis Hollier, *Against Architecture: The Writings of George Bataille* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992), p. ix. In this passage, Hollier paraphrases Bataille, who writes: “Architecture is the expression of the very soul of societies, just as human physiognomy is the expression of the individuals' souls. It is, however, particularly to the physiognomies of official personages (prelates, magistrates, admirals) that this comparison pertains.” See Hollier, *Against Architecture*, p. 46-47.

³⁵ See “Answer of the Hon^{ble} Peter Stuyvesant, Late Director-General of New Netherland, to the Observations of the West India Company on His Report on the Surrender of that Country to the English,” in O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, II: 427-447.

master of the city, can readily approach with scaling ladders . . . and also, if need be, run a mine from the so close adjoining cellars and blow the place up.”³⁶ It is plain to see that Stuyvesant’s remonstrance relies, almost exclusively, on descriptions of a tectonic and three-dimensional nature that we could reasonably assume were absent from Cortelyou’s planimetric description. The only planimetric reference, to the fort “crowded all round about with buildings,” has been whitewashed from the Castello Plan.³⁷ Is this an indication that the author assumed his artistic license to a greater degree than by his superficial elisions alone—including deleting the plan’s street names, gallows, and the accompanying instruments of punishment, including the pillory and whipping-post (that Visscher effectively documented in Dutch cities)—or, is Stuyvesant crying wolf and, owing to a slip-of-the-tongue, at the same time admitting to having visually deceived Company officials in Amsterdam?³⁸

The Castello Plan seeks its end with such caustic devices. If this picture originated from Cortelyou’s plan, and it ought to be acknowledged that it is pure speculation to say that it is “Cortelyou’s plan [that] is preserved as a manuscript copy by Vingboons,” by highlighting the Surveyor-General’s foray into what Svetlana Alpers described as the “mapping-picture relationship,” I mean to emphasise the conflict beneath the surface of the Castello Plan and by implication in the “lost” original, between art and science.³⁹

³⁶ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 242.

³⁷ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 242.

³⁸ We can conclude from the letter of the West India Company directors in Amsterdam dated 24th December 1660 that, at the very least, the streets were named on Cortelyou’s survey. The directors write: “We have been pleased to receive the map of the city of *New Amsterdam*: we noticed, that according to our opinion too great spaces are as yet without buildings, as for instance between *Smeë Street* and *Princes Gracht* or between *Prince Street* and *Tuyn Street*, also between *Heeren Street* and *Beyers Gracht*, where the houses apparently are surrounded by excessively large lots and gardens; perhaps with the intention of cutting streets through them, when the population increases, although if standing closer together, a defense might be easier. We leave this to your consideration and care.” See Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 210. Stokes is also quick to point-out the Castello Plan’s exclusion of the gallows and equally as quick to set the record straight in his “Redraft.”

³⁹ Zandvliet, *Mapping for Money*, p. 200. See also Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, IV: 206, where he writes: “The Castello Plan can, almost without doubt, be identified as a copy of this survey or of a drawing made from it.”

This brings us back to Descartes. It should not come as a surprise to imply that Jaques Cortelyou was capable of making more than a lowly “surveying device.” At the same time, what degree of authorship should we ascribe to Jacob van de Water, Cortelyou’s all but forgotten illustrator? Dutifully recorded as a fervent “Cartesian” by his allies and adversaries alike, “regulating himself, and all externals, by reason and justice alone,”⁴⁰ Cortelyou must be fingered as a proponent in the shift from the philosophy to the science of space. Henri Lefebvre very concisely comments:

“With the advent of Cartesian logic, however, space had entered the realm of the absolute. As Object opposed to Subject, as *res extensa* opposed to, and present to, *res cogitans*, space came to dominate, by containing them, all senses and all bodies. Was space therefore a divine attribute?”⁴¹

This presumes, referring back to Hubert Damisch, “that one pays attention not only to the forms assumed by this production but also to the sites, real or imaginary, where it occurs and which inevitably resound on the discursive level.”⁴² At this point, there is a critical distinction to make between planimetric Cartesianism and the systems of order that the Castello Plan is constructed around. It is the difference between the rational efficacy of geometry and the punitive struggle of its quasi-clerical and sovereign opposite. We have grown accustomed to eighteenth-century English images of the North American city—particularly Thomas Holme’s *Portraiture of the City of Philadelphia* (1682), Peter Gordon’s *View of the Town of Savannah* (1734), and James Wadsworth’s *Plan of the City of New Haven* (1748), among others—descriptions of these via Aristotle, Descartes, and Etienne Bonnot de

⁴⁰ Cortelyou, *The Cortelyou Genealogy*, p. 9.

⁴¹ Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, tr. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1998), p. 1.

⁴² Damisch, *Skyline: The Narcissistic City*, p. 5.

Condillac (1714-1780), and the ubiquitous connection between their patently antisymbolic image and early indications of the democratic ideal (and no doubt their link to earlier forms of urban idealism). (Figures 7.18-7.20) In the process, we have failed to consider in seventeenth-century picturesque ones the lessons of an equally aggressive social, political, and cultural system of cinematic and ultimately pseudo-totalitarian techniques germane to Baroque urbanism in Europe. In the context of the North American city this epistemology is regularly overlooked owing to what is perceived as its overriding European sentiment.

As effortlessly as one might declare that “North American barbarism was to give place to European refinement,” so this image suggests a whole host of anomalies and unseemly episodes accompanying projects of colonisation—no matter whose interest is at stake.⁴³ In *X-Urbanism: Architecture and the American City* (1999), Mario Gandelsonas made the first significant strides into unravelling this picture’s fantasy, terming it “The Radio-Concentric City Below the Gridiron.”⁴⁴ (Figure 7.21) Gandelsonas’s diagrammatic idiom extends as far as acknowledging two separate “morphological structures: a radial structure of blocks with its center on the north-east, and a long block organized by an orthogonal structure revealed by the property lines and an open square on the west.”⁴⁵ Why did I. N. Phelps Stokes first divide it into four misleading sections and eighteen blocks?⁴⁶ At this point, Gandelsonas’s appetite for delving into the city’s colonial investiture is satisfied.

Here, our inquiry into the montage of these formal and cognitive spatial structures gains pace. It is of considerable interest, not to mention provocative, to

⁴³ E. Porter Belden, *New York: Past, Present and Future*, 2nd ed. (New York: Putnam, 1849), p. 11. Cited in Rem Koolhaas, *Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 1994), p. 16. For all his *savoir-faire*, Koolhaas uncharacteristically attaches Belden’s sentiments to the Castello Plan and in the process becomes another victim of its obvious charms.

⁴⁴ Gandelsonas, *X-Urbanism*, p. 82.

⁴⁵ Gandelsonas, *X-Urbanism*, p. 82.

⁴⁶ See Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: Plates 82-82-e.

imagine, in the specific case of the Castello Plan, the contributions that the critical method of cinematic montage popularised by the Soviet film director Sergei Eisenstein (1898-1948), “an heir of the historical avant-garde,” can offer to interpreting the catalogue of colonial representations of New York.⁴⁷ Gandelsonas’s two-dimensional diagram is patently insufficient to wrest all of the sundry orders articulating the unique urban configurations in the colonial city. These are dependent on oppositions, and equally on the individual, the sign of whose presence is cleansed from the image. In this way the colonists were elected, at least superficially, into the collective imprimatur of the “Chosen People.” Unlike typical bird’s-eye views that included a foreground figure in either an iconographic role or on an artificial hill taking in the spectacle of the city, it is made clear in the Castello Plan that the city’s “refinement” owed nothing to the colonist. In fact, its incomparable clarity is dependent on erasing the barbarous image of the colonial subject that at the time was still a powerful part of popular European imagination. Whitewashing the city’s demographics is further abetted, as I have already indicated, by the absence of a textual interface between the image and viewer. Not only does this make it easier on the eye but, under scrutiny, such censorship illustrates that the image had a well-defined political agenda.

Considering the “radial structure of blocks with its center on the north-east,” it should not be a surprise, keeping in mind that by this point in the seventeenth century anything remotely of this character became obscurely classified as a part of ‘military science,’ that its pattern book formulation has proven elusive to literary

⁴⁷ See Manfredo Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, tr. Pellegrino d’Acierno and Robert Connolly (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1990), p. 56. As Tafuri writes: “To begin a detailed analysis of the relationship between the avant-garde and architecture with the work of Piranesi is undoubtedly provocative. And yet, to calm the perplexity of the skeptics, there exists an exceptional study by Sergei Eisenstein on Piranesi’s *Prisons* that offers us an opportunity to confirm our thesis. The connection between Piranesi and the Soviet film director is shown to be a direct one . . .” It is my view that Eisenstein’s method is equally as applicable to the “intellectual montage,” comprising the Castello Plan. In reality, the entire chapter answers to this question. See Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 55-64.

historians. Why does the planimetric outline in the Castello Plan bear an uncanny resemblance to twenty percent of the form of a military outpost of the Venetian Republic called Palmanova? (Figure 7.22) Yet “on either side [of the canal] is a collection of traditional Dutch houses with gabled roofs that maintains the illusion that the transplantation of Amsterdam into the New World has been a success.”⁴⁸ Why is the radial centre, which in Palmanova functioned as a central military zone, first inverted and then converted into a vacant garden lined along the perimeter with a couple dozen houses? Is it a cover-up? First published in Braun and Hogenberg’s *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1572), Palmanova was a military enclosure, designed for maximum control of even the native Venetian soldiers by several distinguished military engineers and planners including Vincenzo Scamozzi, author of the best-selling *L’idea della architettura universale* (1615). Is the Castello Plan’s author acting-out an “urban fantasy” of ideal city plans? A city of ‘artificial accumulation’⁴⁹ that simultaneously strives to imitate one of “those orderly towns which an engineer designs” and that perchance illustrate an adherence to “the basic laws of some wise legislator”?⁵⁰ The “long block organized by an orthogonal structure revealed by the property lines and an open square on the west,” is the distorted planimetric equivalent of Batavia. (Figure 7.23) We know that Batavia bears all the hallmarks of a collaborative venture between the Dutch scientist, military engineer, and mathematician Simon Stevin and Prince Maurits, and that it also bears more than a passing similarity to Stevin’s plan for an ideal city.⁵¹ At this point, replication is again the operative trope. By the seventeenth century idealistic montages were not uncommon. Like the Castello Plan, they too were constructed around identifiable

⁴⁸ Koolhaas, *Delirious New York*, p. 17.

⁴⁹ An oblique reference is being made to the work of the contemporary New York architect Peter Eisenman. This process of ‘artificial accumulation,’ with its distinct political and social aims, would at first glance seem to be the direct inversion of a process that Eisenman has claimed to author and termed “Artificial Excavation.” See Jean-François Bédard, ed., *Cities of Artificial Excavation: The Work of Peter Eisenman, 1978-1988* (Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1994).

⁵⁰ Descartes, *Discourse on Method and the Meditations*, p. 35-36.

⁵¹ See Ron van Oers, *Dutch Town planning Overseas during VOC and WIC Rule (1600-1800)* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2000).

models. However, such utopic accounts were typically reserved to literary domains. By example, as Françoise Choay writes of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516): "This conjunction of nature and culture has produced an original landscape in some ways evocative of Plato's Atlantis, which nevertheless refers in thinly disguised terms to England."⁵² Likewise, J. Weinberger writes of Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1627): "The narrator writes in English, and the voyage to Bensalem represents the future way of Great Britain to the perfection of science as man's destiny. The history of Britain's future is the history of Bensalem . . ."⁵³ It is similar to the institutional trap that scholars have fallen in while falling over themselves to declare that "New Amsterdam replicated in miniature the life of the Golden Age of Holland"⁵⁴

There is more to what Professor Joyce Goodfriend recently described as the "The Struggle over the Sabbath in Petrus Stuyvesant's New Amsterdam," than an interminable list of literary examples evincing the to-ing and fro-ing between Stuyvesant and the colonists.⁵⁵ Foucault convincingly demonstrated that "power is quite different from and more complicated, dense and pervasive than a set of laws or a state apparatus."⁵⁶ It would not be extraordinary to suggest that Stokes's technique of matching colonists to edifices is an exaggerated form of one that Cortelyou is likely to have employed on his survey.⁵⁷ Whether or not this is practicable, however, is inconsequential in the face of the "imaginary architectural scenarios" that it produces.

⁵² Françoise Choay, *The Rule and the Model: On the Theory of Architecture and Urbanism*, ed. Denise Bratton (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997), p. 139-140.

⁵³ Francis Bacon, *The Great Instauration and New Atlantis*, ed. J. Weinberger (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1980), p. xviii.

⁵⁴ Howard B. Rock and Deborah Dash Moore, *Cityscapes: A History of New York in Images* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), p. 12.

⁵⁵ Joyce Goodfriend, "The Struggle over the Sabbath in Petrus Stuyvesant's New Amsterdam." Paper presented at the Society for Netherlandic History Conference, "Power and the City in the Netherlandic World, 1000-2000," at Columbia University, 11-12 June, 2001.

⁵⁶ Michel Foucault, "The Eye of Power," in Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), p. 158.

⁵⁷ A second autonomous object similarly pronounced to be based on an early survey, *Manatus Gelegen op de Noot Rivier* [The Manatus Map] (c. 1665-1670), another Villa Castello discovery, and the earliest extant survey of New York, the Nicolls Map, both employ the commonplace feature of an annotation system keyed to a legend in order to identify key sites.

While the spatial dimension and the distribution of land grants appears benign, the trajectories of the Castello Plan's planimetric equivalent and the population indicate not only what a highly-charged political commodity these land-briefs were, but how in the process architectural and urban typologies were repositioned into protagonists and not pawns to the law. This is a critical distinction to make. It is an inversion of the conventional hierarchical model and the condescending one most-often applied to colonial developments. Again it was Foucault who was instrumental in identifying that "it is the techniques for *practicing* social relations, which are framed and modulated spatially, that allow for the efficient expansion of power, or alternatively, for resistance."⁵⁸ How are these "formal discontinuities" recognised in the objective city? At the site Stokes identifies as [Q]21, that on any other seventeenth-century military plan would be the station of a state *apparatchik*, we know Marten van de Waart lived. (Figure 7.24) This terminus was a cache for stolen goods; Van de Waart, "having by his own confession, 'without torture or force,' admitted various thefts during the preceding seven or eight years."⁵⁹ Equally well-perched at sites [M]18 and [M]19 was the prominent Jewish merchant Abraham de Lucena. Just as conspicuously positioned at [Q]17 was the still-house of Burger Jorissen. Company structures would seem to be embedded everywhere within the spatial regime, however, rather than the seeds of "resistance" being sowed from the margins, the "Remonstrance of New Netherland" emerged right out from under Company noses. In Figure 7.25, the location of each of the eleven signatories—[1] Adriaen van der Donck, [2] Augustyn Harman, [3] Arnoldus van Hardenbergh, [4] Jacob van Couwenhoven, [5] Oloff Stevens, [6] Michiel Janss., [7] Thomas Hall, [8] Elbert Elberts, [9] Govert Lokermans, [10] Hendrick Hendrixs Kip and [11] Jan Everts Bout—at the time the Remonstrance was written has been plotted. (Figure 7.25) At

⁵⁸ Hays, ed., *Architecture Theory since 1968*, p. 428.

⁵⁹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 332.

which of these sites do you suppose they used to meet?⁶⁰ What are the costs of these unidentified moral and ethical aberrations?

For the last thirty years, we have been so attuned to Foucault's assertions on the relations between criminality and spatial planning that we are unsure what to do when his model is breached. One either argues that it has not, in which case the image is undermined, or that it has, in which case all of the ineffectual interpretations of Dutch colonialism are called into question. How can we explain the directors' superficial two-sentence reply to receiving Cortelyou's survey:

“we noticed, that according to our opinion too great spaces are as yet without buildings . . . perhaps with the intention of cutting streets through them, when the population increases, although if standing closer together, a defense might be easier. We leave this to your consideration and care”⁶¹

Is it an unwitting or collaborative description? How do these “imaginary scenarios” tally with the city that Descartes describes in which “the will of men using reason” would be recognisable? On the colony's third side, which is noticeably devoid of “resistance,” the role of the Company garden, including the cemetery, has been transformed from pastoral idyll to silent quisling. Hardly a European ape, in this situation the technics of space, particularly the division between the public and private domain, takes on an unimaginable moral role in society. Foucault's ship is the factual and imaginary reservoir of knowledge in this context. For all intents and purposes, the urban taxonomy is declassified and the likes of typology, mensuration, demographics, and scale acquire new meanings.

⁶⁰ On the location of its preparation, it is written in the Remonstrance: “This task devolved on one Adriaen Van der Donck who, according to a resolution which was adopted at the same time, was lodged in a room in one Michiel Janss' house. One day when Van der Donck was abroad, the General seized this rough draft with his own hand, placed Van der Donck the day following under arrest, convened the Supreme Council, accused his of having committed *Crimen lesæ Majestatis*, and took the matter so seriously that scarcely anything was to be done . . .” See O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, I: 316.

⁶¹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, II: 210.

On a larger scale, in fact encompassing the entire city, it is plain to see that the palisade functions as an overt and patently graphic instrument of internal order rather than the extrovert symbol of city that we have been sold. In effect, the sixteenth-century role of the citadel in society has been turned on its head. The Counter-Remonstrants efficiently transformed the sixteenth-century “geometry of war” into a sociological formula and system of domestic incarceration. It is a delimiting boundary, under the watchful eyes of Reverend Samuel Drisius [K]1 and Domine Drisius [B]7 & [B]8, and not, as we have come to expect, the site of either a garrison of soldiers, or of prostitution and delinquency. Will words really keep the enemy at bay? As it transpired, words and the wall kept the enemy within. This political and moral order was not left to New Amsterdam alone, but extended northward to Beverwijck [Albany] where the system of triangulation (strangulation) is rotated and even more blatantly inscribed between Fort Fredrick, the Dutch church and the town guard house. (Figure 7.26) By calling Vitruvius’s essential architectural diagram into service—“groundplan, elevation, and perspective”—the same one that the fifteenth and sixteenth-century masters, including Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472), Sebastiano Serlio (1475-1554), and Andrea Palladio (1508-1580) repeated in their architectural treatises, one cannot fail to note that this planimetric system fostered a three-dimensional accomplice. Where Renaissance and Baroque authorities deferred to Vitruvian modalities, we have been misled to believe that in the seventeenth-century colonial city the instruments of architecture still served only autocratic ends. This raises a vexing question. Was the transparency of Stuyvesant’s sympathy, the hangover of Willem Kieft’s ideological urbanism, and the popular appeal of the colonist’s Remonstrance instrumental in abetting resistance and facilitating the emergence of deviant space?

Does this explain why Stuyvesant is portrayed at this crucial moment estranged from the city? Not even a witness on the Castello Plan. Is his physical distantiation the first sign of his renunciation of its grotesque form? His position is in such contravention of the picture. Outwith the city nothing worthwhile is even presumed to exist. While the greatest sixteenth and seventeenth-century political summits were decidedly urban affairs, the handover of New Amsterdam was settled in the wilderness. It is the exact same distantiation, “backward and upward,” that marks the Castello Plan. Which brings us back to where we began—to René Descartes and the “unidentified” author of this plan, “each merely used the city—as Plato did the *polis*—as a concept, a metaphor, or an image.”⁶²

⁶² Damisch, *Skyline*, p. 5.

CHAPTER 8 TRANSFORMING CULTURAL DETERMINACY: EARLY
ENGRAVINGS OF NEW YORK CITY, 1651-1736

“Here a historian of the feeling for nature is bewildered by ‘the entirely meaningless mention of the lion.’ But the feeling for nature—a concept which has never been clarified—has nothing to do with the case. It is a matter of literary technique. The lion, that is, figures in Roman poetry. . . It is a case of epic stylization, after the model of Antiquity and the Bible. . . How long did its influence last? In Shakespeare’s Forest of Arden there are still palms, olives, and lions.”

Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, (1953) 1990, p. 184-185

“. . . for the first time in world history, mechanical reproduction emancipates the work of art from its parasitical dependence on ritual. To an ever greater degree the work of art reproduced becomes the work of art designed for reproducibility. . . But the instant the criterion of authenticity ceases to be applicable to artistic production, the total function of art is reversed. Instead of being based on ritual, it begins to be based on another practice—politics.”

Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” in *Illuminations*, tr. Harry Zohn, (1936) 1968, p. 224

Not even David Irving is likely to question the date that the English waltzed into New Amsterdam, regardless of all the polite debates endlessly toiling over the circumstantial minutiae of Director-General Peter Stuyvesant’s hand-over. Yet following the events of 1664, excepting for the short-lived Dutch recapture in 1672

(commemorated in the title of a slightly altered edition of Carolus Allard's "Restitutio View" (c. 1674), the inset view of *Totius Neobelgii Nova Et Accuratissima Tabula*), it is forty-three years before the city is visually revisited.¹ (Figure 8.1) Why? Clearly we are missing the evidence of a cultural hiatus. What is evident at both ends of colonial New York's visual interregnum is the unmistakable hand of nationalism's absolutism. With the lifting of this historical blackout, British draughtsmen and engravers comprehensively subjected the city to the bias of their medium. It is not surprising to find that they first effected this artistry on the mightiest colony formerly in "enemy" hands. The ideological and iconographic imprint of Great Britain, and more specifically the architectural fashion spanning from Inigo Jones (1573-1652) to William Kent (1685-1748), was stamped on the blossoming city. These artisans, and in particular William Burgis (fl. 1717-1731), created an authoritative visual representation of New Amsterdam and New Orange, and set the graphic standard for British colonies in North America. Martin P. Snyder's claim that Peter Cooper's *The South East Prospect of the City of Philadelphia* (c. 1720) should be connected with Burgis's *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York in the Province of New York in North America* [hereafter *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York* (etc.)] (c. 1719-1721) acknowledges the long-established convention of oil painting following printmaking's stylistic lead, and, more pointedly, identifies the fact that visual representation in colonial America is monological in character.² (Figures 8.2, 8.3)

¹ It is worth noting that this is the second considerable gap in contemporary visual information that the present work has identified. In two crucial periods—from the colony's founding until 1651 (commented on in Chapter 6—"The Politics of Taste: A Short Essay Resuscitating Willem Kieft," p. 177-178), and from the colony's capitulation until the publication of William Burgis's *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York in the Province of New York in North America* (c. 1719-1721)—neither a sovereign, nor independently-published view of the city is known to exist.

² On the connection to Burgis, Snyder writes: "There can be little doubt that Peter Cooper's view was modeled upon the Burgis scene of New York. Its size, approach from over the water, coat of arms of Penn, and title all suggest it. Each of the two views includes a key identifying just twenty-four buildings. . . . The best conjecture is that . . . his work was commissioned by someone acting for the Penn family in promoting the province, after William Penn's death in 1718, for an engraving in competition with Burgis's *New York*." See Martin P. Snyder, *City of Independence: Views of Philadelphia Before 1800* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975), p. 29-31. As easy as it is to

The present work will make it clear that all the printed views of British colonial America followed the standard set by Burgis, or more accurately John Harris (*fl.* 1686-1746), the London engraver to whom Burgis entrusted his drawings. I am not the first to notice Burgis's influence—"That he may be called the father of the art of engraving in this country, appears to be beyond question" are the words of the eminent bibliophile William Loring Andrews.³ It is to the underestimated, "prospect specialist" Harris, however, that I will give the lion's share of credit. Coincidentally, Harris was simultaneously active in the production of the two most comprehensive topographic collections of Britain published in the first half of the eighteenth century—*Nouveau Theatre de la Grande Bretagne* (etc.) (1724), and Samuel (1696-1779) and Nathaniel (*fl.* 1725-1753) Buck's *Buck's Perspective Views of Near One Hundred Cities and Chief Towns, in England and Wales; (etc.)* (1721-1774)—and in another elaborately illustrated work, that of his namesake John Harris's *The History of Kent* (etc.) (1719). The colonial graphic standard was centred around two fundamental conditions. It was derived from existing topographic conventions and was dependent on the properties and effects of mechanical reproduction. It is plain to see that colonial views of North American cities operate as tropes. All the verbal decrees, legal issues, and Acts of Parliament did not have the power of the visual image to transform the Dutch city into a British one.

In this chapter, I shall have occasion to comment on fraud and deceit in two

dismiss the painting's style, the mystery continuing to surround the life of the artist is a far more difficult matter. As Snyder broadly documents, and my own correspondence with Phil Lapsansky, Chief of Reference, at the Library Company of Philadelphia confirmed, remarkably little is known of Peter Cooper. He was in Philadelphia at least between 1713-1717. As Lapsansky writes: "An Isaac Norris account book shows a sale of paints and brushes to him in 1713; and he was admitted a freeman of the city in 1717. Thus begins and ends the paper trail of Peter Cooper. We know of no other work by him. The painting first surfaced in London in 1744 when it was mentioned to the Society of Antiquaries. It remained in limbo until 1857 when it was found in a London curiosity shop, given to American ambassador George Mifflin Dallas, who gave it to the Library Company."

³ William Loring Andrews, *A Prospect of the Colledges in Cambridge in New England . . . Engraved by Wm. Burgis in 1726* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1897).

popular representations of colonial New York—William Burgis’s *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York* (etc.) and John Carwitham’s *A View of Fort George with the City of New York from the S.W.* (c. 1731-1736). (Figures 8.3, 8.4)

Specifically, I shall discuss the architectural and urban fabrications implanted in these views. First, I shall briefly comment on the key concepts from cultural theory in the twentieth century that serve to underpin the initiative of the present work, and that act to open the floodgates on the effects of commercialism’s ascendancy. Next, I will introduce the infamous “quartet” of pre-Revolutionary North American prospects—including *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York* (etc.), *A South East View of ye Great Town of Boston in New England in America* (c. 1725), *Prospect of Charles Town* (1739), and *An East Prospect of the City of Philadelphia* (c. 1754)—which will take us through sixteenth and seventeenth-century European topographic printmaking, before alighting on Burgis’s *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York* (etc.), and all of its social and political implications. Throughout the chapter, ‘topographical view’ and ‘prospect’ are used interchangeably, against the tendency to increasingly rarefy terminology, and in the most general sense.

I

“One might generalize by saying: the technique of reproduction detaches the reproduced object from the domain of tradition. By making many reproductions it substitutes a plurality of copies for a unique existence. And in permitting the reproduction to meet the beholder or listener in his own particular situation, it reactivates the object reproduced. These two processes lead to a tremendous shattering of tradition which is the obverse of the contemporary crisis and renewal of mankind. Both processes are intimately connected with the contemporary mass movements.”⁴

From Walter Benjamin to Susan Sontag, the twentieth century has been

⁴ Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, tr. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1988), p. 221.

fascinated by the epochal transformations brought about by photography. Yet as it concerns the transmission of cultural ideas, the rapid expansion of the printmaking industry in the eighteenth century, and the efficiency with which it was practised, resulted in stating the ‘conservative fact,’ what Benjamin refers to as the “desire of contemporary masses to bring things ‘closer’ spatially and humanly, . . . ,” and supplying a burgeoning marketplace.⁵ Unlike their predecessors in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, which were largely intended for atlases and books, the increasingly elaborate topographic prints of the eighteenth century were not only aimed at the expanding institutional market, but also at a purchasing public intent on flaunting its cosmopolitan status, *i.e.* the *nouveaux riches*.⁶ At the beginning of *American Engravers upon Copper and Steel* (1907), David McNeely Stauffer writes:

“This date of 1825 was somewhat arbitrarily selected as about marking the beginning of what may be termed the commercial period of engraving in the United States; or, a time when engraving companies and the employers of engravers began to sign the plates issued, and the identity of the actual engraver was lost for all purposes of record.”⁷

Stauffer’s chronology has been widely accepted, not least by I. N. Phelps Stokes.⁸ For the last century, Stokes’s *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (1915-1928) has been the measure for assessments of cartographic and topographic views of colonial New York. The present work will demonstrate that it is foolhardy to subscribe to Stauffer’s date. Commercialism’s effects play a prominent role in

⁵ Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” p. 223.

⁶ Aside from Samuel (1696-1779) and Nathaniel (*fl.* 1725-1753) Buck’s *Buck’s Perspective Views of Near One Hundred Cities and Chief Towns, in England and Wales*; (etc.), Johannes Kip’s output for *Nouveau Theatre de la Grande Bretagne*, and the widely-scattered work of both John Harris and Thomas Bowles, many others produced British town prospects in the eighteenth-century. As Ralph Hyde notes: “John Haynes, for example, produced one of York in 1731; John Pryer one of Colchester in 1724; . . . W. Westley produced a prospect of Birmingham in c. 1732, rivalling the Bucks’ of 1731, and S. Bradford produced another in 1752 to rival the Bucks’ of 1753.” See Ralph Hyde, *A Prospect of Britain: The Town Panoramas of Samuel and Nathaniel Buck* (London: Pavilion Books Limited, 1994), p. 32.

⁷ David McNeely Stauffer, *American Engravers upon Copper and Steel*, 2 vols. (New York: The Grolier Club of the City of New York, 1907), II: vii.

⁸ See Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928), I: xxv.

printmaking from the outset of the eighteenth century, none more so than in the visual representation of sovereign colonies.

In the preface to *A Biographical Dictionary* (1785), Joseph Strutt writes: “The Art of Engraving was never more encouraged than in the present day, especially in England, where almost every man of taste is in some degree a collector of prints.”⁹ It is so often asserted that the eighteenth-century collector only had an eye for engravings of great works of art, however, as Timothy Clayton writes: “In the middle decades of the eighteenth century there was a marked increase in the range and quality of prints depicting subjects with no immediate relation to the world of connoisseurship.”¹⁰ Architectural and topographic views were among this class, published by entrepreneurs and increasingly collected in England and Europe by “the leisured gentry and those professionally engaged in their amusement,” and in North America—predominantly Boston, Philadelphia, and New York—by the rising moneyed population (almost exclusively of English extraction).¹¹ On early American collections, Stokes writes:

“We know from frequent passages and advertisements in the early papers that maps and ‘prospects,’ as well as portraits, played an important part in the furnishings of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century houses, both in town and country, and many inventories of estates, both large and small, record as cherished possessions pictures—especially prints—glazed and unglazed, of our prosperous cities and growing towns, . . .”¹²

Speaking in general, Clayton notes: “Printsellers seized the opportunity to cater for

⁹ Joseph Strutt, from the Preface to *A Biographical Dictionary: Containing an historical account of all the engravers, from the earliest period of the art of engraving to the present time* (etc.), 2 vols. (London: J. Davis, 1785).

¹⁰ Timothy Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 153.

¹¹ Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802*, p. 153.

¹² Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes and Daniel Carl Haskell, *American Historical Prints: Early Views of American Cities, etc. from the Phelps Stokes and Other Collections* (New York: The New York Public Library, 1932), p. xi.

all interests. More attention was paid to colour, to framing, and display, . . .”¹³ For topographic views, the commercialism of engraving went a step further, having a decisive affect on the print’s image. In many ways these general conditions are the same as those that contributed to the paradigm shift that photography facilitated in the nineteenth century.

In *Finest Prospects. Three Historic Houses: A Study in London Topography* (1986), Julius Bryant notes:

“The topographical recording of specific prospects probably has its origins in this country [England] in military cartography and antiquarian surveys. Wenceslaus Hollar is the best known early exponent of this genre.”¹⁴

To which he adds: “In 1667 Hollar was appointed ‘King’s Scenographer and Designer of Prospects.’”¹⁵ The significance of such a position should not be overlooked. The facadism gracing views of colonial North American cities, however confused, contributed to producing a printed version of the Anglocentric world view. This was an important step, no doubt looked on favourably by King George II, towards overturning the Netherlandish monopoly created by Dutch printers and publishers in the seventeenth century. The authority of the early eighteenth-century object was in direct proportion to its marketability. In the American case, the burden for success in the chain of aesthetic events, originating with the draughtsman (typically an Englishman) in the New World and culminating on the wall of a gentleman’s parlour, fell on the London engraver. At least twice removed from the source—the scene and its draughtsman—these artisans were crucially positioned to

¹³ Clayton, *The English Print, 1688-1802*, p. 153.

¹⁴ Julius Bryant, *Finest Prospects. Three Historic Houses: A Study in London Topography* (London: English Heritage, 1986), p. 16.

¹⁵ Bryant, *Finest Prospects*, p. 16. For a recent study of Wenceslaus Hollar, see Gillian Tindall, *The Man Who Drew London: Wenceslaus Hollar in Reality and Imagination* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2002).

determine New York's final representation.

The twentieth-century's increasing valuation of seventeenth and eighteenth-century prints of colonial American cities is a clear indication of contemporary society's acceptance of their reliability as historical documents that record "the appearances of our early institutions and settlements."¹⁶ Such value is in large part attributable to the plague of amnesia among the city's literary historians. Every *magnum opus* from I. N. Phelps Stokes's *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* to Edwin G. Burrows's and Mike Wallace's *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (1999) has validated New York's colonial views. Turning a blind-eye to the ramifications of the engravings' archetypal architectural character has preserved these historians' arguments. The elevation of these prospects, as the only surviving historical testimony, is advanced by both economic and historiographic modes of perception. The simulacrum has been historiographically authenticated as a result of which the print is ontologically promoted. To overlook the engraving's economic, political and thus visual gamesmanship is to have one's 'eyes wide shut.' In fact, their provenance and visual iconography has never been intensively questioned.

My specific objective is to expose the economic, political, and cultural intentions of the colonial New York prospects produced between 1719 to 1736. In the tendentious, though admittedly useful, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (1997), John Brewer writes:

"Fine art reproductions—of Old Masters, contemporary portraits and modern British painting—the political caricatures and satirical prints which foreigners admired as distinctively English, together with numerous topographical and landscape views, were at the top end of a

¹⁶ Wendy Shadwell, "Prized Prints: Rare American Prints Before 1860 in the Collection of The New-York Historical Society," in *Imprint: Journal of the American Historical Print Collectors Society*, vol. 11, no. 1 (Spring 1986), p. 2, pp. 1-27.

print market that extended to book and magazine illustration, musical scores, single sheets, advertisements and trade cards, as well as the more traditional woodcuts.”¹⁷

Given their position, it is surprising that the influence of these topographical and landscape artists’ political industry has remained virtually unexamined. However, the eighteenth-century cultural shift from commercial reprehensibility to commodity fetishism raises searching questions about the accountability of these topographic views. Their pretensions to architectural accuracy tend to be undermined by even the briefest inquiry into their background. It is doubtful that there is any reliable architectural, spatial, or topographical validity to the existing views. As a consequence, these representations cannot continue to be understood and paraded as literal aesthetic and architectural exemplifications of colonial New York.

On the evidence of eighteenth-century cataloguists, even the general hierarchical order proffered by Brewer is called into question. As it pertains to New York, I will look at five eighteenth-century British engravers—William Burgis, John Carwitham (*fl.* 1723-1741), John Harris, William Toms (*fl.* 1723-1758), and Gerard Vandergucht (1695/96-1776).¹⁸ If we are to take George Vertue’s (1684-1756) *A Catalogue of Engravers, Who have been born, or resided in England* (1763), published posthumously by Horace Walpole, as an index of the distinction between taste and capitalism, it is noteworthy that not a single one of the five British engravers that this paper addresses is listed in Vertue’s *Catalogue* of “true” artists. In Joseph Strutt’s *Biographical Dictionary* they fare only marginally better. He mentions three, but only briefly. So were these really the doyens of culture, or commercial hacks that have posthumously achieved cult-like status for their role in

¹⁷ John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997), p. 451-452.

¹⁸ Like Harris, Vandergucht engraved at least one view—*The South Prospect of the Antient City of York* (etc.) (c. 1721)—for Samuel and Nathaniel Buck’s *Buck’s Perspective Views of Near One Hundred Cities and Chief Towns, in England and Wales; (etc.)*.

these prospects?

II

These five engravers all issued prints by subscription. There is no question that commercial underwriting influenced a print's content and overall impression. By the late nineteenth century in New York, the perks of this economic policy were not even disguised. In the lithograph *Johnstown, N. Y.* (1888), Lucien Rinaldo Burleigh (1853-1923) chose a broadly affordable format and developed an immediately recognisable, albeit run-of-the-mill style that individualised each property within a conventional birds-eye perspective.¹⁹ (Figure 8.5) Thus everyone in the city or town became a potential subscriber. The decorum and pretence typically reserved for the print's inscription is guilelessly exploited in the name of commerce. Reinvented as a billboard, the inscription utilised the most run of the mill typeface to advertise the subscribing companies—including Potter Bros. Knitting Mill, John H. Decker, Son & Co. Glove Factory, and James I. Younglove Lumber Mills—denoted numerically within the view.

Eighteenth-century commercialism was not as crass as late nineteenth and twentieth-century examples, but it was equally opportunistic. The impact on the “historical document” is similar and profound. It is doubtful if Burgis's panorama of New York was “painstakingly prepared in situ,” as Gloria Deák suggests, when the level of accuracy does not even extend to the print's title.²⁰ Burgis is presumed to have arrived in New York from London in about 1718 and shortly thereafter to have

¹⁹ On the subject of Burleigh's work, see John W. Repts, *Views and Viewmakers of Urban America: Lithographs of Towns and Cities in the United States and Canada, Notes on the Artists and Publishers, and a Union Catalog of Their Work, 1825-1925* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984).

²⁰ Gloria Gilda Deák, *Picturing America, 1497-1899: Prints, Maps, and Drawings Bearing on the New World Discoveries and on the Development of the Territory that is now the United States*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), I: 44.

published by subscription, *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York* (etc.). The print was made on four sheets of paper from four copper plates. In 1746, Thomas Bakewell (fl. 1729-1749) of London issued a restrike of the view with “additions and corrections on the plates.” (Figure 8.6) While entitled “A South Prospect,” the engraving is unmistakably an east prospect. In addition to compromising Burgis’s role in the city’s history, which Stauffer and others have already questioned, suggesting that Burgis’s prospect was primarily manufactured in the engraver’s workshop also serves to demonstrate scholarship’s penchant for imposing the romanticism of nineteenth-century European idealism associated with the *plein air* artist on eighteenth-century colonial material.²¹ In contrast to the straightforward nineteenth-century American fare, eighteenth-century English publishers were dependent on mimicking. In the process, they undermined the cultural hallmarks of the aristocratic class on which they depended. The title of Burgis’s view, with the inclusion of the adjective “Flourishing,” is a rhetorical tautology. It is positioned, not at the frame’s upper limit, as is typical, but directly underneath a conspicuous dedication—“To His Excellency Robert Hunter Esq. Captain General and Governour in Chief of the Provinces of New York, New Jersey and Territories depending thereon in America and Vice Admirall of the Same (etc.)”—at the frame’s bottom centre. The dedication is topped by an elaborate, nonetheless, carelessly copied, canted coat of arms of Governor Hunter. The City and Province Seals are displayed on either side of the dedication at the title’s perimeter. For all their dutiful service to these views, I. N. Phelps Stokes’s and Daniel C. Haskell’s scrutiny leads to a surprising conclusion. They write:

²¹ Stauffer writes: “All the . . . known prints associated with the name of William Burgis [excepting *View of the Light House*] are engraved in line, are usually well engraved, and several of them are signed by known engravers. The compiler contends that these prints were simply published by Burgis.” Stauffer, *American Engravers upon Copper and Steel*, I: 36. On the subject of *plein air* views of New York, see, in particular, R. W. G. Vail’s essay on Charles-Balthazar-Julien F vret de Saint-M min’s (1770-1852) *View of New York from Mount Pitt* (1794), entitled “Unknown Views of Old New York,” in *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 3 (July 1949), pp. 149-159.

“Although the Burgis view bears the coat-of-arms of Governor Hunter, which, with his seal, did not reach New York until after July 1st, 1718, it is quite possible that the seal was added by the engraver, who, in all probability, took many liberties with Burgis’ drawing.”²²

The title converts a royal warrant into a slogan. The necessity of rhetorically declaring the city’s success undermines any authority appointed to the conventional signs of prosperity gracing the image—including the foreground shipping, the full sails, the bounteous foreground and background landscape, and the crystalline focus of the architecture.

English subscriptions were reserved either for expensive individual prints, or for a series. John Harris was ingrained in this process. Included in a series of plates collected in the Department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum entitled, *Twenty two prints of several of the capital ships of his majesties Royal Navy with variety of other sea pieces after the drawings of T. Baston (c. 1721)*, of which Harris engraved three, there is a surviving subscription notice. In this announcement, the publisher makes four key pronouncements—(i) “To make the Work more compleat, besides other Decorations, there are added Dedications, suitable Motto’s, &c., wherein is shewn a great Part of the Art of Penmanship; (ii) The Drawings are all of such sizes as will admit of Crown-Glasses for the Preservation of the Prints, and will be proper Furniture for Rooms, Closets, Cabbins of Ships, or to be bound up in a Book; (iii) The Subscription is One Guinea down, and another Guinea on Delivery of the Prints; and (iv) The Subscribers Names will be printed and annex’d to the Collection.” In short, the subscriber got three things—penmanship, possession, and prestige. These are the tools that engender authority and that have been the crutch of twentieth-century historians. It is blindingly apparent that the mechanics of the subscription process is a key contributor to the print’s masquerade.

²² Stokes and Haskell, *American Historical Prints*, p. 19.

The four North American prospects described in this chapter were all engraved in England. There is a generally accepted supposition that they were worked up from original drawings made in North America. I am loathe to accept that premise, particularly in light of the fact that Burgis's two prospects have only survived as engravings. It is true to say that the industry controlling and shaping North America's colonial history has a vested interest in maintaining the historical veracity of these views. On a less sombre note, let us ask why these enormous drawings might have been shipped to England? Was it for financial gain? In the earliest cases was it on account of the fact that "for political reasons, those controlling Colonial affairs forbade the establishment of the printing-press upon these shores for nearly a century after the first settlement"?²³ There is an extant note connected with Burgis's *A South East View of ye Great Town of Boston in New England in America* that the drawing was "sent to London to be engraved by the best hand."²⁴ (Figure 8.7) Such a remark is clearly political and commercial propaganda. If Harris's was the "best hand" why was he so utterly unacclaimed? Scholars have not even agreed if there was only one, or a father and son. According to one author, who is advancing the profiteering perspective, choosing to have works engraved and printed in England addressed two concerns—(i) "Competition in the London printing trades tended to keep prices below those found in the colonies," and (ii) "by basing the work in London, English subscribers could be assured of its quality."²⁵ Is this another case of colonial mercantilism? Yet for all the marketing ballyhoo, there are more extant copies of texts from Imperial Rome than prints of New York. Why can only Carwitham's view, *A View of Fort George with the City of New York from the*

²³ Stauffer, *American Engravers upon Copper and Steel*, I: xxi. Stauffer proceeds to comment: "The scarcity of metallic money among the early colonists, and the necessary issue of a paper currency to meet this condition, probably created the first serious demand for the work of a copperplate engraver."

²⁴ John H. Edmonds, *The Burgis Views of New York and Boston*. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Bostonian Society, 1915. From the collection of the New-York Historical Society.

²⁵ David Bosse, "The Boston Map Trade of the Eighteenth Century," in *Mapping Boston*, ed. Alex Krieger and David Cobb with Amy Turner (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1999), p. 44.

S.W., be found in any quantity?

III

In referring to the “quartet” of eighteenth-century, pre-Revolutionary prospects surely Gloria Deák missed the point when in summation she writes: “Each of the four-foot copperplate panoramas attested to the pride of England in what was clearly seen as the ever-expanding prosperity of its New World.”²⁶ (Figures 8.3, 8.7-8.9) These four views attest to spatial nationalism only as a motivation to individual opportunism. If ever there was a case for the latter this would be it; but the argument does not hold up. The product is style’s self-conscious zenith. Harris’s figure is not only present in the exchange of architectural motifs between his views, but in his ‘hand.’ To quote Louis Marin, “the line triumphs.”²⁷ The precision of Harris’s engraving technique is acutely attuned to the spirit of Palladianism. It is easy to see how these prints might seem the representation of nationalist “pride” set in the unspoken wake of the Act of Union (1707). Yet, the single most influential Parliamentary Act affecting these engravings was the Copyright Act of 1709. It is testimony to “the rise of capitalistic attitudes towards authorship.”²⁸ These engravings shunned the popular influence of Lockean epistemology, with its insistence upon how each individual constructs his/her own mental world, in favour of sacking iconographic and commercial trademarks in an attempt to appeal to a public sensibility. It is another reason why they adopted a linear composition. As

²⁶ Gloria Deák, *Picturing New York: The City from Its Beginnings to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000) p. 22. In fact, Deák is only restating John A. Kouwenhoven. Kouwenhoven writes of *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York in the Province of New York in North America*: “the prominence assigned to the vessels of the Royal Navy, to the seals of the city and province, and to the elaborately ornamented dedicatory panel all bespeak pride in the city’s role as a provincial capital.” See John A. Kouwenhoven, *The Columbia Historical Portrait of New York: An Essay in Graphic History* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1953), p. 52.

²⁷ See Louis Marin, “The City’s Portrait in Its Utopics,” in Louis Marin, *Utopics: Spatial Play*, tr. Robert A. Vollrath (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press Inc., 1984), p. 208, pp. 201-237.

²⁸ See Paul Baines, “‘Our Annus’: Antiquaries and Fraud in the Eighteenth Century,” in *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1 (Spring 1997), p. 34, pp. 33-51.

the practitioners of a formula of cultural gradation, seventeenth-century Dutch engravers were among the first to classify places by adopting pastoral or cosmopolitan affectations. This system established the vantage point of each view. It was, respectively, either a “horned” perspective, where “the receding lines of each lateral facade converge toward different points situated on a single horizontal line,” or planar perspective.²⁹ In each case though, there was the general intention to maximise the settlement’s impact on the viewer. Was the geographic error in the title of Burgis’s New York prospect intentional? It avoided the fact that the city did not have a grand facade to welcome the seafaring Englishman, only a “horned” perspective. Incidentally, in *A History of Kent* (1719), John Harris was among the first to mass-produce the bird’s-eye view as a signifier of private ownership (previously reserved to privately commissioned oil paintings), followed closely by Johannes Kip’s (1653-1722) plates for *Nouveau Theatre de la Grande Bretagne* (etc.). While showing off a city’s assets, these engravers were at the same time selling a product, and, in the case of colonial cities, marketing towns and regions to potential emigrants. Eighteenth-century British engravers, uniquely holding both capitalist and political pretensions, adopted not only the most laudatory historiographic form, but also the simplest one.

What of the prospects great scale? It was another appropriated device. Civility is inherently spatial and concerns scale. It is also clearly to do with order and general comprehensibility. These “Brobdingnagian early eighteenth-century ‘prospects’” self-consciously strain to emulate and mix in the company of an exclusive topographic circle traceable to 1500 with Jacopo de’ Barbari’s (c. 1440/1450-1516) remarkable woodcut of Venice on six sheets.³⁰ By size alone, and it

²⁹ For a thoroughly enjoyable and provocative structuralist inquiry into pictorial representation, see Hubert Damisch, *The Origin of Perspective*, tr. John Goodman (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995). Damisch attributes the introduction of the “horned” perspective to Jean Pélerin Viator (1445-c. 1524).

³⁰ I. N. Phelps Stokes and Daniel C. Haskell, *American Historical Prints: Early Views of American Cities, etc. from the Phelps Stokes and Other Collections* (New York: The New York Public Library,

is an average closer to six feet than four, they are out to achieve authority and respectability. Allying themselves with Claes Jansz. Visscher's (1587-1652) seventeenth-century views of London and Amsterdam was an inspired move. (Figures 8.10, 8.11) By comparison, Samuel Buck's ten "extra large" prospects of English cities, included in the much heralded 'First Series,' were only 40 x 90 cm (16 x 36 in).³¹ Only Samuel and Nathaniel Buck's prospect of London (1749), spread over five sheets and measuring 394 cm (155 in) in total length, is comparable. As we know, Visscher's were not connoisseurs' collectibles but "diplomatic gifts." The extent of patriotic association may have been a consequence of the amount of wall space the print occupied. Equally it is no coincidence that as the American Revolution dawned the views became increasingly less elaborate. In the first instance, however, scale was a key to their commercial targets. Their contemporary rarity, however, does not equate with the level of authority bestowed on these views by generations of scholars.

Although broadly similar in conception, the engravings that comprise the "quartet" were issued by four separate publishers and etched by three separate hands. None of them were very successful. These prints provide a far-reaching insight into each engraver's interpretation of British-ness applied to the image of a colonial city. This is as much attributable to their experience and commercialism's dependence on contemporaneity as it was to their accomplishment as works of draughtsmanship. Keeping this in mind, it is true to say that each of the four engravings is couched in terms of English Palladianism. At a large scale, the views bear a semblance to Samuel and Nathaniel Buck's *The North Prospect of Gravesend in the County of Kent* (1739) and *The South-west Prospect of Yarmouth, in the County of Norfolk* (1741). One cannot mistake the unique buildings in the foreground of John

1932), p. 10.

³¹ See Hyde, *A Prospect of Britain: The Town Panoramas of Samuel and Nathaniel Buck*, p. 7.

Harris's *Wierton the Seat of Sr Christopher Powell Bart*, in Harris's *The History of Kent*, with those in *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York* (etc.). (Figure 8.12, 8.3 (a)) Such "evidence of misdemeanour" was the graphic license appropriated by the London engraver for the benefit, *i.e.* homogeneity, of the pictorial image. What conclusion is one to draw by the recurring connection to Kent? Is this the rhetorical object's cultural genesis? Aside from topographical views, these three engravers etched just about every other subject known to humankind, including portraiture, biblical subjects, floor decorations, animals, architecture, flora and fauna, historical scenes, *etc.* It should not be any surprise that at nearly the same time as Gerard Vandergucht was producing *An East Prospect of the City of Philadelphia* he was also engraving plates for a guidebook to Kent's Palladian garden at Stowe.³² The church spires dotting Burgis's two views are clearly indebted to Sir Christopher Wren (1632-1723). The four principal subjects in the prospect of Boston—ships, an inhabited bridge, religious buildings, and a sloping topography—are identical to those in contemporaneous views of the City of London, only viewed from a much greater distance. One need look only as far as the example in *Nouveau Theatre de la Grande Bretagne* (etc.). (Figure 8.13)

Why are we seeing the two cities in Burgis's views from such a distance? In *Pleasant Places: The Rustic Landscape from Bruegel to Ruisdael* (2000), Walter S. Gibson attributes this fifteenth to seventeenth-century European phenomenon to "the tradition of laudatory poems and prose texts that not only described a particular city—including the beauty of its buildings, the virtues of its inhabitants, and the like—but also celebrated the amenities offered by the surrounding countryside."³³ The prosperous city depended upon its location. Citing the view of Antwerp

³² See *Stow: A Description of the Magnificent Gardens of the Right Honourable Richard, Earl Temple, Viscount and Baron Cobham* (1756) in the Department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum.

³³ Walter S. Gibson, *Pleasant Places: The Rustic Landscape from Bruegel to Ruisdael* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), p. 14-15.

engraved by Melchisedek van Hoorn (*fl.* 1552-1575) in 1550, Gibson contends:

“This and other ‘portraits’ of Antwerp and its countryside are among the earliest manifestations of a form of rustic landscape that we may call the ‘town-and-country’ tradition; it persisted far into the seventeenth century, not only in views of Antwerp but in depictions of other cities as well.”³⁴ (Figure 8.14)

Most notably English ones. I will buy his historical equation, but assert that our artisans were not elaborating such themes, just mimicking them. The landscape serving as a foreground and backdrop in *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of New York* (etc.) is an appropriated pictorial device. In Burgis’s view of Boston, one can hardly find the city for all the landscape. The engraver’s figure includes a culturally specific spatial component. The print’s upper and lower frame is extended to the extreme, diminishing the city’s prospect. It is another sign of the engraver’s conflicting agenda. Brewer’s description of the topographical and landscape tradition in English prints unintentionally pinpoints the cause of the ambiguity in colonial views. He notes that early topographic prints, like *A Prospect of the City of London in Nouveau Theatre de la Grande Bretagne* (etc.), drew “on a Dutch topographical tradition, intended to inform rather than please;” whereas in “landscape prints of the late eighteenth century . . . the image intended to please rather than inform.”³⁵ There is no doubt that Burgis’s two views were destined to impress. While enrapturing the subscriber with historiographic parlance, the engraver escaped being either cartographically or geographically entrapped by avoiding planimetric references. These views have neither a scale, nor an associated two-dimensional map. One cannot help but be overawed, even flabbergasted, by the visual transformation of New York’s cityscape, and the elevation of its cultural status, in the forty-six year period between the “Restitutio View” and *A South Prospect of ye Flourishing City of*

³⁴ Gibson, *Pleasant Places*, p. 16.

³⁵ Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination*, p. 458.

New York (etc.). (Figures 8.1, 8.3) Conveniently, New York's cartographic drought was not spared until James Lyne's, *A Plan of the City of New York from an Actual Survey*, was published in New York by William Bradford in 1731. (Figure 8.15) The Englishman had to wait another decade before John Carwitham published *A Plan of the City of New York* (c. 1740). (Figure 8.16)

By comparison, the two other engravings in the "quartet"—*Prospect of Charles Town*, engraved by William Henry Toms, and particularly *An East Prospect of the City of Philadelphia*, engraved by Gerard Vandergucht thirty-five years after Burgis's view of New York—are not nearly as fashionable. (Figures 8.8, 8.9) But then in his engraving of Henry Popple's view of New York (c. 1733), Toms can already be seen with his finger deep in Burgis's pie.³⁶ (Figure 8.17) Perhaps every stereotype is true and these two cities—Charleston and Philadelphia—are the visual manifestation of Toryism; or, are they the unwitting subjects of two such artists and engravers? One is inclined to favour the later. Comparing Toms's engraving of Charles Town with Bishop Roberts's drawing, one can see how the entire prospect is visually improved by Toms. (Figures 8.8, 8.18) Materials are changed, scale is altered, the architecture is restyled, the format is conventionalised (which included changing the city's edge from a concave to convex form), and the entire scene rendered in a typically English landscape tradition. It is no different today. Politics is unexpurgable from the image. No matter Harris's inclinations, we are acutely aware of Burgis's indiscretions. On this subject John H. Edmonds penned a damning indictment in *The Dictionary of American Biography* (1929). He writes:

"Thomas Selby, Senior Warden of King's Chapel, and keeper of the Crown Coffee House, where Burgis resided, died rather suddenly, and his widow, Mehitable, who had inherited £659-10-4 from him, and had an estate of her own besides, married William Burgis on Oct. 1, 1728. From

³⁶ See Henry Popple, *A Map of the British Empire in America with the French and Spanish settlements adjacent thereto* (1733), in the Department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum.

that time on he is variously referred to in the records as draftsman, painter, innholder, taverner, and gentleman, until Feb. 11, 1730/31, when he was defaulted in a civil suit, having apparently left town. This is confirmed by his wife's unsuccessful petition to the Governor's Council on July 20, 1736, for a divorce, on grounds that he had got what he could of her estate into his hands, about five years since, had left her, and 'has never returned to the Province again . . . and that whether he be living or dead she knows not, and no further trace has as yet been found of him.'"³⁷

It is clear our subject was no Conservative moralist. Is it his dandyism that has survived in the architectural pugilism defining the prospects of Boston and New York?

A

William Burgis was a copyist—of schooners, styles and facades. In his most explicit act he drew and published, and Thomas Johnston (1708-1767) engraved, a reduced, retitled, and dedicated version, *To His Excellency William Burnet, Esqr. This Plan of Boston in New England* (etc.), of John Bonner's (1662-1726) *The Town of Boston in New England* (c. 1728).³⁸ (Figures 8.19, 8.20) It has been said that "with the elegance of its Roman, Gothic, and cursive lettering and its graceful delineation of Boston's complex street pattern the Burgis plan ranks as one of the most attractive examples of urban cartography ever produced in America."³⁹ Yet it was published only once and, like his two large prospects, was not a commercial success. John W.

³⁷ John H. Edmonds, *Dictionary of American Biography*, ed. Allen Johnson, 20 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), III: 278.

³⁸ Benjamin Franklin V writes of Johnston: "painter, japanner, organ builder, and one of the earliest Boston engravers, had a shop 'in Brattle-Street.' He printed and sold his own engravings, including editions of Thomas Walter's *The Grounds and Rules of Musick Explained*, in 1755 and 1766, and several maps." See Benjamin Franklin V, ed., *Boston Printers, Publishers, and Booksellers: 1640-1800* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1980), p. 310. Also, see Sinclair Hitchings, "Thomas Johnston," in Walter Muir Whitehill, ed., *Boston Prints and Printmakers, 1670-1775* (Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1973), pp. 83-131.

³⁹ John W. Reys, "Boston by Bostonians: The Printed Plans and Views of the Colonial City by its Artists, Cartographers, Engravers and Publishers," in Whitehill, ed., *Boston Prints and Printmakers, 1670-1775*, p. 20, pp. 3-56.

Reps further comments: “perhaps its qualities of extravagant embellishment and almost playful decoration did not appeal to unsophisticated colonials.”⁴⁰ Is that not a typical pillorying of colonial life? Keeping in mind that these plans were intended more for decoration than real estate transactions, it is more likely that the colonial population was not fooled by or prone to the pedantry of its economy. The vanguard of the following generation of publishers and printsellers—led by one of Burgis’s younger associates, William Price (c. 1685-1771)—inserted lengthy advertisements (e.g. see the oval at the bottom left-hand corner of the revised *A South East View of ye Great Town of Boston in New England in America*), and included disembodied hands (e.g. see the frame at left-hand edge of William Dewing’s *A New Plan of ye Great Town of Boston in New England in America with the many Additionall Buildings & New Streets, to the Year 1743*) as indicators in the print’s field.⁴¹ (Figures 8.21, 8.22) The engraver clearly worked for the publisher, and one should not assume that accuracy accounted for financial success.

Burgis’s New York view has a curious parallel in his *A South East View of ye Great Town of Boston in New England in America*, also engraved in London by John Harris. (Figure 8.7) In a lecture titled *The Burgis Views of New York and Boston*, delivered at the 1915 Annual Meeting of the Bostonian Society, John Edmonds comments:

“On either side of the key is a flattering description of Boston (then the fourth port in Great Britain), its business and commerce, which in a way

⁴⁰ Reps, “Boston by Bostonians,” p. 20.

⁴¹ On Price, David Bosse writes: “Curiously, the name of William Price (ca. 1685-1771) does not initially appear among the retailer’s of Bonner’s map. He would, however, play a significant role in its history. Price, a cabinetmaker and merchant, has been described as America’s first art dealer. His shop, the King’s Head and Looking Glass, carried musical instruments, toys, cutlery, and other merchandise. As early as 1721, Price advertised maps for sale, and for the next fifty years he remained one of the chief map importers and retailers in Boston. In 1725, he became a cartographic publisher, reprinting Bonner’s map. See David Bosse, “The Boston Map Trade of the Eighteenth Century,” in Alex Krieger and David Cobb with Amy Turner, eds., *Mapping Boston* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1999), p. 45. Also, see Franklin V, ed., *Boston Printers, Publishers, and Booksellers: 1640-1800*, p. 417.

accounts for the immense amount of shipping in the foreground. This may seem overdone, but, for example, in the small harbor of Marblehead on September 16, 1727, were driven ashore in a gale, three ships, a brigantine and twenty-three schooners, sloops and shallops, not to say anything about those who did not drag their anchors.”⁴²

Following Edmonds’s lead, in *The Columbia Historical Portrait of New York* (1953) John Kouwenhoven writes of Burgis’s New York prospect: “the presence of so many ships in the East River, two of which are firing salutes, suggests that the view was intended to celebrate some special occasion, possibly King George’s birthday on May 28, 1717.”⁴³ Likewise, Wendy Shadwell in *American Printmaking: The First 150 Years* (1969) and Gloria Deák in *Picturing America* (1988) offers the same interpretation. The proliferation of ships in the view’s foreground is nothing more than continuing an established convention for topographic views dating to the sixteenth century. It is a common pictorial device proving the city’s economic prosperity. Converting visual traditions into institutionalised forms is a strategy intended to entice subscriptions. As one has seen that subscribers’ names were often associated with prints, it is not stretching the imagination to suggest that the subscriber’s ship or a personal favourite became incorporated into the print. In fact, near the far right-hand edge of Burgis’s prospect of New York, and denoted by the key caption 24, can be seen “Collonel [Lewis] Morris’s Fancy turning to Windward with a Sloop of Common Mould.” In Cornelis Claesz’s (fl. 1578-1609) engraving of Hendrick Cornelisz Vroom’s *The Landing at Philippine* (1600), the foreground ships, as one would expect by the print’s title, are unquestionably the engraving’s *pièce de resistance*.⁴⁴ (Figure 8.23) Indeed, the painstaking observation and rendering of the vessels enhanced the print’s commercial viability. Claes Jansz. Visscher, the master

⁴² John H. Edmonds, *The Burgis Views of New York and Boston*. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Bostonian Society, 1915. From the collection of the New-York Historical Society.

⁴³ Kouwenhoven, *The Columbia Historical Portrait of New York*, p. 52.

⁴⁴ See “Topography and Contemporary History,” in Ger Luijten and Ariane van Suchtelen, eds., *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1993), p. 516-538.

of economic opportunism, would confirm this tactic with his variation on the topographic theme in *Battle at Duins*, published in 1639. (Figure 8.24) Both of these engravings relied on the undistinguished, schematic rendering of the towns and villages in the background to enhance the engraving's depth. At the same time, there is no doubt that the eighteenth-century publisher could see that such foreground artistry, coupled with a more sophisticated city view, would produce a highly marketable product. Pieter Serwouters's (1586-1657) *Gezicht op Rotterdam* (1615) demonstrates essentially the same practice. (Figure 8.25) In fact, this takes us back to Claes Jansz. Visscher. In *Profile of Amsterdam from the IJ, with Subsidiary Scenes* (1611), his untempered urban vision with "propagandist intentions" created the perfect "diplomatic gift." (Figure 8.26) Let us not forget, this is exactly what these engravings were intended to be. His son's four-plate prospect of Hamburg (1652) admirably follows his convention; on top of which, in the banderole at the lower right of the first plate, there are "five lines Dutch and six lines Latin explaining that the ships in front are not in accordance with reality."⁴⁵ (Figure 8.27)

B

Aside from a *View of the New Dutch Church* (1731), there is one final illustration of colonial New York in William Burgis's portfolio. (Figure 8.28) As it has been recorded, "an unsuspected Burgis print surfaced in 1948, when the New York print dealer Harry Shaw Newman [Old Print Shop, New York City] announced the discovery of a mezzotint of Fort George in New York that closely resembled the *Boston Light* [*View of the Light House* (1729)] in size and style."⁴⁶ This engraving

⁴⁵ See Friedrich Wilhelm Heinrich Hollstein, *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, ca. 1450-1700* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1949-). In full, the text reads—[in left half of the banderole] "Dese Schepen bier onder/ Langs gevoecht is buÿten/ ordre, alleen tot cieraet, en/ vicrtooninge vande overgroote/ Scheepryckheÿt deser stede. Naves . . . exhibentur." [in right half of the banderole] "Naves ha non situ conve:/ nienti, sed ornatus gratia,/ ut navigationis et negotia/ tionis amplitudo, hac ur/ be Florens denotetur, loco/ hoc depicta, exhibentur."

⁴⁶ Richard B. Holman, "William Burgis," in Whitehill, ed., *Boston Prints and Printmakers, 1670-1775*, p. 71, pp. 58-81. [Note: *Boston Light* was issued April 11, 1729]

“was unrecorded before its acquisition by the New York Historical Society in 1948, and it remains the only known impression.”⁴⁷ Burgis’s *View of Fort George* (c. 1729-1731) is the ultimate allegorical foil. (Figure 8.29) The city is afforded none of the grandiosity, secularity, or style of his earlier topographic view, although it does not fail to include a dedication to Governor John Montgomerie. It lacks the sophistication bestowed on the overblown ship, itself a facsimile from the view of Boston, whose pronounced cannon fire suggests that it has just arrived from Britain. However, based on the proximity of the dates assigned to this view and *View of the Light House*, and the tumult accompanying Burgis’s swift exit from Boston, the cannon fire could be interpreted as a self-conscious pictorial device announcing the artist’s return to New York from his nine-year hiatus in Boston.

The print is determined to emphasise the sovereign’s authority. Without a subscription notice, how else can one explain the engraving’s dedication and the array of commercial devices? The emphasis on the two highlighted institutions—the church and state—the dedication to Governor Montgomerie, the strong south-western wind, and the fully-formed horticulture is all a part of its attempt to win broad commercial appeal. In fact, the engraving sums itself up in its subtext. Burgis is at no pains to give the city any air of culture or of the *bon vivant*. It is far less sophisticated and more diminutive than the earlier view. To this end, he has redeployed the “horned” perspective common to seventeenth-century Dutch pastoral views. The print’s emphasis is overshadowed by the harbour’s ominous atmosphere, which has fallen under the spell of either meteorology or divinity, not just incompetent engraving. With smoke pouring from many of the buildings’ chimneys and the dark, looming sky, it seems a winter’s day in which the city offers a haven of retreat. This view’s hardly disguised subtext is domestic, personal, and motivated by intense

⁴⁷ See Wendy J. Shadwell, *American Printmaking: The First 150 Years* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1969), p. 19.

sentimentality. The print's inconsistencies are alarming precisely because they do not tally with eighteenth-century conventions or Burgis's *oeuvre*, apart from with *View of the Light House*. And that is the key. Could the *View of the Light House* be the first print of a unique autobiographical pair? (Figure 8.30)

C

By contrast, purportedly of the same date, *A View of Fort George with the City of New York from the S.W.* is an altogether more economically motivated and one can sense political and ideological trophy. (Figure 8.4) The view was engraved by John Carwitham and published in London by the immensely successful Carington Bowles Map & Printseller as one of a collection of *Views of Cities*.⁴⁸ The outstanding question has always been the relationship between Carwitham's work and Burgis's *View of Fort George*. In the terms of this manuscript, Burgis was a copyist, but Carwitham was a poacher. By broadly agreed chronology, it is hard to imagine anything other than that Carwitham commercialised and anglicised Burgis's mezzotint. Yet it has been assumed that this engraving was executed following a lost drawing showing the coastline further along the Hudson. In light of the work's picturesque perfection, I would argue that there is no such lost drawing. It was not even necessary. It is more likely that Carwitham got his hands on Burgis's views of New York in tandem with *A Plan of the City of New York from an Actual Survey*, and by following the rules of early eighteenth-century English city views conjured this perfected and idealised picture. (Figure 8.15) It is noteworthy that it is taken from the exact position of the inset view *Nieuw Amsterdam op t Eylant Manhattans*, from the map issued by Visscher (c. 1655-1656). (Figure 8.31) As a sucker for such

⁴⁸ Wendy Shadwell writes: "The views of colonial American towns such as Boston, Philadelphia, and New York engraved by Carwitham were included in a collection of 271 world wide scenes offered for sale by Carington Bowles in London in the late 1760's." See Shadwell, *American Printmaking: The First 150 Years*, p. 25.

idealism, I would no doubt have bought one, and probably both if you include his view of Boston [*A South East View of the Great Town of Boston in New England in America* (c. 1731-1736)]—ostensibly a re-work of Burgis’s earlier view. (Figure 8.32) There is sufficient visual distinction between the views enabling them to serve as Tory propaganda in support of colonialism in North America, and at the same time not too great an iconographic deviance from English ‘taste’ so as to endanger their commercial viability in the London market. There is not a single detail in any other part of the print that would have depended on a lost drawing. The accumulation of small buildings is merely an embellished foreground to the print’s conventional city hierarchy, with a couple of Dutch hangovers in the front and “Meiser’s” windmill hanging onto the print’s left-hand edge, and floating somewhere within the King’s Farm or beyond. These examples all illustrate the tendency to convert historical data into marketable tokens.

Having toiled over the print’s details and attempted to invoke every snippet of the most arcane correspondence in order to give an exact date for the view, Stokes then curiously claims that Carwitham’s *A View of Fort George with the City of New York from the S.W.* and *A Plan of the City of New York* “may even have been drawn at the same time and by the same artist.”⁴⁹ (Figures 8.4, 8.16) Upon inspection, this could only be the case if one is willing to accept that the artist would simultaneously produce two prints without any recourse to one another. Based on the inaccuracy of the plan’s scale, although from a specific perspectival position there is a limited degree of agreement between the setting-out of the view’s significant buildings, the two could only be connected if Carwitham had copied and pasted Burgis’s view and then altered the perspectival position to create the print’s other half. This view is unquestionably flawed if the viewer is not taken to be Hydra. Is there any question of the fruitlessness of attempts to specify a date based on the print’s architecture?

⁴⁹ Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, I: 269.

There is an incomparable cleanliness to the view. No matter that in the fort it is impossible to distinguish between the Governor's house and the church, or that the church tower is not even attached to the larger structure, it is all so exquisitely-shaped and pictorially satisfying. To his credit, he has restored the Old Dutch church to the view. Where Burgis illustrated only a few village houses, which seem a hangover from Visscher's view, Carwitham restores all of Burgis's youthful exuberance to the city. The topography in the print is grossly generalised, the trees are cultivated to perfection, and the rosy hue enveloping the city is accurately measured for an ideal summer's day. The water is conventionally rendered, and passengers in the foreground boats are all typical Englishmen. I am convinced that the ship is signalling its arrival, which is a hangover from Burgis's view that Carwitham plays to a heightened graphic effect. The print's foreground assumes a balancing role to the city's silence by changing the perpetuity of time to one of immediacy. Including an action in the present time, either a sending-off or welcoming between the men on the large ship and the smaller boat of five men, which the cannon firing also helps to substantiate, gives the view a degree of authenticity it does not warrant. Though these five cannot be sure where they will end up without a rudder. Is there any question to the motivation behind the desired perfection, or of the city's profile to defer to these expectations?

IV

I. N. Phelps Stokes (1867-1944), John W. Reps (1921-), Gloria Deák (1930-), and Edwin G. Burrows (1943-) and Mike Wallace represent four generations of eminent historians who have depended so entirely on the historical veracity of the few extant engravings of colonial New York to validate their arguments that they have overlooked the system of economy on which mechanical reproduction

depended. Nowhere do they acknowledge that these views are subject to visual tropes. Contrary to their intentions, their empirical assertions have done more to inhibit sustained counter-judgements on the city's colonial history, certainly its architectural and urban past, than to promote it. It is unsatisfactory for New York's visual legacy to be continuously relegated to a supporting role in colonial scholarship and trivialised in countless graphic histories. These unique records have the capacity to play an influential role in broadening the debate on the city's colonial legacy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY AND ARCHIVAL SOURCES

North America

Historic Hudson Valley, Tarrytown, NY
Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Department of European Paintings
The Museum of the City of New York
National Archives of Canada, Ottawa
The New-York Historical Society
The New York Public Library
The New York Public Library, Central Children's Room
The New York Public Library, Division of Prints and Photographs
The New York State Archives, Albany

United Kingdom

Ashmolean Museum, The University of Oxford
Bethnal Green Museum of Childhood
Bodleian Library, University of Oxford
The British Library
The British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings
The John Rylands Library, The University of Manchester
National Library of Scotland
The National Maritime Museum
The Royal Collection
The University of Edinburgh Library, Special Collection
The University of Liverpool, Sydney Jones Library, Special Collection
The Warburg Institute

The Netherlands

Amsterdams Historisch Museum, Amsterdam
Archiefdienst voor Kennemerland, Haarlem

Archiefdienst Westfriese Gemeenten, Hoorn
Centraal Museum, Utrecht
Gemeentearchief Amsterdam
Gemeentearchief Dordrecht
Gemeentearchief Kampen
Gemeentearchief Leiden
Gemeentearchief Rotterdam
Gemeentearchief Zaanstad, Koog aan de Zaan
Haags Gemeentearchief, The Hague
Hoogheemraadschap van Rijnland, Leiden
Mauritshuis, The Hague
Regionaal Archief, Alkmaar
Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
Ryksargyf Leeuwarden
Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, Leiden
Stichting Atlas Van Stolk, Rotterdam
Stichting Iconographisch Bureau, The Hague
Streekarchiefdienst Hollands Midden, Gouda

Europe

Archives Départementales des Ardennes, Charleville-Mézières, France
Archives Départementales du Nord, Lille, France
Archives de l'État à Mons, Mons, France
Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des estampes et de la photographie,
Paris, France
Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna, Austria
Médiathèque Municipale à Mons, Mons, France
Médiathèque Municipale Sedan, Sedan, France
Stadsarchief Antwerpen, Antwerp, Belgium
Städt. Kunstsammlungen, Augsburg, Germany
Stadtverwaltung Wesel, Wesel, Germany
Trinity College Library, The University of Dublin, Ireland

THESES

- Frank, Fred Roy, *The Development of New York City 1600-1900*, Master's Thesis, Cornell University, 1955.
- Mielke, H., *Hans Vredeman de Vries, Verzeichnis der Stichwerke und Beschreibung seines Stil sowie Beiträge zum Werke Gerard Groennings*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Berlin, 1967.
- Schmidt, Benjamin, *Innocence Abroad: The Dutch Imagination and the Representation of the New World, c. 1570-1670*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1995.
- Simon, M., *Claes Jansz. Visscher*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Freiburg, 1958.
- Westra, Frans, *Nederlandse ingenieurs en de fortificatiewerken in het eerste tijdperk van de Tachtigjarige oorlog, 1573-1604*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1992.

CHIEF PRINTED SOURCES CONSULTED

- Abbott, Jacob, *Rollo's Tour in Europe*, 10 vols. (Boston: Taggard and Thompson, 1864-1867).
- Abbott, John Stevens Cabot, *Peter Stuyvesant, the Last Dutch Governor of New Amsterdam* (New York: Dodd & Mead, 1873).
- Adhémar, Jean, *Graphic Art of the Eighteenth Century*, tr. M. I. Martin (London: Thames and Hudson, 1964).
- Adjmi, Morris, ed., *Aldo Rossi: The Complete Buildings and Projects, 1981-1991* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991).
- Agrest, Diana, *Architecture from Without: Theoretical Framings for a Critical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1993).
- Alberti, Leon Battista, *On Painting*, tr. Cecil Grayson (London: Penguin Books, 1972).
- Alberti, Leon Battista, *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, tr. Joseph Rykwert, et al., (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1988).
- Allard, Carolus, *Orbis Habitabilis Oppida et Vestibus* (etc.) (Amsterdam: C. Allard, 1680).

- Alpers, Svetlana, *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (London: John Murray Publishers Ltd., 1983).
- Althusser, Louis, *Montesquieu, Rousseau, Marx: Politics and History*, tr. Ben Brewster (London: Verso, 1982).
- Andrews, William Loring, *An Index to the Illustrations in the Manuals of the Corporation of the City of New York, 1841-1870* (New York: The Society of Iconophiles, 1906).
- Andrews, William Loring, *New Amsterdam, New Orange, New York: A Chronologically Arranged Account of the Engraved Views of the City from the First Picture Published in MDCLI until the Year MDCCC* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1897).
- Andrews, William Loring, *A Prospect of the Colleges in Cambridge* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1897).
- Andrews, William Loring, *The Old Booksellers of New York and Other Papers* (New York, 1895).
- Anon., *Colonial Stories: Retold from St. Nicholas* (New York: The Century Co., 1910).
- Anon., *Dutch Pageant . . . Celebrating the 300th Anniversary of the Settling of New Amsterdam* (New York, 1924).
- Anon., *Germania Inferior, vulgo Neder-lant, Gallice Pays-Bas* (Antwerp: Ioannem Bapt. Urintium, 1603).
- Anon., *Illustrated Catalogue of the Notable Collection of Views of New York and Other American Cities, Historical China and Books Relating to New York formed by Mr. Percy R. Pyne 2d* (New York: The American Art Association, 1917).
- Anon., *Notable American Prints: The Collection of Henry Graves, Jr.* Exhibition Catalogue to accompany exhibition May 7-31, 1959 at Kennedy Galleries, Inc., New York.
- Anon., *Nouveau Theatre de la Grande Bretagne* (etc.), 4 vols. (London: Joseph Smith, 1724).
- Anon., *The Traveller; or, an Entertaining Journey Round the Habitable Globe* (etc.), 2nd ed. (London: Printed for J. Harris and Son, 1820).
- Aptheker, Herbert, *The Colonial Era* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1960).
- Archdeacon, Thomas J., *New York City, 1664-1710: Conquest and Change* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976).

- Asher, Georg Michael, *A Bibliographical and Historical Essay on the Dutch Books and Pamphlets Relating to New-Netherland* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Frederik Muller, 1854-1867).
- Augustyn, Robert T. and Paul E. Cohen, *Manhattan in Maps, 1527-1995* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1997).
- Averlino, Antonio di Piero (called Filarete), *Filarete's Treatise on Architecture*, 2 vols., ed. and tr. John R. Spencer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965).
- Bachman, Van Cleaf, *Peltries or Plantations: The Economic Policies of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland, 1623-1639* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969).
- Bacon, Francis, *The Advancement of Learning and New Atlantis*, ed. Arthur Johnston (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).
- Bacon, Francis, *The Great Instauration and New Atlantis*, ed. J. Weinberger (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1980).
- Bacon, Francis, *The Works of Francis Bacon*, eds. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, 14 vols. (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1857-1874).
- Baerle, Caspar van, *Rerum per octennium in Brasilia et alibi nuper gestarum sub praefectura* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Ioannis Blaeu, 1647).
- Baird, Charles Washington, *History of the Huguenot Emigration to America*, 2 vols. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1885).
- Bakhtin, M. M., *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, tr. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981).
- Balmer, Randall, *A Perfect Babel of Confusion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Balzer, Richard, *Peepshows: A Visual History* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1998).
- Barbaro, Daniello, *La Practica della perspettiva* (etc.) (Venice: B. & R. Borgominieri, 1568).
- Barbault, Jean, *Vues des plus beaux restes des antiquités romaines telles qu'elles subsistent encore à Rome* (etc.) (Rome, 1775).
- Barthes, Roland, *Camera Lucida*, tr. Richard Howard (New York: Hill & Wang, 1981).

- Barthes, Roland, *Image Music Text*, tr. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana Press, 1977).
- Barthes, Roland, *Mythologies*, tr. Annette Lavers (New York: The Noonday Press, 1972).
- Baur, Johann Wilhelm, *Ionnis Guilielmi Baur Iconographia, complectens in se, Passionem* (etc.) (Augsburg, 1670).
- Bayer, Henry G., *The Belgians: First Settlers in New York and in the Middle States* (New York: The Devin-Adair Co., 1925).
- Bédard, Jean-François, ed., *Cities of Artificial Excavation: The Work of Peter Eisenman, 1978-1988* (Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1994).
- Behringer, Wolfgang and Bernd Roeck, *Das Bild der Stadt in der Neuzeit, 1400-1800* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1999).
- Belden, E. Porter, *New York: Past, Present and Future*, 2nd ed. (New York: Putnam, 1849).
- Belknap, Jr., Waldron Phoenix, *American Colonial Painting: Materials for a History* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959).
- Bell, Arthur Ernest, *Christian Huygens and the Development of Science in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1947).
- Bender, Thomas and Carl E. Schorske, eds., *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).
- Bender, Thomas, *New York Intellect: A History of Intellectual Life in New York City, from 1750 to the Beginnings of Our Own Time* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
- Benecke, Gerhard, *Society and Politics in Germany, 1500-1750* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974).
- Benevolo, Leonardo, *The History of the City*, tr. Geoffrey Culverwell (London: Scolar Press, 1980).
- Bengtsson, Åke, *Studies on the Rise of Realistic Landscape Painting in Holland 1610-1625* (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1952).
- Benjamin, Walter, *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, tr. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1988).
- Benjamin, Walter, *One Way Street and Other Writings*, tr. Edmund Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter (London: New Left Books, 1979).
- Bennett, Jim and Stephen Johnston, *The Geometry of War, 1500-1700* (Oxford: Museum of the History of Science, 1996).

- Bennett, Mary, *Merseyside Painters, People and Places*, 2 vols. (Liverpool: Merseyside County Council, 1978).
- Bergvelt, Ellinoor, et al., *Verzamelan: van rariteitenkabinet tot kunstmuseum* (Open Universiteit, Heerlen: Gaade Uitgevers, 1993).
- Berlin, Isaiah, ed., *The Age of Enlightenment: The 18th Century Philosophers* (New York: Meridian, 1984).
- Bernier, Théodore, *Dictionnaire Géographique, Historique, Archéologique, Biographique & Bibliographique du Hainaut* (Mons: Hector Manceaux, Imprimeur-Éditeur, 1879).
- Bernt, Walther, *Die Niederländischen Maler und Zeichner des 17. Jahrhunderts*, 5 vols. (Munich: Verlag F. Bruckmann KG, 1948).
- Besson, Jacques, *Instrumentorum et Machinarum* (etc.) (Orleans?, 1569?).
- Besson, Jacques, *Theatrum instrumentorum et machinarum . . . Cum Franc. Beroaldi figurarum declaratione demonstratiua* (Lyon: Barth. Vincentium, 1578).
- Besson, Jacques, *Theatre des Instrumens Mathematiques & Mechaniques de Jaques Besson* (etc.) (Lyon: Barthelemy Vincent, 1629).
- Bhabha, Homi K., *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).
- Bibiena, Giuseppe Galli de, *Architettura e Prospettiva* (Augsburg, 1740).
- Bingham, Jane and Grayce Scholt, *Fifteen Centuries of Children's Literature: An Annotated Chronology of British and American Works* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1980).
- Blackburn, Roderic H. and Ruth Piwonka, *Remembrance of Patria: Dutch Arts and Culture in Colonial America 1609-1776* (Albany, NY: Publishing Center for Cultural Resources for the Albany Institute of History and Art, 1988).
- Black, George Ashton, *The History of Municipal Ownership of Land on Manhattan Island: to the beginning of sales by the commissioners of the sinking fund in 1844*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University, 1891).
- Blaeu, Johannes and Willem Blaeu, *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, sive Atlas novus* (etc.), 3 vols. (Amsterdam: J. Blaeu, 1641-1655).
- Blaeu, Willem, *Toonneel des Aerdrijcx ofte Nieuwe Atlas* (Amsterdam, 1648-1658).
- Blaeu, Johannes, *Toonneel der Steden van de Vereenighde Nederlanden* (Amsterdam, 1649).
- Blasse-Hegeman, H., et al., eds., *Nederlandse Portretten: Bijdragen over de portretkunst in de nederlanden uit de zestiende, zeventiende en achttiende eeuw* (SDU Uitgeverij: The Hague, 1990).
- Blau, Joseph L., ed., *American Philosophic Addresses, 1700-1900* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946).

- Bol, Laurens J. and George S. Keyes, *Netherlandish Paintings and Drawings from the Collection of F. C. Butôt* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet Publications, 1981).
- Bonnardot, Alfred, *Histoire artistique et archéologique de la gravure en France* (etc.) (Paris: Librairie Ancienne de Deflorenne Neveu, 1849).
- Bonnefoit, Régine, *Johann Wilhelm Baur (1607-1642): ein Wegbereiter der barocken Kunst in Deutschland* (Berlin: Wasmuth, 1997).
- Bonomi, Patricia U., *The Lord Cornbury Scandal: The Politics of Reputation in British America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).
- Bonomi, Patricia U., *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Boorstin, Daniel Joseph, *America and the Image of Europe: Reflections on American Thought* (New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1960).
- Boorstin, Daniel Joseph, *The Americans: The Colonial Experience* (New York: Random House, 1958).
- Booth, Mary Louise, *History of the City of New York, from Its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York: W. R. C. Clark & Meeker, 1859).
- Borggreffe, Heiner, et al., eds., *Hans Vredeman de Vries: und die Renaissance im Norden* (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2002).
- Boschloo, Anton W. A., et al., eds., *Academies of Art between Renaissance and Romanticism* (The Hague: SDU Uitgeverij, 1989).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, tr. Richard Nice (London: Routledge, 1999).
- Bowles, Thomas, *The Emperor of China's Palace at Peking, and his Principal Gardens, as well as in Tartary, as at Peking, Gehol, and the adjacent Countries* (1753).
- Boxer, C. R., *The Dutch in Brazil, 1624-1654* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957).
- Boxer, C. R., *The Dutch Seaborne Empire, 1600-1800* (London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1965).
- Boyer, M. Christine, *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1994).
- Bracht, J. van, *Atlas van kaarten en aanzichten van de VOC en WIC* (etc.) (Bussum: Unieboek, 1981).
- Braudel, Fernand, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, tr. Sian Reynolds (London: Collins, 1973).

- Braun, Georg and Frans Hogenberg, *Civitates Orbis Terrarum*, 6 vols. (Cologne, 1572-1617).
- Braun, Volkmar, *Geschichtliches Wesel, Band 3: Stadtansichten auf Gemälden, Stichen und Zeichnungen* (Cologne: Rheinland-Verlag, 1979).
- Bredenkamp, Horst, *The Lure of Antiquity and the Cult of the Machine: The Kunstammer and the Evolution of Nature, Art and Technology*, tr. Allison Brown (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1995).
- Brehier, Emile, *The Seventeenth Century*, tr. Wade Baskin (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1966).
- Brewer, John, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997).
- Brewington, Dorothy E. R., *Dictionary of Marine Artists* (Salem, MA: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1982).
- Bridenbaugh, Carl, *Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955).
- Bridenbaugh, Carl, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960).
- Briganti, Giuliano, *The View Painters of Europe*, tr. Pamela Waley (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1970).
- Brodhead, John Romeyn, *History of the State of New York*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1853-1871).
- Brodwin, Stanley, ed., *The Old and New World Romanticism of Washington Irving* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1986).
- Broeck, Matheus van den, *Journael, ofte historiaelse beschrijvinge van Matheus vanden Broeck. . . aldaer* (Amsterdam, 1651).
- Bromley, J. S. and E. H. Kossmann, eds., *Britain and the Netherlands* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1960).
- Brown, Christopher, *Dutch Landscape: The Early Years, Haarlem and Amsterdam 1590-1650* (London: The National Gallery, 1986).
- Brown, Christopher, *Dutch Townscape Painting* (London: The National Gallery, 1972).
- Brown, Christopher, *Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Painting of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Faber, 1984).
- Brown, Henry Collins, ed., *Valentine's Manual of Old New-York*, New Series, 12 vols. (New York: The Chauncey Holt Company, 1916/17-1928).
- Brown, Lloyd, ed., *The Future Metropolis* (New York: George Braziller, 1961).

- Brown, Stuart, ed., *British Philosophy and the Age of Enlightenment* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- Bry, Theodore de, *Historia Americæ sive Novi Orbis: Americæ Tertia Pars* (etc.) (Frankfurt: Ioannem Wechelum, 1592).
- Bryant, Julius, *Finest Prospects. Three Historic Houses: A Study in London Topography* (London: English Heritage, 1986).
- Buckle, Stephen, *Natural Law and the Theory of Property: Grotius to Hume* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
- Buisseret, David, ed., *Envisioning the City: Six Studies in Urban Cartography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998).
- Bull, Hedley, ed., *Hugo Grotius and International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
- Burke, Peter, *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd., 2001).
- Burns, Ric, James Sanders and Lisa Ades, *New York: An Illustrated History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999).
- Burrows, Edwin G. and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
-
- Calloway, Colin G., *New Worlds for All: Indians, Europeans, and the Remaking of Early America* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997).
- Carasso-Kok, M. and J. Levy-van Halm, *Schutters in Holland: Kracht en zenuwen van de stad* (Zwolle: Uitgeverij Waanders, 1988).
- Carnoy, Martin, *The State and Political Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).
- Cassirer, Ernst, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, tr. Fritz C. A. Koelln and James P. Pettegrove (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951).
- Cassirer, Ernst, *The Question of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, ed. and tr. Peter Gay (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975).
- Cauchies, Jean-Marie, ed., *Les Enceintes Urbaines en Hainaut* (Brussels: Crédit Communal de Belgique, 1983).
- Caus, Salomon de, *Les Raisons des Forces Mouvantes, avec diverses Machines tant utiles que plaisantes: Ausquelles sont adjoints plusieurs desseins de Grottes & Fontaines* (Paris: Charles Sevestre, 1624).

- Cayton, Andrew R. L. and Fredrika J. Teute, eds., *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).
- Certeau, Michel de, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, tr. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1988).
- Chaplin, Joyce E., *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500-1676* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).
- Chiappelli, Fredi, ed. *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old*, 2 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976).
- Choay, Françoise, *The Rule and the Model: On the Theory of Architecture and Urbanism*, ed. Denise Bratton (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997).
- Ciucci, Giorgio, et al., *The American City: From the Civil War to the New Deal* (London: Granada Publishing Limited, 1980).
- Clayton, Timothy, *The English Print, 1688-1802* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
- Cock, Hieronymus, *Compertimentorum quod vocant multiplex genus lepidissimis historiolis poetarumque fabellis ornatum* (etc.) (Antwerp, 1566).
- Cohen, I. Bernard, *Revolution in Science* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985).
- Colton, Julia Maria, *Annals of Old Manhattan, 1609-1664* (New York: Brentano's, 1901).
- Colton, Julia Maria, *Annals of Switzerland* (New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1897).
- Commager, Henry Steele, *The Empire of Reason: How Europe Imagined and America Realized the Enlightenment* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977).
- Commager, Henry Steele and Elmo Giordanetti, *Was America a Mistake? An Eighteenth-Century Controversy* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968).
- Condon, Thomas J., *New York Beginnings: The Commercial Origins of New Netherland* (New York: New York University Press, 1968).
- Cooke, Jacob Ernest, ed., *Encyclopedia of the North American Colonies*, 3 vols. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1993).
- Cooper, James Fenimore, *New York* (Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1973).
- Cortelyou, John van Zandt, *The Cortelyou Genealogy: A Record of Jaques Cortelyou and of Many of His Descendants* (Lincoln, NE: Press of Brown Printing Service, 1942).

- Cosgrove, Denis, ed., *Mappings* (London: Reaktion Books, 1999).
- Crary, Jonathan, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992).
- Craven, Wayne, Wendy J. Shadwell and Robert Strunsky, *Catalogue of American Portraits in The New-York Historical Society*, 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).
- Craven, Wayne, *Colonial American Portraiture: The Economic, Religious, Social, Cultural, Philosophical, Scientific, and Aesthetic Foundations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- Craven, Wesley Frank, *The Colonies in Transition, 1660-1713* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968).
- Cresswell, Donald H., *The American Revolution in Drawings and Prints: A Checklist of 1765-1790 Graphics in the Library of Congress* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1975).
- Curti, Merle, *The Growth of American Thought* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1943).
- Curtius, Ernst Robert, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, tr. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).
-
- Damisch, Hubert, *The Origin of Perspective*, tr. John Goodman (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995).
- Damisch, Hubert, *Skyline: The Narcissistic City*, tr. John Goodman (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).
- Darling, William Charles, *New Amsterdam, New Orange, New York, with Chronological Data* (Privately Printed, 1889).
- Daston, Lorraine and Katharine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150-1750* (New York: Zone Books, 1998).
- Davis, Asahel, *History of New Amsterdam; or, New York as It Was, in the Days of the Dutch Governors* (New York: R. T. Young Publisher, 1854).
- Deák, Gloria Gilda, *American Views: Prospects and Vistas* (New York: Viking Press, 1976).
- Deák, Gloria Gilda, *Picturing America, 1497-1899: Prints, Maps, and Drawings Bearing on the New World Discoveries and on the Development of the Territory that is now the United States*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

- Deák, Gloria, *Picturing New York: The City from Its Beginnings to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, tr. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).
- Denton, Daniel, *A Brief Description of New-York: Formerly Called New-Netherland* (London: John Hancock & William Bradley, 1670).
- D'Entrèves, Alexander Passerin, *The Notion of State: An Introduction to Political Theory* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967).
- Derrida, Jacques, *Of Grammatology*, Corrected Edition, tr. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
- Derrida, Jacques, *The Truth in Painting*, tr. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987).
- Descartes, René, *Discourse on the Method and the Meditations*, tr. F. E. Sutcliffe (London: Penguin Books, 1968).
- Deventer, Jacques de, *Atlas topographique des Pay-Bas (c. 1557-1570)*.
- Diderot, Denis and Jean le Rond d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, 17 vols. (Paris, 1751-1765).
- Dijksterhuis, E. J., ed., *The Principal Works of Simon Stevin* (Amsterdam: C. V. Swets & Zeitlinger, 1955).
- Dijksterhuis, E. J., *Simon Stevin: Science in the Netherlands around 1600* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970).
- Dilliard, Maud Esther, *Old Dutch Houses of Brooklyn* (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1945).
- Dodds, George and Robert Tavernor, eds., *Body and Building: Essays on the Changing Relation of Body and Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2001).
- Dolmetsch, Joan D., ed., *Eighteenth-Century Prints in Colonial America: To Educate and Decorate* (Williamsburg, VA: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1979).
- Donck, Adriaen van der, *A Description of the New Netherlands*, ed. Thomas F. O'Donnell, tr. Jeremiah Johnson (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968).
- Dunlap, William, *History of the New Netherlands, Province of New York, and State of New York, to the Adoption of the Federal Constitution*, 2 vols. (New York, 1839).

- Dunn, Shirley W. and Allison P. Bennett, *Dutch Architecture near Albany: The Polgreen Photographs* (Fleischmanns, NY: Purple Mountain Press, Ltd., 1996).
- Dürer, Albrecht, *Etliche Unterricht zu Befestigung der Stett Schloss und Flecken* (Nürnberg, 1527).
- Dürer, Albrecht, *Etliche Unterricht zu Befestigung der Stett Schloss und Flecken*, intro. Martin Biddle (Farnborough: Gregg International Publishers Limited, 1972).
- Duvosquel, Jean-Marie, *Albums de Croÿ* (Brussels: Crédit Communal de Belgique, 1985-).
- Eco, Umberto, *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Eco, Umberto, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984).
- Eco, Umberto, *A Theory of Semiotics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976).
- Edmonds, John H., *The Burgis Views of New York and Boston* (Boston, 1915).
- Eisenstein, Sergei, *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*, ed. and tr. Jay Leyda (San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company).
- Ekkart, R. E. O., *Dutch Portraits from the Seventeenth Century* (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, 1995).
- Elias, Johan Engelbert, *De Vroedschap van Amsterdam, 1578-1795*, 2 vols. (Haarlem, 1903-1905).
- Emerson, Caroline Dwight, *New Amsterdam; Old Holland in the New World* (Champaign, IL: Garrard Pub. Co., 1967).
- Emerson, Caroline Dwight, *Old New York for Young New Yorkers* (New York: Dutton, 1932).
- Emmer, Pieter, *The Dutch in the Atlantic Economy, 1580-1880: Trade, Slavery and Emancipation* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1998).
- Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Praise of Folly and Letter to Maarten van Dorp, 1515*, tr. Betty Radice (London: Penguin Books, 1993).
- Everaert, J. and J. Parmentier, eds., *International Conference on Shipping, Factories and Colonization* (Brussels, 1996).

- Fagan, Louis Alexander, *Catalogue of the Engraved Works, etc. of William Woollett* (London: Fine Art Society, 1885).
- Fagan, Louis Alexander, *A Catalogue Raisonné of the Engraved Works of William Woollett* (London: The Fine Art Society Limited, 1885).
- Feenstra, R., ed., *The World of Hugo Grotius (1583-1645)* (Amsterdam and Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1984).
- Fernow, B., ed., *The Records of New Amsterdam, from 1653 to 1674 anno Domini*, 7 vols. (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1897).
- Figgis, John Neville, *Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius, 1414-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907).
- Filipczak, Zirka Zaremba, *Picturing Art in Antwerp, 1550-1700* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- Flenley, Ralph, *Modern German History* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1953).
- Flower, Elizabeth and Murray G. Murphey, *A History of Philosophy in America*, 2 vols. (New York: Capricorn Books, 1977).
- Ford, Ford Madox, *New York is Not America* (New York: Albert and Charles Boni, 1927).
- Ford, James, *Slums and Housing, with Special Reference to New York City: History, Conditions, Policy*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936).
- Forest, J. W. de, *The de Forests of Avesnes (and of New Netherland): A Huguenot Thread in American Colonial History, 1494 to the Present Time* (New Haven, CT: The Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor Co., 1900).
- Foucault, Michel, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley, et al. (London: Allen Lane of the Penguin Press, 1998).
- Foucault, Michel, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994).
- Foucault, Michel, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).
- Fowble, E. McSherry, *Two Centuries of Prints in America, 1680-1880: A Selective Catalogue of the Winterthur Museum Collection* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1987).
- Franits, Wayne, *Looking at Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art: Realism Reconsidered* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Franklin V, Benjamin, ed., *Boston Printers, Publishers, and Booksellers: 1640-1800* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1980).

- Fries, Sylvia Doughty, *The Urban Idea in Colonial America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977).
- Frijhoff, Willem, *Identity Achievement, Education, and Social Legitimation in Early Modern Dutch Society: The Case of Evert Willemsz (1622-23)* (Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2001).
- Frijhoff, Willem, *Wegen van Evert Willemsz.: Een Hollands weeskind op zoek naar zichzelf, 1607-1647* (Nijmegen: SUN Memoria, 1995).
- Fritz, Rolf, *Das Stadt-und Strassenbild in der holländischen Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1932).
- Fulton, Thomas Wemyss, *The Sovereignty of the Sea* (London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1911).
- Füsslin, Georg, et al., *Der Guckkasten: Einblick - Durchblick - Ausblick* (Stuttgart: Füsslin Verlag, 1995).
- Füsslin, Georg, *Optisches Spielzeug oder wie die Bilder laufen lernten* (Stuttgart: Verlag Georg Füsslin, 1993).
-
- Gandelsonas, Mario, *X-Urbanism: Architecture and the American City* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999).
- Garnett, Jr., Christopher Browne, *The Kantian Philosophy of Space* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939).
- Garvan, Anthony N. B., *Architecture and Town Planning in Colonial Connecticut* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951).
- Gaskell, Ivan, *Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Painting* (London: Philip Wilson Publishers Ltd., 1990).
- Gaskell, Ivan, *The Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection: Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Painting* (London: Philip Wilson Publishers Ltd., 1990).
- Gay, Peter, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation. The Rise of Modern Paganism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1968).
- Gelder, Jan Jacob de, *Bartholomeus van der Helst: een studie van zijn werk, zijn levensgeschiedenis, een beschrijvende catalogus van zijn oeuvre, een register en 41 afbeeldingen naar schilderijen* (Rotterdam: W. L. & J. Brusse's Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1921).
- Gelder, Roelof van, ed., *The Birth of New York: Nieuw Amsterdam 1624-1664*, tr. Gary Schwartz (Amsterdam: The Municipal Archives and The Amsterdam Historical Museum, 1982).

- Gellinek, Christian, *Hugo Grotius* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1983).
- Gerard, James W., *The Old Streets of New York Under the Dutch*, a paper read before the New York Historical Society, June 2nd, 1874 (New York: F. B. Patterson, 1875).
- Gerard, James W., *The Old Stadt Huys of New Amsterdam*, a paper read before the New York Historical Society, June 15th, 1875 (New York: F. B. Patterson, 1875).
- Gernsheim, Helmut, *The History of Photography: From the Earliest Use of the Camera Obscura in the Eleventh Century up to 1914* (London: Oxford University Press, 1955).
- Geyl, Pieter, *The Netherlands Divided, 1609-1648*, tr. S. T. Bindoff (London: Williams & Norgate, 1936).
- Geyl, Pieter, *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century: Part One, 1609-1648* (London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1961).
- Gheyn II, Jacob de, *Wapenhandelinghe van roers musquetten ende spiessen* (The Hague, 1607).
- Gibson, Walter S., *Pleasant Places: The Rustic Landscape from Bruegel to Ruisdael* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- Gierke, Otto, *Natural Law and the Theory of Society, 1500 to 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950).
- Gilbert, William, *Tractatus, Sive Physiologia Nova de Magnete* (etc.) (Sedini: Typis Gotzianis, 1633).
- Giltay, J. and G. Jansen, eds., *Perspectieven: Saenredam en de architectuurschilders van de 17e eeuw* (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, 1991).
- Ginoux, M. Ch., *Jacques Rigaud: Dessinateur et Graveur Marseillais* (Paris: Typographie de E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, 1898).
- Glacken, Clarence J., *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967).
- Gnudi, Martha Teach, ed. and tr., *The Various and Ingenious Machines of Agostino Ramelli: A Classic Sixteenth-Century Illustrated Treatise on Technology* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1987).
- Goodfriend, Joyce D., *Before the Melting Pot: Society and Culture in Colonial New York City, 1664-1730* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).
- Goodman, Anthony and Angus MacKay, eds., *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe* (London: Longman, 1990).

- Goodrich, Samuel Griswold, *The First Book of History, Combined with Geography* (etc.), Revised and Improved Edition, with important additions (Boston: Jenks, Hickling & Swan, 1852).
- Goodrich, Samuel Griswold, *Peter Parley's Method of Telling about Geography to Children* (New York: F. J. Huntington & Co., 1838).
- Goodrich, Samuel Griswold, *A Pictorial History of America: Embracing both the northern and southern portions of the new world* (Hartford, CT: House & Brown, 1848).
- Goodrich, Samuel Griswold, *Tales about Europe, Asia, Africa, and America / by Peter Parley*, 5th ed. (London: Printed for T. Tegg, 1842).
- Goodwin, Maud Wilder, Alice Carrington Royce and Ruth Putnam, eds., *Historic New York: Being the first series of the Half Moon papers* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897).
- Goodwin, Maud Wilder, Alice Carrington Royce, Ruth Putnam and Eva Palmer Brownell, eds., *Historic New York: Being the second series of the Half Moon papers* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899).
- Goslinga, Cornelis Ch., *The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580-1680* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1971).
- Goslinga, Cornelis Ch., *A Short History of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1979).
- Gottdiener, Mark, *Postmodern Semiotics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995).
- Gottdiener, Mark and Alexandros Ph. Lagopoulos, eds., *The City and the Sign: An Introduction to Urban Semiotics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).
- Grafton, Anthony, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).
- Grafton, Anthony, *Leon Battista Alberti* (London: Allen Lane, 2000).
- Green, Lucy Garrison, *The De Forests and the Walloon Founding of New Amsterdam* (etc.) (Lincoln, NE: Privately Printed, 1916).
- Greenblatt, Stephen, *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- Greenblatt, Stephen, ed., *New World Encounters* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
- Greene, Evarts B. and Richard B. Morris, *A Guide to the Principal Sources for Early American History (1600-1800) in the City of New York*, 2nd ed., rev. Richard B. Morris (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953).

- Greene, Jack P., *The Intellectual Construction of America: Exceptionalism and Identity from 1492 to 1800* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
- Greene, Jack P., *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988).
- Griffiths, Antony, *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689* (London: British Museum Press, 1998).
- Groce, George C. and David H. Wallace, *The New-York Historical Society's Dictionary of Artists in America, 1564-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969).
- Grotius, Hugo, *The Freedom of the Seas; or, the right which belongs to the Dutch to take part in the East Indian trade*, ed. James Brown Scott, tr. Ralph van Deman Magoffin (New York, 1916).
- Grotius, Hugo, *On the Origin of the Native Races of America: A Dissertation*, tr. Edmund Goldsmid (Edinburgh: Privately Printed, 1884).
- Grotius, Hugo, *The Rights of War and Peace, including The Law of Nature and of Nations*, tr. A. C. Campbell (New York: M. Walter Dunne, Publisher, 1901).
- Grünsteudel, Günther, Günter Hägele and Rudolf Frankenberger, eds., *Augsburger Stadtlexikon* (Augsburg: Perlach Verlag, 1998).
- Gutkind, Erwin Anton, *International History of City Development, Vol. 5: Urban Development in Western Europe: France and Belgium* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1970).
- Gutkind, Erwin Anton, *International History of City Development, Vol. 6: Urban Development in Western Europe: The Netherlands and Great Britain* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1971).
- Haakonssen, Knud, *Natural Law and Moral Philosophy: From Grotius to the Scottish Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Hale, J. R., *Renaissance Fortification: Art or Engineering?* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).
- Hall, Elton W., ed., *American Maritime Prints* (Dartmouth, MA: The Old Dartmouth Historical Society, 1985).
- Hall, Peter, *Cities in Civilization: Culture, Innovation, and Urban Order* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1998).

- Hamilton, Sinclair, *Early American Book Illustrators and Wood Engravers 1670-1870*, 2 vols. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968).
- Hammond, John H., *The Camera Obscura: A Chronicle* (Bristol: Adam Hilger Ltd., 1981).
- Hampson, Norma, *The Enlightenment* (London: Penguin Books, 1976).
- Harari, Josue V., *Scenarios of the Imaginary: Theorizing the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).
- Harley, J. B. and David Woodward, eds., *The History of Cartography, Volume 1: Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
- Harley, J. B., *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*, ed. Paul Laxton (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).
- Harline, Craig E., *Pamphlets, Printing, and Political Culture in the Early Dutch Republic* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987).
- Harris, John, *The History of Kent* (etc.) (London: D. Midwinter, 1719).
- Hart, Simon, *The Prehistory of the New Netherland Company: Amsterdam Notarial Records of the First Dutch Voyages to the Hudson* (Amsterdam: City of Amsterdam Press, 1959).
- Hart, Vaughan and Peter Hicks, eds., *Paper Palaces: The Rise of the Renaissance Architectural Treatise* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
- Hartgers, Joost, *Beschrijvinghe van Virginia, Nieuw Nederlandt, Nieuw Engelandt, en d'Eylanden Bermudes, Barbados, en S. Christoffel* (etc.) (Amsterdam, 1651).
- Hartgers, Joost, *Oost en Westindische Voyagien* (etc.) (Amsterdam, 1648).
- Haskell, Daniel Carl, ed., *Manhattan Maps: A Co-operative List* (New York: The New York Public Library, 1931).
- Haviland, Virginia and Margaret N. Coughlan, eds., *Yankee Doodle's Literary Sampler of Prose, Poetry, and Pictures: Being an Anthology of Diverse Works Published for the Edification and/or Entertainment of Young Readers in America Before 1900* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974).
- Hawks, Francis Lister, *Uncle Philip's Conversations with Young Persons: History of New York, Vol. 1* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1834).
- Hays, K. Michael, ed., *Architecture Theory since 1968* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2000).
- Hazard, Samuel, *Annals of Pennsylvania, from the Discovery of the Delaware, 1609-1682* (Philadelphia: Hazard and Mitchell, 1850).
- Hexham, Henry, *The First Part of the Principles of the Art Military* (etc.), 2nd ed. (Delft, 1642).

- Hindle, Brooke, *Technology in Early America: Needs and Opportunities for Study* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966).
- Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Hockney, David, *Secret Knowledge: Rediscovering the Lost Techniques of the Old Masters* (London: Thames & Hudson Ltd., 2001).
- Hoetink, Hans R., ed., *Dutch Painting of the Golden Age from the Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis* (The Hague: Johan Maurits van Nassau Foundation, 1982).
- Hoffman, Ross J. S., ed., *Edmund Burke, New York Agent, with his letters to the New York Assembly, and intimate correspondence with Charles O'Hara, 1761-1776* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956).
- Hofman, W., et al., *Historische plattegronden van Nederlandse steden*, 8 vols. (Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto, 1978-).
- Hollier, Denis, *Against Architecture: The Writings of George Bataille*, tr. Betsy Wing (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1998).
- Hollstein, Friedrich Wilhelm Heinrich, *Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, ca. 1450-1700* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1949-).
- Hollstein, Friedrich Wilhelm Heinrich, *German Engravings, Etchings and Woodcuts ca. 1400-1700* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1954-).
- Hollyer, Samuel, *Old New York Views*, 2 vols. (New York: Privately Printed, 1905-1912).
- Hondius, Henrik, *Architectur oder Bawmeisterschafft* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Jan Janszon, 1628).
- Hondius, Henrik, *Beschryvinge vande begraefnisse* (etc.) (The Hague: H. Hondius, 1615).
- Hondius, Henrik, *Breve Instruction des Règles de la Géométrie fort utile et nécessaire à la Perspective et Architecture militaire, ou Fortification* (The Hague, 1625).
- Hondius, Henrik, *Les Cinq Rangs de l'Architecture* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Jean Janson, 1617).
- Hondius, Henrik, *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium, præcipue?* (The Hague: 'ex officina Henrici Hondii, 1610).
- Honour, Hugh, *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discoveries to the Present Time* (London: Allen Lane, 1975).
- Horkheimer, Max, *Eclipse of Reason* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).
- Hullung, Mark, *The Autocritique of Enlightenment* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).

- Hume, David, *The Philosophical Works of David Hume*, 4 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1854).
- Huppert, George, *The Style of Paris: Renaissance Origins of the French Enlightenment* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).
- Hyde, Ralph, *A Prospect of Britain: The Town Panoramas of Samuel and Nathaniel Buck* (London: Pavilion Books Limited, 1994).
- Impey, Oliver and Arthur MacGregor, eds., *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Innes, John H., *New Amsterdam and Its People* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902).
- Irving, Washington, *A History of New York* (etc.) (London: J. Murray, 1824).
- Irving, Washington, *A History of New York* (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1850).
- Irving, Washington, *A History of New York, From the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch Dynasty*, in Washington Irving, *History, Tales and Sketches*, ed. James W. Tuttleton (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1983).
- Irving, Washington, *A History of New York*, ed. Michael L. Black and Nancy B. Black (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1984).
- Israel, Jonathan I., *Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 1585-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).
- Israel, Jonathan I., *The Dutch Republic and the Hispanic World, 1606-1661* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).
- Israel, Jonathan I., *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
- Israel, Jonathan I., *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Jackson, Kenneth T., ed., *The Encyclopedia of New York City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Jacobs, Jaap, *Een zegenrijk gewest: Nieuw-Nederland in de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Prometheus. B. Bakker, 1999).

- Jameson, J. Franklin, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953).
- Jaray, Cornell, *Historic Chronicles of New Amsterdam, Colonial New York and Early Long Island*, 2 vols. (Port Washington, NY: Ira J. Friedman, 1968).
- Johnson, Allen, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929).
- Johnson, Allen, ed., *Dutch and Quakers*, Volume 5: The Chronicles of America Series (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919).
- Johnston, Alexander, *A History of the United States for Schools* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1889).
- Jones, Howard Mumford, *O Strange New World, American Culture: The Formative Years* (New York: The Viking Press, 1964).
- Jong, S. de and J. Schipper, *Gebouwd in de Zaanstreek* (Wormerveer: Stichting Uitgeverij Noord-Holland, 1987).
- Jongh, E. de, *Portretten van echt en trouw: Huwelijk en gezin in de Nederlandse kunst van de zeventiende eeuw* (Zwolle: Uitgeverij Waanders, 1986).
- Jongh, E. de, *Questions of Meaning: Theme and Motif in Dutch Seventeenth-Century Painting*, ed. and tr. Michael Hoyle (Leiden: Primavera Press, 2000).
-
- Kammen, Michael, *Colonial New York: A History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Kant, Immanuel, *The Critique of Judgement*, tr. James Creed Meredith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952).
- Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta, *The Mastery of Nature: Aspects of Art, Science, and Humanism in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
- Keller, Albert G., *A Theatre of Machines* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1964).
- Kelley, Wyn, *Melville's City: Literary and Urban Form in Nineteenth-Century New York* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Kerling, J. B. J., *A Catalogue of Rare Dutch Pamphlets Relating to New-Netherland and to the Dutch West-and East-India Companies and to Its Possessions in Brazil/Angolo/etc. (etc.)*, auction catalogue (The Hague: Van Stockum's Antiquariat, 1911).
- Kim, Sung Bok, *Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1664-1775* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978).

- Kircher, Athanasius, *A. Kircheri . . . Ars magna Lucis et Umbrae in decem libros digesta* (etc.), 2 vols. (Rome, 1646).
- Klein, Robert, *Form and Meaning: Essays on the Renaissance and Modern Art* (New York: The Viking Press, 1979).
- Klooster, Wim, *The Dutch in the Americas 1600-1800* (Providence, RI: The John Carter Brown Library, 1997).
- Koeman, Cornelis, *Atlantes Neerlandici. Bibliography of Terrestrial, Maritime and Celestial Atlases and Pilot Books published in the Netherlands up to 1880*, 5 vols. (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1969-1971).
- Koolhaas, Rem, *Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 1994).
- Kostof, Spiro, *The City Shaped: Urban Patterns and Meanings Through History* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1991).
- Kouwenhoven, John A., *The Columbia Historical Portrait of New York* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1953).
- Kraus, Rosalind E., *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1986).
- Krewson, Margrit B., *New Netherland 1609-1664: A Selective Bibliography* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1995).
- Krieger, Alex and David Cobb with Amy Turner, eds., *Mapping Boston* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1999).
- Kruft, Hanno-Walter, *A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present*, tr. Ronald Taylor, et al. (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994).
- Krull, Ebba, *Franz Xaver Habermann (1721-1796): Ein Augsburger Ornamentist des Rokoko* (Augsburg: Verlag Hieronymus Mühlberger, 1977).
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl, ed., *America in European Consciousness, 1493-1750* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1995).
- Kuyper, W., *Dutch Classicist Architecture: A Survey of Dutch Architecture, Gardens and Anglo-Dutch Architectural Relations from 1625 to 1700* (Delft: Delft University Press, 1980).
- Kuyper, W., *The Triumphant Entry of Renaissance Architecture into the Netherlands: The Joyeuse Entrée of Philip of Spain into Antwerp in 1549, Renaissance and Mannerist Architecture in the Low Countries from 1530 to 1630*, 2 vols. (Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto, 1994).

- Lacan, Jacques, *Ecrits: A Selection*, tr. Alan Sheridan (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1977).
- Lacan, Jacques, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, tr. Alan Sheridan (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1981).
- Laer, Arnold Johan Ferdinand van, ed. and tr., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626* (San Marino: The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1924).
- Laer, Arnold Johan Ferdinand van, ed. and tr., *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts: being the letters of Kiliaen Van Rensselaer, 1630-1643, and other documents relating to the colony of Rensselaerswyck* (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1908).
- Laet, Johannes de, *De Nieuwe Wereldt ofte Beschrijvinghe van West-Indien* (etc.), 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1630).
- Laet, Johannes de, *Histoire ofte Iaerlijck Verhael van de Verrichtinghen der Geoctroyeerde West-Indische Compagnie* (Leiden: Bonaventuer ende Abraham Elsevier, 1644).
- Laet, Johannes de, *L'Histoire du Nouveau Monde ou Description des Indes Occidentales* (Leiden: Chez B. & A. Elseuiers, 1640).
- Lakerveld, Carry van, ed., *The Dutch Cityscape in the Seventeenth Century and Its Sources* (Bentveld-Aerdenhout: Uitgeverij Landshoff, 1977).
- Lamb, Martha J., *History of the City of New York: Its Origin, Rise, and Progress*, 2 vols. (New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1877-1880).
- Lambert, Audrey M., *The Making of the Dutch Landscape: An Historical Geography of the Netherlands* (London: Seminar Press, 1971).
- Laugier, Abbé Marc-Antoine, *Essai sur l'Architecture* (Paris, 1755).
- Lawall, David B., *Asher Brown Durand: His Art and Art Theory in Relation to His Times* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977).
- Law, Ernest, *The Royal Gallery of Hampton Court Illustrated* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1898).
- Lawrence, Richard Hoe, *Catalogue of the Engravings Issued by the Society of Iconophiles of the City of New York, MDCCCXCIV-MCMVIII* (New York: The Society of Iconophiles, 1908).
- Lawrence, Richard Hoe and Otto Hufeland, *Valentine's Manuals: A General Index to the Manuals of the Corporation of the City of New York, 1841-1870* (Harrison, NY: Harbor Hill Books, 1981).

- Leach, Neil, ed., *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- Le Corbusier, *The City of To-morrow and Its Planning*, tr. Frederick Etchells (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1987).
- Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space*, tr. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1998).
- Leiby, Adrian C., *The Early Dutch and Swedish Settlers of New Jersey* (Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964).
- Leonard, John William, *History of the City of New York 1609-1909* (etc.) (New York: The Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, 1910).
- Library of Congress, *American Printmaking Before 1876: Fact, Fiction, and Fantasy* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1975).
- Locke, John, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Roger Woolhouse (London: Penguin Books, 1997).
- Locke, John, *Political Essays*, ed. Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Lossing, Benson John, *History of New York City, Embracing an Outline Sketch of Events from 1609 to 1830, and a Full Account of Its Development from 1830 to 1884*, 2 vols. (New York: The Perine Engraving and Publishing Co., 1884).
- Luijten, Ger and Ariane van Suchtelen, et al., eds., *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 1993).
- Liotard, Jean-François, *Discours, Figure* (Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1978).
-
- MacCoun, Townsend, *Early New York* (New York: Townsend MacCoun, 1909).
- McDowell, John, *Mind and World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, *The Discourses*, tr. Leslie J. Walker (London: Penguin Books, 1998).
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, *The Prince*, tr. George Bull (London: Penguin Books, 1995).
- MacLaren, Neil, *The Dutch School, 1600-1900*, 2 vols., rev. Christopher Brown (London: The National Gallery, 1991).
- McManus, Blanche, *How the Dutch Came to Manhattan* (New York: E. R. Herrick & Co., 1897).
- McNeill, John T., *The History and Character of Calvinism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954).

- Maggi, Girolamo and Jacomo Fusto Castriotto, *Della Fortificatione delle Città* (etc.) (Venice, 1564).
- Mahony, Bertha E., Louise Payson Latimer and Beulah Folmsbee, eds., *Illustrators of Children's Books, 1744-1945* (Boston: The Horn Book Inc., 1961).
- Manuel, Frank E. and Fritzie P. Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1979).
- Marchi, Francesco de, *Della Architettura militare* (etc.) (Brescia, 1599).
- Marin, Louis, *Utopics: Spatial Play*, tr. Robert A. Vollrath (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press Inc., 1984).
- Marle, Raimond van, *Hoorn au Moyen-Age* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1910).
- Marolois, Samuel, *The Art of Fortification, or Architecture Militaire* (etc.), rev. Albert Girard, tr. Henry Hexham (Amsterdam: M. John Johnson, 1638).
- Marolois, Samuel, *Fortification; das ist, Vestung-Bauw, in kriegszeiten, so wol zur offension als zur defension zu gebrauchen* (etc.) (Amsterdam, 1627).
- Marshall, D. R., *Viviano and Niccolo Codazzi and the Baroque Architectural* (Milan: Jande Sapi Editore, 1993).
- Marx, Leo, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Matson, Cathy, *Merchants and Empire: Trading in Colonial New York* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
- May, Henry F., *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).
- Mee, Arthur, ed., *The Children's Encyclopedia*, 10 vols. (London: The Educational Book Company Limited, 1925).
- Meinig, Donald William, *The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective on 500 Years of History, Volume 1: Atlantic America, 1492-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).
- Meisner, Daniel, *Thesaurus Philo-Politicus*, 7 vols. (Frankfurt, 1625).
- Merian, Matthaeus, *Topographia Westphaliae* (Frankfurt am Main, 1647).
- Merwick, Donna, *Death of a Notary: Conquest and Change in Colonial New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).
- Merwick, Donna, *Possessing Albany, 1630-1710: The Dutch and English Experiences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Mettrie, Julien Offray de la, *Machine Man and Other Writings*, ed. and tr. Ann Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

- Metropolitan Museum of Art, *American Paintings & Historical Prints from the Middendorf Collection: A Catalogue of an Exhibition* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1967).
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Roland E. Murphy, eds., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Metzmacher, Gerhard and Heinz Reuber, *Unsere Stadt - gestern und heute. Wesel* (Cologne: Steimel Verlag, 1957).
- Mézierès, Nicolas Le Camus de, *The Genius of Architecture; or, The Analogy of That Art with Our Sensations*, intro. Robin Middleton (Santa Monica: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1992).
- Millar, Oliver, *The Later Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, 2 vols. (London: Phaidon, 1969).
- Miller, Perry, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1956).
- Miller, Perry, *The Raven and the Whale: Poe, Melville, and the New York Literary Scene* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
- Miller, Rev. John, *A Description of the Province and City of New York* (etc.) (London, 1843).
- Millon, Henry A., ed., *The Triumph of the Baroque: Architecture in Europe 1600-1750* (Milan: Bompiani, 1999).
- Minici, Carlo Alberto Zotti, *Il Mondo Nuovo: Le meraviglie della visione dal '700 alla nascita del cinema* (Milan: Mazzotta, 1988).
- Montaigne, Michel de, *The Complete Essays*, tr. M. A. Screech (London: Penguin Books, 1991).
- Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*, tr. Anne M. Cohler, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- More, Thomas, *Libellus vere aureus nec minus salutaris quam festivus de optimo reip. statu. deque nova insula Utopia* (Louvain: Thierry Martens, 1516).
- More, Thomas, *Utopia*, tr. Paul Turner (London: Penguin Books, 1965).
- Mott, Frank Luther, *A History of American Magazines, 1741-1850* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957).
- Mott, Frank Luther, *A History of American Magazines, 1850-1865* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957).
- Mott, Frank Luther, *A History of American Magazines, 1865-1885* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957).
- Mott, Frank Luther, *A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957).

- Mumford, Lewis, *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects* (San Diego: Harcourt, Inc., 1961).
- Mumford, Lewis, *The Culture of Cities* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1970).
- Museum of the City of New York, *New York Begins: A Rare Drawing of New Amsterdam, c. 1650*, exhibition script (New York, 1998).
- New York Commercial Tercentenary Commission, *The Commercial Tercentenary of New York, 1614-1914* (New York: The New York Commercial Tercentenary Commission, 1914).
- New-York Historical Society, *American Landscape and Genre Paintings in the New-York Historical Society*, 3 vols. (New York: NYHS with G. K. Hall, 1982).
- New York Public Library, Research Libraries Staff, *Dictionary Catalog of Materials on New York City*, 3 vols. (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1977).
- Nicolson, Benedict, *John Hamilton Mortimer ARA, 1740-1779: Paintings, Drawings and Prints* (London: Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art, 1968).
- Nieuhof, Jan, *L'Ambassade de la Compagnie Orientale des Provinces Unies vers l'Empereur de la Chine* (etc.) (Leiden: J. de Meurs, 1665).
- Nieuhof, Jan, *An Embassy from the East-India Company of the United Provinces to the Grand Tartar Cham Emperour of China* (etc.) (London: J. Macock, 1669).
- Nieuhof, Jan, *Gedenckwaerdige Zee-en Lant-Reize door de voornaemste Landschappen van West en Oost Indien* (Amsterdam, 1682).
- Nieuhof, Jan, *Het Gezantschap der Neêrlandtsche Oost-Indische Compagnie, aan den grooten Tartarischen Cham, Den tegenwoordigen Keizer van China* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Jacob van Meurs, 1665).
- Nobbs, Douglas, *Theocracy and Toleration: A Study of the Disputes in Dutch Calvinism from 1600 to 1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).
- Nooter, Eric and Patricia U. Bonomi, eds., *Colonial Dutch Studies: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (New York: New York University Press, 1988).

- O'Brien, Karen, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- O'Callaghan, Edmund Bailey, *The Documentary History of the State of New-York*, 4 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons & Co., 1849).
- O'Callaghan, Edmund Bailey, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, 11 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, Printers, 1856-1861).
- O'Callaghan, Edmund Bailey, *History of New Netherland; or, New York under the Dutch*, 2 vols. (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1845).
- O'Callaghan, Edmund Bailey, ed. and tr., *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland, 1638-1674* (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company Printers, 1868).
- O'Callaghan, Edmund Bailey, *The Register of New Netherland, 1626-1674* (Albany: J. Munsell, 1865).
- Ockman, Joan, ed., *Architecture Culture 1943-1968: A Documentary Anthology* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1993).
- Oers, Ron van, *Dutch Town Planning Overseas during VOC and WIC Rule, 1600-1800* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2000).
- Oestreich, Gerhard, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich and H. G. Koenigsberger, tr. David McLintock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- Ortelius, Abraham, *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (Antwerp: Ægid. Coppenium Diesth, 1570).
- Outram, Dorinda, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Ozanne, Nicolas Marie, *Marine Militaire* (etc.) (Paris: Chereau, 1762).
-
- Paas, John Roger and Bernd Wißner, eds., *Augsburg, die Bilderfabrik Europas* (Augsburg: Wißner-Verlag, 2001).
- Page, Max, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900-1940* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999).
- Palissy, Bernard, *Recepte Véritable* (etc.) (Paris, 1636).
- Panofsky, Erwin, *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*, 4th ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955).
- Panofsky, Erwin, *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (London: Penguin Books, 1993).
- Panofsky, Erwin, *Perspective as Symbolic Form* (New York: Zone Books, 1991).

- Parkinson, George Henry Radcliffe, ed., *The Renaissance and Seventeenth-century Rationalism* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- Parrington, Vernon Louis, *Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920*, Volume One, 1620-1800: The Colonial Mind (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1927-1931).
- Paulding, James, *Affairs and Men of New Amsterdam in the Time of Governor Peter Stuyvesant* (New York: C. C. Childs, 1843).
- Penn, William, *A Letter from William Penn Proprietary and Governour of Pennsylvania in America, to the Committee of the Free Society of Traders of That Province, Residing in London* (etc) (London: Andrew Sowle, 1683).
- Pepper, Simon and Nicholas Adams, *Firearms and Fortifications: Military Architecture and Siege Warfare in Sixteenth-Century Siena* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).
- Pérez-Gómez, Alberto and Louise Pelletier, *Architectural Representation and the Perspective Hinge* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997).
- Pérez-Gómez, Alberto, *Architecture and the Crisis of Modern Science* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1983).
- Persons, Stow, *American Minds: A History of Ideas* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958).
- Peters, Harry Twyford, *America on Stone* (etc.) (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1931).
- Pierce, Carl Horton, *New Harlem, Past and Present: The Story of an Amazing Civic Wrong, Now at Last to be Righted* (New York: New Harlem Publishing Company, 1903).
- Plante, Franciscus, *Francisi Plante Brugensis Mauritiados libri xii. . . poetica* (Leiden, 1647).
- Plato, *The Republic*, 2nd rev. ed., tr. Desmond Lee (London: Penguin Books, 1987).
- Pollak, Martha D., *Military Architecture, Cartography and the Representation of the Early Modern European City: A Checklist of Treatises on Fortification in the Newberry Library* (Chicago: Newberry Library, 1991).
- Pollak, Martha D., *Turin 1564-1680, Urban Design, Military Culture, and the Creation of the Absolutist Capital* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991).
- Popple, Henry, *A Map of the British Empire in America with the French and Spanish settlements adjacent thereto* (London, 1733).
- Prange, Peter, *Salomon Kleiner 1700-1761 zum 300. Geburtstag* (Salzburg: Salzburger Barockmuseum, 2000).

- Prange, Peter, *Salomon Kleiner und die Kunst des Architekturprospekts* (Augsburg: Dr. Bernd Wißner, 1997).
- Price, J. L., *Culture and Society in the Dutch Republic During the Seventeenth Century* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1974).
- Raesly, Ellis Lawrence, *Portrait of New Netherland* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945).
- Rahe, Paul Anthony, *Republics Ancient and Modern: Classical Republicanism and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
- Ramelli, Agostino, *Le Diverse et Artificiose Machine* (etc.) (Paris, 1588).
- Ramirez, Jan Seidler, ed., *Painting the Town: Cityscapes of New York* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).
- Ramusio, Giovanni Battista, *Primo volume & seconda edizione delle Navigazioni et Viaggi* (etc.), 3 vols. (Venice: Nella stamperia de Giunti, 1554-1559).
- Redgrave, Samuel, *A Dictionary of Artists of the English School: Painters, Sculptors, Architects, Engravers, and Ornamentists* (London, 1874).
- Regt, Herman C. D. G. de, *Representing the World by Scientific Theories: The Case for Scientific Realism* (Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, 1994).
- Religious Tract Society, *The Picture Gallery of the Nations* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1870).
- Renger, Konrad, *Adriaen Brouwer und das niederländische Bauerngenre 1600-1660* (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1986).
- Rensselaer, Kiliaen van, *The Van Rensselaer Manor* (etc.) (Baltimore, 1917).
- Rensselaer, Mariana Griswold van, *Accents as Well as Broad Effects: Writings on Architecture, Landscape, and the Environment, 1876-1925*, ed. David Gebhard (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).
- Rensselaer, Mariana Griswold van, *History of the City of New York in the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909).
- Reps, John William, *The Making of Urban America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965).
- Reps, John William, *North American Views and Viewmakers: A Union Catalogue of Lithographic Prints of Cities and Towns, 1834-1926* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984).

- Reynolds, Donald Martin, *The Architecture of New York City: Histories and Views of Important Structures, Sites & Symbols*, rev. ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1994).
- Richter, Jean Paul, ed., *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).
- Richter, Melvin, *The Political Theory of Montesquieu* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- Riegl, Alois, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, intro. Wolfgang Kemp, tr. Evelyn M. Kain and David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999).
- Riley, Isaac Woodbridge, *American Philosophy: The Early Schools* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1958).
- Riley, Isaac Woodbridge, *American Thought from Puritanism to Pragmatism and Beyond*, 2nd ed. (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1915).
- Ringe, Donald A., *The Pictorial Mode: Space & Time in the Art of Bryant, Irving & Cooper* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1971).
- Rink, Oliver A., *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).
- Ripa, Cesare, *Baroque and Rococo Pictorial Imagery*, ed. Edward A. Maser (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971).
- Rock, Howard B. and Deborah Dash Moore, *Cityscapes: A History of New York in Images* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).
- Roosevelt, Theodore, *New York* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891).
- Rorty, Amelie Oksenberg, *Mind in Action: Essays in the Philosophy of Mind* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988).
- Rosenau, Helen, *The Ideal City: Its Architectural Evolution in Europe*, 3rd ed. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1983).
- Rosenberg, Jakob, Seymour Slive and E. H. ter Kuile, *Dutch Art and Architecture, 1600 to 1800* (London: Penguin Books, 1966).
- Rossi, Aldo, *The Architecture of the City*, tr. Diane Ghirardo and Joan Ockman (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1984).
- Rossi, Aldo, *A Scientific Autobiography*, tr. Lawrence Venuti (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1981).
- Rossi, Paolo, *Francis Bacon: From Magic to Science*, tr. Sacha Rabinovitch (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968).
- Roth, Martin, *Comedy and America: The Lost World of Washington Irving* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1976).

- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Confessions*, tr. J. M. Cohen (London: Penguin Books, 1953).
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Discourses and other early political writings*, tr. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Social Contract*, tr. Maurice Cranston (London: Penguin Books, 1968).
- Ruelens, Ch., et al., *Atlas des villes de la Belgique au XVI siècle. Cent plans du Géographe Jacques de Deventer* (Brussels: Institut National de Géographie, 1884-1924).
- Rykwert, Joseph, *On Adam's House in Paradise: The Idea of the Primitive Hut in Architectural History* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1972).
- Rykwert, Joseph, *The First Moderns: The Architects of the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1991).
- Rykwert, Joseph, *The Idea of a Town: The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1976).
- Said, Edward W., *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994).
- Said, Edward W., *Ornamentalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).
- Said, Edward W., *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).
- Saunders, Jason Lewis, *Justus Lipsius, The Philosophy of Renaissance Stoicism* (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1955).
- Schaer, Roland, Gregory Claeys and Lyman Tower Sargent, eds., *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World* (New York: The New York Public Library, 2000).
- Schaffer, Daniel, ed., *Two Centuries of American Planning* (London: Mansell, 1987).
- Schama, Simon, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (London: Fontana Press, 1991).
- Scheele, Friedrich, *Rrrr! Ein ander Bild! Guckkastenblätter des 18. Jahrhunderts aus der graphischen Sammlung* (Oldenburg: Isensee Verlag, 1999).
- Scheiner, Christophorus, *Rosa Ursina, sive, Sol ex admirando facularum et macularum suarum phaenomeno varius necnon* (etc.) (Bracciani, 1630).
- Scheurleer, Th. H. Lunsingh and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes, eds., *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

- Schilder, Gunther and Jan van Bracht, *The Origins of New York* (Zurich: Edition Seefeld, 1988).
- Schlereth, Thomas John, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume and Voltaire* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977).
- Schneider, Herbert Wallace, *A History of American Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946).
- Schmidt, Benjamin, *Innocence Abroad: The Dutch Imagination and the New World, 1570-1670* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Schwartz, Hillel, *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles* (New York: Zone Books, 1996).
- Schwartz, Marvin D., *The Jan Martense Schenck House* (Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1964).
- Scott, Kenneth and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *New York Historical Manuscripts Dutch*, 4 vols., tr. Arnold Johan Ferdinand van Laer (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1974).
- Ségal, Georges B. and Alain F. Moirandat, *Bücher und dekorative Graphik aus vier Jahrhunderten, 1500-1900*, Auction in den Räumen von Antiquités M. & G. Ségal, Basel, 4 and 5 December 1997.
- Serlio, Sebastiano, *Tutte l'opere d'architettura di Sebastiano Serlio* (etc.) (Vicenza: Giacomo de' Franceschi, 1618).
- Shadwell, Wendy J., *American Printmaking: The First 150 Years* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1969).
- Shepherd, William Robert, *The Story of New Amsterdam* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926).
- Short, John Rennie, *Representing the Republic: Mapping the United States, 1600-1900* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001).
- Sitte, Camillo, *The Art of Building Cities: City Building According to Its Artistic Fundamentals*, tr. Charles T. Stewart (New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1945).
- Skelton, R. A. and A. O. Vietor, eds., *Mirror of the World: A Series of Early Books on the History of Urbanization. Braun & Hogenberg: Civitates Orbis Terrarum*, 4 vols., intro. R. A. Skelton (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1966).
- Slive, Seymour, *Dutch Painting, 1600-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

- Smith, George L., *Religion and Trade in New Netherland: Dutch Origins and American Development* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973).
- Smith, William A. M., *The History of the Province of New York from the First Discovery to the Year 1757*, 2 vols., ed. Michael Kammen (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1972).
- Snyder, Martin P., *City of Independence: Views of Philadelphia Before 1800* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975).
- Sousa-Leão, Joaquim de, *Frans Post, 1612-1680* (Amsterdam: A. L. van Gendt & Co., 1973).
- Spann, Edward K., *Ideals and Politics: New York Intellectuals and Liberal Democracy, 1820-1880* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1972).
- Specklin, Daniel, *Architectura von Vestungen* (etc.) (Strasbourg, 1589).
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge Kegan & Paul, 1988).
- Stafford, Barbara Maria and Frances Terpak, *Devices of Wonder: From the World in a Box to Images on a Screen* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2001).
- Stapel, Leonore, *Perspectieven van de stad: over bronnen, populariteit en functie van het zeventiende-eeuwse stadsgezicht* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2000).
- Stauffer, David McNeely, *American Engravers upon Copper and Steel*, 2 vols. (New York: The Grolier Club of the City of New York, 1907).
- Stayton, Kevin L., *Dutch by Design: Tradition and Change in Two Historic Brooklyn Houses* (New York: Phaidon Universe, 1990).
- Stechow, Wolfgang, *Dutch Landscape Painting of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1966).
- Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, *Catalogus van de schilderijen en tekeningen* (Leiden: Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal, 1983).
- Stevens, Henry, *Recollections of Mr. James Lenox of New York and the Formation of His Library* (London: Henry Stevens & Son, 1886).
- Stevenson, Edward Luther, *Willem Janszoon Blaeu, 1571-1638: A Sketch of His Life and Work* (New York: The Hispanic Society of America, 1914).
- Stevin, Simon, *Castrametatio, dat is Legermeting* (etc.) (Rotterdam: Jan van Waesberghe, 1617).
- Stevin, Simon, *Materiae politicae* (etc.) (Leiden: A. Rosenboom, 1649).
- Stevin, Simon, *De sterckenbouwing* (etc.) (Frankfurt am Main: Hartman Palthenium, in Verlegung der Hulsischen, 1623).
- Stokes, Isaac Newton Phelps, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1915-1928).

- Stokes, Isaac Newton Phelps, *New York Past and Present: Its History and Landmarks, 1524-1939* (New York, 1939).
- Stokes, Isaac Newton Phelps and Daniel Carl Haskell, *American Historical Prints: Early Views of American Cities, etc. from the Phelps Stokes and Other Collections* (New York: The New York Public Library, 1932).
- Stott, Annette, *Holland Mania: The Unknown Dutch Period in American Art and Culture* (Woodstock, NY: Overlook Press, 1998).
- Strehler, Giorgio, *La camera dei sortilegi: Autoritratto di una società nei diorami teatrali del '700* (Milan: Electa Spa, 1987).
- Struik, Dirk J., *The Land of Stevin and Huygens: A Sketch of Science and Technology in the Dutch Republic during the Golden Century* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1981).
- Strutt, Joseph, *A Biographical Dictionary: Containing an historical account of all the engravers, from the earliest period of the art of engraving to the present time*, 2 vols. (London: J. Davis, 1785).
- Summerson, John, *Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).
- Sutton, Peter C., *Dutch and Flemish Seventeenth-Century Paintings: The Harold Samuel Collection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Sutton, Peter C., *Masters of Seventeenth-Century Dutch Landscape Painting* (London: Herbert, 1987).
- Sutton, Peter C., *Pieter de Hooch, 1629-1684* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
- Tafuri, Manfredo, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, tr. Barbara Luigia La Penta (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1976).
- Tafuri, Manfredo, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, tr. Pellegrino d'Acierno and Robert Connolly (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1990).
- Taylor, Rev. Isaac, *Scenes in Europe, for the Amusement and Instruction of Little Tarry-At-Home Travellers*, 2nd ed. (London: Printed for J. Harris, 1819).
- Thiel, P. J. J. van, et al., *All the Paintings of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam: A Completely Illustrated Catalogue* (Amsterdam: Maarssen, 1976).
- Tindall, Gillian, *The Man Who Drew London: Wenceslaus Hollar in Reality and Imagination* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2002).

- Todd, Charles Burr, *A Brief History of the City of New York* (New York: American Book Company, 1899).
- Todd, Charles Burr, *The Story of the City of New York* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1888).
- Todorov, Tzvetan, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, tr. Richard Howard (New York: Harper & Row, 1984).
- Tracy, James D., ed., *City Walls: The Urban Enceinte in Global Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Tschumi, Bernard, *Le Fresnoy: Architecture In/Between* (New York: The Monacelli Press, 1999).
- Tuck, Richard, *Natural Rights Theories: Their Origin and Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- Tuck, Richard, *Philosophy and Government 1572-1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Tuckerman, Bayard, *Peter Stuyvesant: Director-General for the West India Company in New Netherland* (London: B. F. Stevens, 1893).
- Tufte, Edward R., *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information* (Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press, 1983).
- Valentine, David Thomas, *History of the City of New York* (New York: G. P. Putnam & Company, 1853).
- Valentine, David Thomas, *Manual of the Corporation of the City of New York*, 28 vols. (New York, 1842-1870).
- Vaughan, Charles Edwyn, *Studies in the History of Political Philosophy before and after Rousseau*, 2 vols. (Manchester: The University Press, 1925).
- Versteeg, Dingman, *Manhattan in 1628, as described in the recently discovered autograph letter of J. Michaelius written from the settlement on the 8th of August of that year and now first published* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1904).
- Vidler, Anthony, *The Writing of the Walls: Architectural Theory in the Late Enlightenment* (London: Butterworth Architecture, 1989).
- Vingboons, Johannes, *Verzameling van pas-kaarten, dienende tot de vaart naar Oost en Westindien; meest alle uitvoerig met de Pen getekent* (etc.) (1628-1693).
- Visscher, Claes Jansz., *Atlas Contractus* (etc.) (Amsterdam, c. 1650-1680).

- Vitruvius, *Les dix livres d'architecture de Vitruve*, 2nd rev. ed., ed. and tr. M. Perrault (Paris: Jean Baptiste Coignard, 1684).
- Vitruvius, *The Ten Books on Architecture*, tr. Morris Hicky Morgan (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960).
- Voltaire, *Candide and Other Stories*, tr. Roger Pearson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Voltaire, *Candide, or Optimism*, 2nd ed., tr. Robert M. Adams (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991).
- Voltaire, *Political Writings*, tr. David Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Voorsanger, Catherine Hoover and John K. Howat, eds., *Art and the Empire City: New York, 1825-1861* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000).
- Vreeland, Hamilton, *Hugo Grotius: The Father of the Modern Science of International Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1917).
- Vries, David Peterson de, *Voyages from Holland to America, A.D. 1632 to 1644*, tr. Henry C. Murphy (New York: Billin and Brothers, printers, 1853).
- Vries, Hans Vredeman de, *Hortorum viridariorumque elegantes* (etc.) (Antwerp: Philippus Gallæus, 1583).
- Vries, Hans Vredeman de, *Perspective, c'est a dire, le tresrenommé art du poin & oculaire* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1604-1605).
- Vries, Hans Vredeman de, *Perspective, id est . . . ars inspicientis . . . oculorum aciei, in pariete, tabula aut tela depicta* (etc.) (Lugduni Batavorum, 1605).
- Vries, Hans Vredeman de, *Variae Architecturae Formae* (Antwerp: T. Gallaeus, 1601).
- Walford, E. John, *Jacob van Ruisdael and the Perception of Landscape* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).
- Walpole, Horace, *A Catalogue of Engravers, who have been born, or resided in England; digested by Mr. Horace Walpole from the MSS. of Mr. George Vertue* (etc.) (Strawberry-Hill, 1763).
- Warburg, Aby, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, intro. Kurt W. Forster, tr. David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999).

- Wassenaer, Claes, *Historisch Verhael alder ghedenck-weerdichste geschiedenisse* (etc.) (Amsterdam, 1622-1635).
- Watson, John Fanning, *Annals and Occurrences of New York City and State* (etc.) (Philadelphia: H. F. Anners, 1846).
- Weir, Robert Walter, *Robert Weir: Artist and Teacher of West Point* (West Point: Cadet Fine Arts Forum of the United States Corps of Cadets, 1976).
- Weitenkampf, Frank, *The Eno Collection of New York City Views* (New York: New York Public Library, 1925).
- Werkmeister, W. H., *A History of Philosophical Ideas in America* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949).
- Wheelock, Jr., Arthur K., *A Collector's Cabinet* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1998).
- Wheelock, Jr., Arthur K., *Johannes Vermeer* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1995).
- White, Morton, *Science and Sentiment in America: Philosophical Thought from Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).
- White, Richard, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Whitehill, Walter Muir, *Boston: A Topographical History* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959).
- Whitehill, Walter Muir, ed., *Boston Prints and Printmakers, 1670-1775* (Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 1973).
- Wieder, Frederik Caspar, *De Stichting van New York in Juli 1625* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1925).
- Wieder, Frederik Caspar, ed., *Monumenta Cartographica* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1925-1933).
- Willensky, Elliot and Norval White, *AIA Guide to New York City*, 3rd ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988).
- Willey, Basil, *The Eighteenth Century Background: Studies on the Idea of Nature in the Thought of the Period* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1940).
- Williams, Stanley Thomas, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Washington Irving: A Check List* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936).
- Wilson, James Grant, ed., *The Memorial History of the City of New-York: From Its First Settlement to the Year 1892*, 4 vols. (New York: New-York History Company, 1892-1893).

- Wilson, William H., *Dutch Seventeenth Century Portraiture: The Golden Age* (Sarasota, FL: The John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art Foundation, 1980).
- Winters, William H., *Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Settlement on Manhattan Island, 1614-1914* (New York, 1914).
- Witsen, Nicolaas, *Aeloude en hedendaegsche scheeps-bouw en bestier* (etc.) (Amsterdam: Casparus Commelijjn; Broer en Jan Appelaer, 1671).
- Wittkower, Rudolf, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1971).
- Wolff, Hans, ed., *America: Early Maps of the New World* (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1992).
- Wood, Henry Trueman, *A History of the Royal Society of Arts* (London: John Murray, 1913).
- Woodward, David, ed., *Art and Cartography: Six Historical Essays* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
- Wootton, David, ed., *Modern Political Thought: Readings from Machiavelli to Nietzsche* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1996).
-
- Yates, Frances A., *The Art of Memory* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966).
- Yerbury, F. R., ed., *Old Domestic Architecture of Holland* (London: The Architectural Press, 1924).
-
- Zandvliet, C. J., *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and Their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion During the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Amsterdam: BV Uitgeverij De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1998).
- Zandvliet, Kees, ed., *Maurits Prins van Oranje* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2000).
- Zee, Henri and Barbara van der, *A Sweet and Alien Land: The Early History of New York* (New York: The Viking Press, 1978).
- Zeller, Nancy Anne McClure, ed., *A Beautiful and Fruitful Place: Selected Rensselaerswijck Seminar Papers* (Albany: New Netherland Publishing, 1991).

- Zisska, F. and R. Kistner, *Handschriften - Autographen, Selten Bücher. Landkarten - Stadtansichten, Dekorative Graphik*, Auktion 32/I, 2-5 November 1998 at Buch- und Kunstauktionshaus F. Zisska and R. Kistner, Munich.
- Zonca, Vittorio, *Novo Teatro di Machine et Edificii* (etc.) (Padua: Franco Bertelli, 1621).
- Zubler, Leonhard, *Novum Instrumentum Geometricum . . . Germanice? primum descriptum* (etc.) (Basel, 1607).
- Zwaan, F. L., C. W. de Kruyter and S. Groenveld, *Gekast naar de konst: Fragmenten uit P. C. Hoofst Nederlandsche Historiën* (Culemborg: Tjeenk Willink, 1977).
- Zwierlein, Frederick, *Religion in New Netherland: A History of the Development of the Religious Conditions in the Province of New Netherland, 1623-1664* (Rochester, NY: John P. Smith Printing Company, 1910).

ARTICLES

- Arneil, Barbara, "John Locke, Natural Law and Colonialism," in *History of Political Thought*, vol. 13, no. 4 (Winter 1992), pp. 587-603.
- Arneil, Barbara, "The Wild Indian's Venison: Locke's Theory of Property and English Colonialism in America," in *Political Studies*, vol. 44, no. 1 (March 1996), pp. 60-74.
- Augustyn, Robert T. and Paul E. Cohen, "Maps in the Making of Manhattan," in *The Magazine Antiques*, vol. 148, no. 3 (September 1995), pp. 336-347.
- Baines, Paul, "'Our Annius': Antiquaries and Fraud in the Eighteenth Century," in *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1 (Spring 1997), pp. 33-51.
- Bomford, David, "Perspective, Anamorphosis, and Illusion: Seventeenth-Century Dutch Peep Shows," in *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 55 (1998), pp. 124-135.
- Booth, Mary Louise [?], "The Dutch on Manhattan," in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 52 (September 1854), pp. 433-453.

- Brunetti, Estella, "Some Unpublished Works by Codazzi, Salucci Lemaire and Patel," in *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 100 (September 1958), pp. 311-316.
- Calloway, Colin G., "Native American History and the Search for Common Ground," in *Reviews in American History*, vol. 20, issue 4 (December 1992), pp. 447-452.
- Campbell, Tony, "Claes Jansz. Visscher: A Hundred Maps Described," in *Map Collectors' Series*, vol. 5, no. 46 (1968), pp. 3-54.
- Campbell, Tony, "New Light on the Jansson-Visscher Maps of New England," in *Map Collectors' Series*, vol. 3, no. 24 (1965), pp. 3-44.
- Cohen, David Steven, "How Dutch Were the Dutch of New Netherland?," in *New York History*, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1981), pp. 43-60.
- Connors, Joseph, "The Lion of Florence," in *The New York Review of Books*, vol. 48, no. 14 (September 20, 2001), pp. 73-78.
- Cousins, Mark, "The Ugly," in *AA Files* 28 (Autumn 1994), pp. 61-64.
- Croix, Horst de la, "Military Architecture and the Radial City Plan in Sixteenth Century Italy," in *Art Bulletin*, vol. 42 (1960), pp. 263-290.
- Cumming, William P., "The Montessor-Ratzer-Sauthier Sequence of Maps of New York City 1766-76," in *Imago Mundi: The Journal of the International Society for the History of Cartography*, vol. 31 (1979), pp. 55-65.
- Cutler, A. Claire, "The 'Grotian tradition' in international relations," in *Review of International Studies*, vol. 17 (1991), pp. 41-65.
- Damisch, Hubert, "The Underneath of Painting," tr. Francette Pacteau and Stephen Bann, in *Word and Image*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1985), pp. 197-209.
- Desbarats, Catherine, "Essai sur quelques elements de l'écriture de l'histoire amerindienne," in *Revue d'histoire de l'Amerique francaise* 53 (Spring 2000), pp. 491-520.
- Desbrière, Michel, "De L'Image Cachée à l'Image Classique de la Champagne Septentrionale (1591-1656)," in Solange Bidou, ed., *La première moitié du XVIIe siècle dans le territoire actuel du département des Ardennes* (Charleville-Mézières: Conseil général des Ardennes, 1992), pp. 37-51.

- Desbrière, Michel, "L'oeuvre de Jacques Fougeu, relative à la Champagne septentrionale pendant le règne de Henri IV," in C. Bousquet-Bressolier, ed., *L'oeil du cartographe*, Editions du C. T. H. S., no. 18 (1995), p. 233-244.
- Dorrian, Mark, "On Some Spatial Aspects of the Colonial Discourse on Ireland," in *The Journal of Architecture*, vol. 6, no. 1 (Spring 2001), pp. 27-51.
- Fix, Andrew, "Angels, Devils, and Evil Spirits in Seventeenth-Century Thought: Balthasar Bekker and the Collegiants," in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 50, no. 4 (October-December 1989), pp. 527-547.
- Fontaney, Antoine Étienne, "Littérature Américaine: Washington Irving—The Alhambra," in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vol. 6 (1832), pp. 515-549.
- Frijhoff, Willem, "New Views on the Dutch Period of New York," unpublished lecture presented at the Equitable Tower, New York, February 14, 1998.
- Gastel, Ada van, "Van der Donck's Description of the Indians: Additions and Corrections," in *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 3rd Series, vol. 47, no. 3 (July 1990), pp. 411-421.
- Gehring, Charles T., "Peter Minuit's Purchase of Manhattan Island—New Evidence," in *de Halve Maen*, vol. 55 (Spring 1980).
- Gehring, Charles T., "Petrus Stuyvesant, directeur-generaal van Nieuw-Nederland: een spannend begin 1647-1652," in *Jaarboek Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie* 50 (1996), pp. 69-87.
- Gibbs, George, "Account of the Statue of George III., Formerly Standing in the Bowling Green, New York," in *Proceedings of the New York Historical Society* (1845), pp. 168-175.
- Gnudi, Martha Teach, "The Cover Design: Agostino Ramelli and Ambroise Bachot," in *Technology and Culture*, vol. 15, no. 4 (1974), pp. 614-625.
- Goodfriend, Joyce D., "Writing/Righting Dutch Colonial History," in *New York History* (January 1999), pp. 5-28.
- Grafton, Anthony, "Believe It or Not," in *The New York Review of Books*, (November 5, 1998), pp. 14-18.
- Grafton, Anthony, "Over the Rainbow," in *The New York Review of Books*, vol. 47, no. 19 (November 30, 2000), pp. 4-6.

- Harley, J. B., "Silences and Secrecy: The Hidden Agenda of Cartography in Early Modern Europe," in *Imago Mundi: The Journal of the International Society for the History of Cartography*, no. 40 (1988), pp. 57-76.
- Harris, Charles X., "Henri Couturier: An Artist of New Netherland," in *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin*, vol. 11, no. 2 (July 1927), pp. 45-52.
- Harris, Charles X., "Jacobus Gerritsen Strycker (c. 1619-1687): An Artist of New Amsterdam," in *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin*, vol. 10, no. 3 (October 1926), pp. 83-91.
- Herman, Daniel J., "Perspectives: Romance on the Middle Ground," in *Journal of the Early Republic*, no. 19 (Summer 1999), pp. 279-291.
- Hirst, Paul, "The Defence of Places: Fortifications as Architecture," in *AA Files* 33 (Summer 1997), pp. 13-26.
- Hirst, Paul, "Foucault and Architecture," in *AA Files* 26 (Autumn 1993), pp. 52-60.
- Hoekstra, Rozemarijn, "Images of Dress in the Golden Age of Dutch Painting: A Methodology of Research into Women's Costume in the Netherlands of the Seventeenth Century," in *Costume: The Journal of the Costume Society*, no. 33 (1999), pp. 36-45.
- Honour, Hugh, "Leonard Knyff," in *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 96 (November 1954), pp. 336-338.
- Hudson, Alice, "Manhattan on Paper: The Mapping of Property and Environment in Manhattan since the 1600s, with a Check List of Property Maps and Atlases," in *Biblion: The Bulletin of The New York Public Library*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Spring 1993), pp. 39-70.
- Jameson, J. Franklin, "Willem Usselinx: Founder of the Dutch and Swedish West India Companies," in *Papers of the American Historical Association*, vol. 2, no. 3, (1887), pp. 155-382.

- Kaldenbach, C. J., "Perspective Views," in *Print Quarterly*, vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1985), pp. 86-104.
- Keller, Alexander Gustav, "The Missing Years of Jacques Besson: Inventor of Machines, Teacher of Mathematics, Distiller of Oils, and Huguenot Pastor," in *Technology and Culture*, vol. 14 (1973), pp. 28-39.
- Keyser, E. de, "Les vues d'optique," in *Bulletin de la Société le Vieux Papier*, vol. 38 (1977), pp. 125-132.
- Kidson, Alex, "The Political Patronage of Portraiture in Britain 1760-1820," unpublished essay.
- Kraus, Evelyn L., "Vues d'Optique," in *Art on Paper*, vol. 5, no. 2 (November-December 2000), pp. 66-67.
- Krogt, Peter van der, "Amsterdam Atlas Production in the 1630s: A Bibliographer's Nightmare," in *Imago Mundi: The International Journal for the History of Cartography*, vol. 48 (1996), pp. 149-160.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl, "Early American History with the Dutch Put In," in *Reviews in American History* 21 (1993), pp. 195-201.
- Larsen, Erik, "Supplements to the Catalogue of Frans Post," in *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 124 (June 1982), pp. 339-343.
- Liedtke, Walter, "From Vredeman de Vries to Dirck van Delen: Sources of Imaginary Architectural Painting," in *Bulletin of the Rhode Island School of Design*, vol. 57, no. 2 (1970), pp. 15-25.
- Long, Pamela O. "The Contribution of Architectural Writers to a 'Scientific' Outlook in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," in *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2 (Fall 1985), pp. 265-298.
- Longhi, Roberto, "Viviano Codazzi e l'invenzione della veduta realistica," in *Paragone* (November 1995), pp. 41-42.
- Lukacher, Brian, "Joseph Gandy and the Mythography of Architecture," in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 53, no. 3 (September 1994), pp. 280-299.
- Marin, Louis, "Disneyland: A Degenerate Utopia," in *Glyph: Johns Hopkins Textual Studies*, vol. 1 (1977), pp. 50-66.

- Marks, Arthur S., "The Statue of King George III in New York and the Iconology of Regicide," in *The American Art Journal*, vol. 13, no. 3 (Summer 1981), pp. 61-82.
- Marshall, David, "A View of Poggioreale by Viviano Codazzi and Domenico Gargiulo," in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 45, no. 1 (March 1986), pp. 32-46.
- Merwick, Donna, "Dutch Townsmen and Land Use: A Spatial Perspective on Seventeenth-Century Albany, New York," in *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 3rd series, vol. 37, no. 1 (January 1980), pp. 53-78.
- Meurs, Paul, "Nieuw-Amsterdam op Manhattan 1625-1660," in P. J. J. van Dijk, et al., eds., *Vestingbouw overzee: Militaire architectuur van Manhattan tot Korea* (Zutphen, 1996), pp. 19-32.
- Meyjes, G. H. M. Posthumus, "Les Eglises wallonnes aux Pays-Bas (XVI^e et XVII^e siècles)," in *Études Germaniques*, no. 2 (April-June 1997), pp. 215-230.
- Paltsits, Victor Hugo, "The Founding of New Amsterdam in 1626," in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, New Series, vol. 34, pt. 1 (1925), pp. 39-65.
- Palumbo, Anne Cannon, "Prints into Paint: The Influence of Prints on Eighteenth-Century American Painting," in *Imprint: Journal of the American Historical Print Collectors Society*, vol. 18, no. 2 (Autumn 1993), pp. 13-20.
- Pepper, Simon, "Sword and Spade: Military Construction in Renaissance Italy," in *Construction History: Journal of the Construction History Society*, vol. 16 (2000), pp. 13-32.
- Reclus, Elisée, "The Evolution of Cities," in *Contemporary Review* 6 (1895), pp. 246-264.
- Rink, Oliver A., "Company Management or Private Trade: The Two Patroonship Plans for New Netherland," in *New York History* (January 1978), pp. 5-26.
- Rink, Oliver A., "Private Interest and Godly Gain: The West India Company and the Dutch Reformed Church in New Netherland, 1624-1664," in *New York History*, vol. 75, no. 3 (July 1994), pp. 245-264.

- Rink, Oliver A., "The People of New Netherland: Notes on Non-English Immigration to New York in the Seventeenth Century," in *New York History*, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1981), pp. 5-42.
- Rink, Oliver A., "Unraveling a Secret Colonialism," in *de Halve Maen*, Part I: vol. 60, no. 1 (March 1987), pp. 13-16; Part II: vol. 60, no. 2 (June 1987), pp. 8-11.
- Rowland, Ingrid D., "Through a Glass, Darkly," in *The New York Review of Books*, vol. 49, no. 3 (February 28, 2002), pp. 10-14.
- Schama, Simon, "The Dandy Dutch," in *The New Yorker*, vol. 75, no. 4 (March 22, 1999), pp. 94-95.
- Schefer, Jean-Louis, "Thanatography, Skiagraphy (from *Espèce de chose mélancolie*)," tr. Paul Smith, in *Word and Image*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1985), pp. 191-194.
- Schmidt, Benjamin, "Mapping an Empire: Cartographic and Colonial Rivalry in Seventeenth-Century Dutch and English North America," in *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 3rd Series, vol. 54, no. 3 (July 1997), pp. 549-578.
- Seitz, Wolfgang, "The Engraving Trade in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth- Century Augsburg: A Checklist," in *Print Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 2 (1986), pp. 116-128.
- Shadwell, Wendy, "Prized Prints: Rare American Prints Before 1860 in the Collection of The New-York Historical Society," in *Imprint: Journal of the American Historical Print Collectors Society*, vol. 11, no. 1 (Spring 1986), pp. 1-27.
- Skinner, Quentin, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," in *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History*, vol. 8 (1969), pp. 3-53.
- Syrett, Harold C., "Private Enterprise in New Amsterdam," in *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 3rd Series, vol. 11, no. 4 (October 1954), pp. 536-550.
- Truettner, William H., "The Art of History: American Exploration and Discovery Scenes, 1840-1860," in *The American Art Journal*, vol. 14, no. 1 (Winter 1982), pp. 4-31.

Vail, R. W. G., "Unknown Views of Old New York," in *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 3 (July 1949), pp. 149-159.

VanHoevenberg, Alma R., "The Stuyvesants in the Netherlands and New Netherland," in *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin*, vol. 10, no. 1 (April 1926), pp. 3-12.

Vidler, Anthony, "Diagrams of Utopia," in *Daidalos* 74 (October 2000), pp. 6-13.

Weitenkampf, Fred, "Peep-Show Prints," in *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, vol. 25, no. 6 (June 1921), pp. 359-366.

Westra, Frans, "Lost and Found: Crijn Fredericx—A New York Founder," in *de Halve Maen*, vol. 71, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 7-16.

Wooden, Warren W. and John N. Wall, Jr., "Thomas More and the Painter's Eye: Visual Perspective and Artistic Purpose in More's *Utopia*," in *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 15 (1985), pp. 231-263.

Wright, Langdon C., "Local Government and Central Authority in New Netherland," in *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1973), pp. 7-29.

Yerushalmi, Yh, "Between Amsterdam and New Amsterdam: The Place of Curacao and the Caribbean in Early Modern Jewish History," in *American Jewish History*, vol. 72, no. 2 (1982), pp. 172-192.

Zavala, Silvio, "The American Utopia of the Sixteenth Century," in *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 4 (August 1947) pp. 337-347.

Zwierlein, Frederick J., "New Netherland Intolerance," in *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 4, pt. 2 (April 1918), pp. 186-216.

Zwieten, Adriana E. van, "The Orphan Chamber of New Amsterdam," in *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 3d Series, vol. 53, no. 2 (April 1996), pp. 319-340.